THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

Goldsmiths' Library

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

620142

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_may-7-june-7-1883_279

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

46° VICTORIÆ, 1883.

VOL. CCLXXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE SEVENTH DAY OF MAY 1883,

TO

THE SEVENTH DAY OF JUNE 1883.

Fourth Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1883.

8995

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCLXXIX.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, MONDAY, MAY 7.

Page

PARLIAMENT—PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—RESOLUTION—

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to make such provision, by legislation or otherwise, as will enable either House of Parliament, if it shall think fit, at any stage of its proceedings upon any Bill which shall have been passed by the other House of Parliament, to adjourn further proceedings upon such Bill to such day as shall for that purpose be then named, in the first or second week of the next succeeding Session of Parliament,"—(*The Lord Balfour*) .. 1

After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

NAVY—H.M.S. "HECLA"—THE SUEZ CANAL—Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook 12

ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 17—ANNUAL DRAINAGE INSTALMENTS—Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Waterford, The Earl of Belmore; Reply, Lord Carlingford 14

Pluralities Acts Amendment Bill (No. 42)—

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read .. 17

After short debate, House in Committee (according to Order); an amendment made; the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.* [6.15.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, MAY 7.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill—

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Manchester Ship Canal Bill that they have power to inquire and consider whether the powers respecting the Canal can be properly granted, regard being had to the question whether, to make the Canal effective, a low-water channel in the estuary of the Mersey be necessary, and whether the formation and maintenance of such a channel is reasonably practicable," (*Sir Joseph Bailey*) 17

Motion *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

Navy—Engine Room Artificers—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 18
Africa (River Congo)—Action of Portugal—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 18
Ireland—Commissioners of National Education—Mr. Owen Ryan, Assistant Teacher in the Belfast National School—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 19
Post Office—Mail Carts and Newspaper Parcels—Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Fawcett 20
Post Office—The Parcels Post—Appointment of Officials—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 20
Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Telegraph Clerks, Belfast—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 21
Income Tax—Assessment of Profits made Abroad—Questions, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Macfarlane, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 22
South Africa—Langalibalele—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 22
Poor Law (Ireland)—Election of Guardians for Castleblayney—The Papers—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 23
Fishery Piers and Harbours (Ireland)—Rossclare Pier and Harbour—Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. Courtney 23
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Mr. J. F. L. M'Farlane, J.P.—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 24
Poor Law (Ireland)—Donegal Workhouse—The Roman Catholic Chaplain—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 24
General Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Accommodation—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 25
Law and Justice (Scotland)—Procurators Fiscal and Private Practice—Case of William Meikle—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate 26
Navy—Iron-clads for Foreign Powers—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 27
India—Debates on Indian Affairs—Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Chairman of Ways and Means 27
South Africa (The Transvaal)—Murder of Mr. J. S. M'Gilloray—Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley .. 28
The Irish Land Commission—Appointment of Additional Commissioners—Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan.. .. 28
Lighthouse Illuminants—The Board of Trade—Resignation of Professor Tyndall—Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain .. 28
Contagious Diseases Acts—The Metropolitan Police—Questions, Mr. Gorst, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Sir William Harcourt .. 29
Army—Soldiers' Illegitimate Children—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 30
Arterial Drainage (Ireland)—The River Shannon—Drainage Works at Meeluk—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. Courtney .. 30
Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury Panel, Dublin—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Question, Mr. Harrington; [No reply] 30
Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Section 14—Police Searches—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 31
Royal Irish Constabulary—Suicide of a Constable—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 32
Poor Law (Ireland)—Carrick-on-Shannon Union—Election of Guardians—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 33

Licensing Acts (Ireland)—Dublin—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 34

Law and Justice (India)—Courts of Law—Mr. Justice Norris—Conditions of Admission for Natives—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 35

Indian Penal Code—Newspapers—The "Calcutta Englishman"—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 36

The Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Mr. Philips Newton—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 37

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Sentence on James M'Claskey—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 37

Duchy of Lancaster—Foreshores—The Corporation of Southport—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, Mr. Dodson 38

Contagious Diseases Acts—Provisional Arrangements—Questions, Mr. Puleston, Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. Gorst; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir William Harcourt .. 40

Royal Irish Constabulary—Tearing Down National League Placards—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 42

Poor Law (Ireland)—Case of John Flanagan, a Lunatic—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 42

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Execution of Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 44

Parliament—Business of the House—Ministerial Statement—Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 45

Parliament—Business of the House—Lords Alcester and Wolseley Annuities Bills—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Speaker .. 46

Parliament—Department of the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce—Question, Mr. James Howard; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 47

Egypt—Administration of Justice—Ahmed Bey Khandeel—Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 47

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill—Local Collectors of Income Tax—Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Hicks; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 48

Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule of Blocking Notices—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Speaker 49

Egypt (Re-organization)—Mr. Sheldon Amos—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 50

India—Private Employment of Indian Officials—Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 51

Navy—The "Clyde" Court Martial—Question, Captain Maxwell-Heron; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 51

Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Section 14—Police Searches—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 52

Russia—Coronation of the Czar—The Embassy to Moscow—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Courtney 52

Contagious Diseases Acts—Motion for Adjournment of the House—*Moved*, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Puleston*) .. 52
After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Navy Estimates.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £937,100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884" 75

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Jenkins*:)—After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) Bill [Bill 156]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 147

After debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.* [1.45]

LORDS, TUESDAY, MAY 8.

SUNDAY OPENING OF NATIONAL MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES—RESOLUTION—

Moved to resolve, "That, seeing the success which has attended the action of Her Majesty's Government in opening on Sundays the national museums and galleries in the suburban districts of London and in the city of Dublin, and whereas this House was last Session informed by Her Majesty's Government that no opposition to Sunday opening, so far as it had already gone, had come before them, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived for extending the policy of Sunday opening after Two o'clock to all museums and galleries supported by national funds,"—(*The Earl of Dunraven*) 155

Amendment *moved*,

To leave out all the words after ("That") and insert ("inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March, 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried out,")—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

After debate, on question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 91, Not-Contents 67; Majority 24.

Resolved in the *negative.*

Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 185

Moved to resolve, "That inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried out,"—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*The Earl of Carnarvon*:) After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Moved, as an amendment to the foregoing Resolution, to leave out ("the time has arrived when") and in the last line after ("should") to insert ("if and so far as may be found consistent with the safety and general welfare of those institutions") (*The Earl Cairns*); after further short debate, the said amendment, on question, *agreed to:*

Resolved, That inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March 1860, that such institutions as the British Museums and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that this recommendation should, if and so far as may be found consistent with the safety and general welfare of those institutions, be carried out.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS—"BRADLAUGH v. CLARKE"—Question, Lord Denman; Answer, The Lord Chancellor .. 192

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Dalhousie*); read 1ª (No. 56) 193

[8.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MAY 8.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill (by Order)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 194

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to insert the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now read the third time,' stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 173, Noes 157; Majority 16.—(Div. List, No. 85.)

Moved, "That the Vote of Mr. Plunket be disallowed,"—(*Mr. Kenny*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 36, Noes 254; Majority 218.—(Div. List, No. 86.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to* (Queen's *Consent* signified):—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—THE LATE EX-GAIKWAR OF BARODA—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 220

SOUTH AFRICA—ZULULAND—THE BISHOP OF NATAL—Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley .. 221

GROUND GAME ACT, 1880—SPRING TRAPS (SCOTLAND)—Questions, Sir Alexander Gordon, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Sir William Harcourt 221

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 16—SECRET EXAMINATIONS—Questions, Mr. Kenny, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 223

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CASE OF PATRICK KENNEDY—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 224

STATE OF IRELAND—AGRARIAN OUTRAGES IN MILTOWN MALBAY, COUNTY CLARE—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 225

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS (WELLS UNION)—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, Mr. Mundella 226

SUNDAY TRADING (LONDON)—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 227

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—ABSENCE OF A SENIOR EXAMINER—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Mundella 227

IRELAND—THE DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE AND THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE COMMITTEES OF INQUIRY—Questions, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 228

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—MR. SHELDON AMOS—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 230

COMMISSION ON TECHNICAL EDUCATION—THE REPORT—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 230

DUCHY OF LANCASTER—LANDS ACT, 1855—FORESHORES—THE CORPORATION OF SOUTHPORT—Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, Mr. Dodson 230

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—DRAINAGE CONSOLIDATION (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Courtney .. 232

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—THE EARL OF DUFFERIN'S DESPATCH—Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gladstone 232

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 16—PRIVATE EXAMINATIONS AT DUBLIN CASTLE—Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 233

[*May* 8.] Page

ADJOURNMENT—THE DERBY DAY—Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 234
PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL—RECOMMENDATION OF PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES — Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 235
SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 235
PARLIAMENT—PRIVILEGE—PARLIAMENTARY OATH (MR. BRADLAUGH)—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Speaker .. 236
EAST INDIA (EXPENDITURE)—Observations, Mr. E. Stanhope .. 238

DUCHY OF LANCASTER—LANDS ACT, 1855—FORESHORES—THE CORPORATION OF SOUTHPORT—MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Jesse Collings*) .. 238
After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MOTION.

EAST INDIA (EXPENDITURE)—RESOLUTION—
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that early steps be taken to reduce the expenditure of India,"—(*Mr. E. Stanhope*) 264
Amendment proposed,
To leave out all the words after the word "House" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "every effort should be made to effect economy in the Government of India,"—(*Mr. J. Kynaston Cross*,)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put, and *agreed to*.
Main Question again proposed 306
Amendment proposed,
At the end of the Question, to add the words "and this House regrets the decision arrived at by Her Majesty's Government to cast a further burden upon the Revenues of India in order to meet the extraordinary charges incurred by that Government on account of the Military expedition to Egypt,"—(*Mr. Onslow.*)
Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Marjoribanks:*)—After further short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 77, Noes 17; Majority 60.—(Div. List, No. 87:)—Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday*.

QUESTION.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE BILL—Question, Mr. Hicks; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. W. H. Smith .. 316

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) Bill [Bill 156]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) 317
Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

NATIONAL DEBT—
Resolutions *considered* in Committee 317
Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*.

MOTIONS.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 172] .. 318

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 173] 318

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 174] ... 318

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 175] .. 318

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 176] 318

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 177] .. 319

Board of Works (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 178] 319

Charitable Trusts Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 179] 319

Trust Funds (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James Stewart, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Crum*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 180] 319

[2.0.]

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9.

Their Lordships met for the despatch of Judicial Business only. [2.45.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9.

QUESTION.

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—SURREY (TRIAL OF CAUSES) BILL—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Speaker 320

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Agricultural Holdings Bill [Bill 42]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Staveley Hill*) 321

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Heneage*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

Theatres Regulation Bill [Bill 81]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland*) 331

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 22, Noes 141; Majority 119.—(Div. List, No. 88.)

Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Second Reading *put off* for six months.

Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment Bill [Bill 91]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Broadhurst*) .. 343

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Monckton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 44, Noes 124; Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 89.)

Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Second Reading *put off* for six months.

National Debt Bill—Resolutions [May 8] *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 182] 354

MOTIONS.

Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. George Russell, Mr. Edward Stanhope*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 183] 354

High Court of Justice (Service of Writs) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Cochran-Patrick, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. James Campbell, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Armitstead*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 184] 354

Companies (Colonial Registers) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Macnaghten, Mr. Salt*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 185] 355

[5.58.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, MAY 10.

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS—

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess.

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill (No. 52)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord O'Hagan*) .. 356

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* the 24*th instant.*

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—MESSRS. NOLAN AND SMITH—Question, Observations, Earl Cairns; Reply, Lord Carlingford:—Short debate thereon 356

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS — NON-ENFORCEMENT OF THE COMPULSORY CLAUSES—ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT—Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook:—Short debate thereon 371

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE LAW ADVISER—Question, The Earl of Limerick; Answer, Lord Carlingford:—Short debate thereon .. 378

Cathedral Statutes Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle*); read 1ª (No. 58) 380

Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Northbrook*); read 1ª (No. 61) 380

[6.45.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MAY 10.

Page

ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—CASE OF JAMES M'GOWAN, JUNR., CONACLOON, CO. LEITRIM—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 380

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS — NON-ENFORCEMENT OF COMPULSORY EXAMINATION — WITHDRAWAL OF THE POLICE FROM CHATHAM—ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT—Questions, Mr. J. G. Talbot, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 381

ARMY—MUSKETRY INSTRUCTORS—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 382

WESTERN ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC—AUSTRALIAN COLONIES—ANNEXATION OF NEW GUINEA BY QUEENSLAND — Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Courtney 382

METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING ACTS AMENDMENT ACT—THE "HOTEL METROPOLE"—Question, Mr. Story-Maskelyne; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 382

IRELAND—STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION—Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Questions, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Mayne; [No reply] .. 383

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—CO. LONGFORD—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 384

HALL-MARKING (GOLD AND SILVER PLATE)—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE (1878-9)—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 384

ITALY—RENEWAL OF COMMERCIAL TREATY—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 385

LAW AND JUSTICE—DORMANT FUNDS IN CHANCERY—Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, Mr. Courtney 386

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—ROSSCLARE PIER AND HARBOUR —Questions, Colonel Colthurst; Answers, Mr. Courtney .. 386

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—APPOINTMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICER TO THE CASHEL DISPENSARY DISTRICT—Questions, Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 387

NAVY (THE BLUE RIBBON)—Question, Mr. Stewart Macliver; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 388

BALLOT ACT CONTINUANCE AND AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 388

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—WESTMINSTER HALL (WESTERN SIDE)—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre.. .. 389

HALL-MARKING (GOLD AND SILVER PLATE) (INDIA)—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 389

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—MARTIN NASH—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 390

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST WORKHOUSE — IRREGULARITIES IN BOOK-KEEPING—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 391

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—CONDUCT OF THE POLICE—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 392

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY — EMPLOYMENT IN CULTIVATING FARMS OF EVICTED TENANTS—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 392

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—DUNFANAGHY WORKHOUSE—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 393

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—OUTDOOR RELIEF—DUNFANAGHY BOARD OF GUARDIANS—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan.. .. 394

IRELAND—HUNTING IN CARLOW CO.—Questions, Mr. Kenny, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan.. .. 395

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 14—POLICE SEARCHES— —Questions, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan .. 397

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SUB-INSPECTOR SMITH—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 399

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—JURY PANEL—TRIAL OF JOSEPH BRADY—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 400

[*May* 10.] Page

Post Office (Ireland)—The Telegraph Office, Dundalk—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 400
The Contagious Diseases Acts — Non-Enforcement of Compulsory Examination—Withdrawal of the Police—Action of the Government—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Puleston; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 401
Turkey (Asiatic Provinces)—Governorship of the Lebanon—Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 402
Post Office—The Irish Mail Service—Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 402
Army—The Royal Engineers—Question, Mr. Greer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 402
Army—Cavalry Regiments in Ireland — Question, Colonel O'Beirne; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 403
Morocco—Slavery — Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 403
Portugal—International Sailing Code—The "City of Mecca"—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 404
Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner — Rebuilding of the Wellington Arch—Questions, Mr. A. Pease, Mr. Gerard Noel; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 404
Navy — Victualling Accounts — Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 405
Factory Acts (Inspectors)—Mr. William Paterson—Questions, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 405
Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar—Colonel Maceo—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 406
Civil Service (Re-organization)—Promotion—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Mr. Courtney 407
Explosive Acts—Orders in Council, April 20, 1883—Explosives—Question, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 407
Parliament—Rules and Orders—Petitions—Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) Amendment Bill—Proxy Signatures—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Sir Charles Forster 408
Parliament—Public Business—Ministerial Statement—Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, The Attorney General 408
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Execution of Myles Joyce, Convicted of Murder—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 410
South Africa—The Transvaal Convention—Questions, Sir William Hart Dyke, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 411
The Viceroy of India—Criminal Code (Procedure) Amendment Bill—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 412
Trade and Commerce — The Sugar Duties—Question, Mr. Samuel Morley; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 413
National School Teachers (Ireland)—Grants to Training Colleges—Questions, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 414
Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Section 16—Secret Examinations—Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan .. 414
Inland Navigation (Ireland)—The Upper Shannon—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Courtney 417
Parliament—Business of the House—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone 418
Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill—Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gladstone 419

INLAND REVENUE — CULTIVATION OF TOBACCO — Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 420

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £28,220, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Buildings of the Houses of Parliament" 421

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £27,720, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Rylands*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 433

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £27,880, be granted, &c.,"—(*Sir Edward Watkin*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 444

After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £550, to complete the sum for the Monument to the Earl of Beaconsfield.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to.* 446

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £117,762, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Maintenance and Repair of Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, including various special Works; for providing the necessary supply of Water; for Rents of Houses hired for the accommodation of Public Departments, and Charges attendant thereon" 446

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £5,000, being the sum required for the National Gallery (Improvement of Accommodation) be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Gorst*:)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question again proposed 454

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £3,500 for the Tower of London (Works of Restoration) be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Percy Wyndham*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 461

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £5,000, for New Works and alterations of a minor character, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Lord Randolph Churchill*:)—After further short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 29, Noes 79; Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 90.)

Original Question again proposed 470

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £113,062, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Henry H. Fowler*:)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 40, Noes 69; Majority 29.—(Div. List, No. 91.)

Original Question again proposed:—After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock; Committee to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill [Bill 140]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 30*th April*] 473

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

QUESTION.

——o——

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—POLICY OF HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 508

[May 10.] Page

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—EAST INDIA (EXPENDITURE)—Observations, Mr. Onslow:—Short debate thereon 510

SPAIN — EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR — Observation, Sir R. Assheton Cross 512

MOTIONS.

Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Dodson*) 512

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Solicitor General*).

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill—

Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) 516

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 190.]

HARBOURS OF REFUGE—NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE—

Ordered, That the Select Committee do consist of Twenty-three Members:—List of the Committee 518

Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill—

Bill *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 186] 519

Moved, "That the Bill be read a second time upon *Monday* 28th May:"—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*.

Poor Law Conferences Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Pell, Mr. Stansfeld, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Hollond*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 187] 519

Medals Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Courtney, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 188] 519

Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 191] 519

Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 189] 520

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES (LONDON) [SALARIES AND EXPENSES]—

Considered in Committee 520

Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

[1.45.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MAY 11.

QUESTIONS.

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS—THE BOARD OF TRADE—RESIGNATION OF PROFESSOR TYNDALL — Questions, Mr. Gibson, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain 520

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—OUTDOOR RELIEF—Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 521

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—WATERFORD CO.—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 522

IRELAND—EVICTIONS IN CO. SLIGO—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer. Mr. Trevelyan 523

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 14—SEARCHES FOR DOCUMENTS—MR. JOHN CULLEN, OF MANORHAMILTON—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; [No reply] 524
LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 525
CRIMINAL CODE (INDICTABLE OFFENCES PROCEDURE) BILL (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General 525
DUCHY OF LANCASTER—LANDS ACT, 1855—COUNCIL OF THE DUCHY—Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Dodson 526
EMIGRATION (ENGLAND AND WALES)—Questions, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain 527
PARLIAMENT—LORD ALCESTER'S AND LORD WOLSELEY'S ANNUITY BILLS—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 527
PARLIAMENT—GRAND COMMITTEES—REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Gladstone.. 529
REGISTRATION (IRELAND) ACTS—REGISTERED CHARGES ON ESTATES—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 530
PARLIAMENT—ADJOURNMENT—THE DERBY DAY—Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker 530
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE NATIONAL DEBT BILL—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 532
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE DUBLIN MURDER TRIALS—Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Macartney; Answers, Mr. Speaker 532
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—Questions, Mr. Moore, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 533
NAVY—H.M.S. "LONDON"—Questions, Sir John Hay; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 535

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT — ADJOURNMENT (WHITSUN RECESS)—SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR—MOTION—
Moved, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Monday the 21st instant,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) 535
After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to*. [6.55.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, MAY 21.

QUESTIONS.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—APPLICATIONS UNDER THE ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 570
STATE OF IRELAND—DECREASE OF CRIME—WITHDRAWAL OF EXTRA POLICE—Questions, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 571
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—SPECIAL RESIDENT MAGISTRATES AND THE CONSTABULARY—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 573
POOR LAW ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Plunket, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 574
STATE OF IRELAND—EXTRA POLICE (TIPPERARY)—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 575

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE PHŒNIX PARK MURDERS—PATRICK DELANEY—Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Harrington; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland 576
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, CO. LEITRIM—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 577
THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS) — CAVAN — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 577
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—MAIL SERVICE IN CO. SLIGO—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 578
IRELAND—INFLAMMATORY LANGUAGE—THE REV. CHARLES FLYNN—Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 579
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, KILDYSART—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 579
BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY (IRELAND) ACT, 1857—TRANSFER OF FUNDS—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 580
INDIA—THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, CALCUTTA—MISLEADING TELEGRAM—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross .. 581
ARMY (INDIA) — EUROPEAN SOLDIERS AT BARRACKPUR—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 582
INDIA (BENGAL)—THE RYOTS OF MEHERPUR—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 582
INDIA—THE MADRAS CIVIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 583
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND YOUNG PERSONS—LEGISLATION—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 584
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 584
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—MILITIA UNIFORMS—Question, Mr. Bellingham; Answer, Mr. Brand 584
LAW AND JUSTICE (INDIA)—TREATMENT OF EUROPEANS AND NATIVES—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 585
INDIA—THE SALEM RIOTS—MR. MACLEAN—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 585
PRISONS (IRELAND)—MR. HEALY, M.P., MR. DAVITT, AND MR. QUINN, PRISONERS IN RICHMOND GAOL—Questions, Mr. Lalor; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 586
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE ADJUTANT OF THE ANTRIM MILITIA—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Brand 587
SUPPLY—THE ARMY ESTIMATES—Questions, Sir Henry Fletcher, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Mr. Brand 587

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £95,000, to complete the sum for Public Offices Site.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 588
(2.) £14,730, to complete the sum for Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 610
(3.) £279,312, to complete the sum for Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 611
(4.) £29,150, to complete the sum for County Court Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 632
(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,675, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Metropolitan Police Court Buildings" 635

After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 50, Noes 15; Majority 35.—(Div. List, No. 94.)

(6.) £6,520, to complete the sum for the Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland.

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £42,013, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Purchase of a Site, Erection of Building, and other Expenses for the New Courts of Justice and Offices belonging thereto" 639

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £27,013, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*) 648

After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed:—Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,513, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor:*)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 30, Noes 79; Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 95.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £192,500, to complete the sum for Surveys of the United Kingdom.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 659

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £21,379, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1884, for erecting and maintaining new Buildings, including Rents, &c., for the Department of Science and Art" 668

After short debate, Motion made, and Question porposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,379, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Labouchere:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(9.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £16,379, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for erecting and maintaining new Buildings, including Rents, &c., for the Department of Science and Art" 675

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,379, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Labouchere:*)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 53, Noes 104; Majority 51.—(Div. List, No. 96.)

Original Question again proposed 678

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

(10.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,338, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Maintenance and Repair of the British Museum and Natural History Museum Buildings, for Rents of Premises, supply of Water, Fuel, &c. and other Charges attendant thereon" 684

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,838, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question again proposed 687

After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Trevelyan*) .. 687

After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

Canal Boats Act (1877) Amendment Bill [Bill 139]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time, and *referred* to the Select Committee on Canals,"—(*Mr. Broadhurst*) 694

Motion *agreed to.* [1.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MAY 22.

Page

MOTIONS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) (Birmingham and Lambeth) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 192] 695

Local Government Provisional Order (Highways) (County of Dorset) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 193] 695

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) (Ashton-in-Makerfield, &c.) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 194] 695

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) (Barnet Union, &c.) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 195] 695

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) (Bognor, &c.) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 196] .. 695

Parochial Charities (London) Bill—

Ordered, That the Report of the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty to inquire into the Parochial Charities of the City of London, which was presented to this House in the year 1880, be referred to the Select Committee on the Parochial Charities (London) Bill.

Ordered, That the Report of the Select Committee on the London Parochial Charities (London) Bills, together with the Minutes of Evidence presented to this House in the year 1882, be referred to the Select Committee on the Parochial Charities (London) Bill.—(*Mr. Lefevre.*)

New Forest (Highways) Bill—

Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 696

QUESTION.

Burial Acts—15 & 16 Vict. c. 85, & 16 & 17 Vict. c. 134—Consecration of Cemeteries—Rhos, Denbighshire—Questions, Sir Robert Cunliffe, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 696

Vaccination Acts—Calf Lymph—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 697

Inland Revenue—Income Tax (Ireland)—Drumduff, Co. Leitrim—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Courtney .. 698

Mercantile Marine—The Passing Tolls Act—Collection of the Light Dues—Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain .. 699

Fishery Reports—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain .. 699

Evictions (Ireland)—Clonmany, Co. Donegal—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 699

Egypt—The Massacre at Alexandria—Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 701

MOTIONS.

Parliament—Adjournment—The Derby Day—Motion—

Moved, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday,"—(*Sir Herbert Maxwell*) 701

After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 185, Noes 85; Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 97.)

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT)—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the statement of the financial affairs of India should be made at a period of the Session when it can be fully discussed,"—(*Mr. R. N. Fowler*) 714

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "fully," and insert the words referred to a Select Committee, and after examination properly,"—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fully' stand part of the Question:" —After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill [Bill 140]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 726

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Biggar:*)—Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (No. 2) Bill [Bill 51]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Stevenson*) .. 729

After short debate, [House counted out.] [7.30.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, MAY 24.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate— [House adjourned.] [4.45.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MAY 24.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now considered,"—(*Mr. Dodds*) 732

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now considered," in order to add the words "re-committed to the former Committee,"—(*Viscount Folkestone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered,' stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 69, Noes 177; Majority 108.—(Div. List, No. 98.)

Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *re-committed* to the former Committee.

Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now considered,"—(*Mr. Dodds*) 749

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now considered," in order to add the words "re-committed to the former Committee,"—(*Viscount Folkestone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived.*

Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *re-committed* to the former Committee.

[*May* 24.] *Page*

East and West India Dock Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)—
Order for Second Reading read 753
Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

MEXICO—RENEWAL OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 753
CIVIL SERVANTS OF THE CROWN IN CONNECTION WITH FINANCIAL UNDERTAKINGS—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 753
IRELAND—LOANS TO IRISH RAILWAYS—Question, Mr. T. A. Dickson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 754
SOUTH AFRICA—ZULULAND—Questions, Sir Henry Holland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 754
LUNACY ACTS—MR. JOSEPH BERRY—Question, Mr. Brogden; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 755
THE MAGISTRACY (ENGLAND AND WALES)—PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH MAGISTRACY—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 755
NAVY—WARRANT OFFICERS—Question, Sir H Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 756
THE NATIONAL GALLERY AND BRITISH MUSEUM—ELECTRIC LIGHTING—Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 756
CRIMINAL LAW — WIFE-BEATING — Questions, Mr. Coope, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 757
TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE V. –RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN BULGARIA—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 758
PRISONS (IRELAND)—MR. HEALY, M.P., MR. DAVITT, AND MR. QUINN, PRISONERS IN RICHMOND GAOL—Questions, Mr. Lalor, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 758
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS—PREMATURE DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS—THE ARMY MEDICAL INQUIRY—Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Puleston, Dr. Cameron, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone.. 760
RUSSIA—TRANS-CAUCASUS TRANSIT DUTIES—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 763
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Mr. Dodson 764
PAPAL SEE — DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN — MR. ERRINGTON — Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Newdegate, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Gorst, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gladstone 765
INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—TREATMENT OF NATIVES AND EUROPEANS—Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 769
LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—CASE OF JOHN RAFFERTY—Question, Mr. Wills; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 770
REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE — Question, Mr. Round; Answer, Mr. Dodson 770
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, COUNTY LONGFORD—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 771
CONVICT PRISONS—PAY AND POSITION OF WARDERS—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 771
EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACTS—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL—Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 771

INLAND REVENUE—EXCISE PERMITS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 774

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) — THE BELFAST POST OFFICE—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 775

IRELAND—THE COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION—THE VOTE FOR MODEL SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 775

THE SCOTTISH LEGAL FRIENDLY SOCIETY—DISHONESTY OF OFFICIALS—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate 775

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—ROMAN CATHOLIC MILITIAMEN—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 777

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SCOTCH BUSINESS—Question, Mr. A. Elliot; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 777

DUCHY OF LANCASTER—LANDS ACT, 1855—FORESHORES—THE CORPORATION OF SOUTHPORT—Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, Mr. Dodson .. 777

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1881—JUDICIAL RENTS—"CHAINE *v.* NELSON" —Questions, Mr. T. A. Dickson, Mr. Givan, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Brodrick; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 778

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. Heneage, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 781

PARLIAMENT—RULES OF DEBATE—QUESTIONS—Questions, Mr. Stewart Macliver, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 782

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Gladstone.. 782

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—NATIONAL DEBT BILL—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 782

MADAGASCAR—BOMBARDMENT OF MAYUNGA—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 783

TURKEY—THE NEW TARIFF—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 783

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—USE BY THE VOLUNTEERS OF THE BUTTS AT WORMWOOD SCRUBBS—Question, Admiral Egerton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 784

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEIZURE OF THE "KERRY SENTINEL"—Questions, Mr. Parnell, Colonel King-Harman, Mr. Harrington, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 784

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £56,000, Divine Service.—After debate, Vote *agreed to.* 786

(2.) £36,900, Administration of Military Law.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 803

(3.) £520,000, Militia Pay and Allowances.—After long debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 817

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £69,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884" 852

After long debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 126, Noes 21; Majority 105.—(Div. List, No. 99.)

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Medals Bill [Bill 188]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Courtney*) .. 873

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland) Bill—
Moved, "That the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred till Thursday next,"—(*Mr. Courtney*) 878
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Second Reading *deferred* till *Thursday* next.

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 4) (South Shields, &c.) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*) 880
[1.45.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, MAY 25.

NEW GUINEA—PAPER PRESENTED—
Further Correspondence relating to New Guinea (in continuation of [C.—1566.] of July 1876) 881
Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, The Earl of Derby.

Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment Bill—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Northbrook*) .. 882
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next. [5.0.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MAY 25.

QUESTIONS.

NAVY—THE DOCKYARDS — SHIPWRIGHTS—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey 886
POST OFFICE—THE PARCELS POST—Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 886
LAW AND POLICE — THE WANDSWORTH POLICE COURT — Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 886
ARMY (THE EGYPTIAN EXPEDITION)—THE VETERINARY REPORT—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 886
LUNACY ACTS—CASE OF HUGH FLANAGAN—Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Trevelyan 887
NAVY—FIRST-CLASS PETTY OFFICERS—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 889
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, SHILLELAGH UNION—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 889
IRELAND—LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTIONS AT WICKLOW ASSIZES—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 889
BURIAL ACTS—CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES—RHOS, DENBIGHSHIRE—Question, Sir Robert Cunliffe; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 890
POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—GUARDIANS OF THE POOR, WESTMINSTER—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 891
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—THE RATHDOWN GUARDIANS—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 892
PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON—Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 893
GOVERNMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND MADAGASCAR—AGREEMENT FOR REGULATING THE TRAFFIC IN SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS—Question, Mr. Cropper; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 894
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS—PREMATURE DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS—THE ARMY MEDICAL INQUIRY — Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 894

[*May* 25.] *Page*

SOUTH AFRICA—CETEWAYO—Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 895

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—WATERFORD CO.—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 897

EGYPT—THE SUEZ CANAL—PROPOSED NEW CANAL—Questions, Mr. Norwood; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 897

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—PAINTING BY SIR FREDERICK LEIGHTON—Questions, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. 898

CUSTOMS DUTIES (IRELAND)—THE PORT OF GALWAY—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Courtney 899

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 899

PARLIAMENT—GRANTS TO LORDS ALCESTER AND WOLSELEY—Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 901

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMENIA AND EUROPEAN TURKEY—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will, in conjunction with the other Powers of Europe, signataries of the Treaty of Berlin, continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin,"—(*Mr. Bryce,*)—instead thereof 902

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and in European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin,"—(*Mr Bryce,*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

IRELAND—UTILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES—Observations, Dr. Lyons 929
[House counted out.] [8.45.]

LORDS, MONDAY, MAY 28.

Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) Bill (No. 59)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Rosebery*) .. 930
Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Parks (Metropolis)—Richmond Park—The Roehampton Gate—Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne, Viscount Midleton; Reply, Lord Sudeley 930

Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner—Questions, Observations, Earl Fortescue, Earl Cadogan, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, Lord Sudeley 932

[5.0.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, MAY 28.

QUESTIONS.

India—Ceylon — Privilege of Franking Letters — The Bishop of Colombo—Question, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley .. 934

Ireland—State-Aided Emigration—Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 935

India—Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross .. 935

Poor Law—Case of William Davis—Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 936

Royal Irish Constabulary — Sub-Inspector Smith—Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 937

Royal Irish Constabulary—Suicide of Sub-Constable Coleman—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 938

Treaty of Berlin—Article X.—The Varna Railway Claims—Questions, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 938

Parliament—Alleged Candidature of Mr. Sub-Commissioner Wylie—Question, Mr. Long; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 939

Parliament—Privilege—Petitions—Fraudulent Signatures—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Sir Charles Forster 940

Prisons (Ireland)—Limerick Gaol—Questions, Mr. Synan, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 941

The Magistracy (Ireland)—Mr. M'Farlane—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 942

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease—The Metropolitan Cattle Market—Question, Sir Sydney Waterlow; Answer, Mr. Dodson 943

Chili and Peru—Treaty of Peace—Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 943

Borough Boundary Commission (Ireland)—The Report—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 944

Poor Law (Ireland)—Belfast Workhouse—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 944

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease—The Orders in Council—Questions, Mr. Heneage, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Chaplin; Answers, Mr. Dodson 945

State of Ireland—Police Protection at Rathfaland, Co. Clare—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 946

Jamaica and the Leeward Islands—The Commission of Inquiry—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 947

Egypt—Toulba Pasha—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 948

Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Section 12—Case of John O'Connor—Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 948

The Irish Land Commission—Kerry Sub-Commission—Questions, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 949

Sale of Crown Lands (Ireland)—Maryborough Heath—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Courtney 950

[*May* 28.]

Page

EGYPT—HASSAN BEY SADYK—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 950
EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—REFORM OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE—Questions, Mr. Gorst, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 950
CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—FEES TO COUNSEL—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; [No reply] 951
STATE OF IRELAND—THE CONSTABULARY—Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 952
PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON—Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 952
NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—MODEL SCHOOLS—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 953
ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE—JUNIOR MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 954
PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACT, 1879—THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS—THE REGULATIONS—Questions, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 955
METROPOLIS — OBSTRUCTIONS IN MAIN THOROUGHFARES — Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 956
NAVY—EXAMINATION OF NAVAL CADETS (THE "BRITANNIA")—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 956
EGYPT—QUARANTINE—Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 956
ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN ESTABLISHMENT—Questions, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter 957
METROPOLIS—THE COAL AND WINE DUTIES—APPLICATION FOR RENEWAL—Questions, Mr. Firth, Mr. Slagg, Lord George Hamilton; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 958
METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS — COMMUNICATIONS ACROSS THE THAMES—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 960
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL—Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 960
POOR LAW (IRELAND) — LIMERICK BOARD OF GUARDIANS—STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 960
WEST INDIES (JAMAICA)—EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, 1851 TO 1882—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 961
ARMY—LIEUTENANT GENERAL WILBY, C.B.—Question, Captain Price; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 962
PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL—Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 962
SOUTH AFRICA—HER MAJESTY'S DOMINIONS—POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT—Notices, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Gorst 962
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE "COUNT-OUT" ON FRIDAY, MAY 26—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 963

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEIZURE OF THE "KERRY SENTINEL"—Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 965
Moved, "That Motion for Adjournment be now made,"—(*Mr. Harrington:*)—Question put: — The House *divided;* Ayes 137, Noes 135; Majority 2.—(Div. List, No. 100.)
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Harrington:*)—After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SUPPLY—
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) .. 981
After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £10,726, to complete the sum for the Natural History Museum.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,193, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for maintaining certain Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade" .. 982

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,763, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*:)—Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 19, Noes 120; Majority 101.—(Div. List, No. 101.)

Original Question again proposed 987

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,043, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Molloy*:)—After further debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 16, Noes 82; Majority 66.—(Div. List, No. 102.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £136,880, to complete the sum for Rates on Government Property.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 999

(4.) £7,500, to complete the sum for the Metropolitan Fire Brigade.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1000

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £165,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales during the year ended on the 25th day of March 1883" .. 1018

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £140,000, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Ramsay*:)—After further debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 49, Noes 162; Majority 113.—(Div. List, No. 103.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland during the year ended Whitsuntide 1883" 1037

After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 202, Noes 12; Majority 190.—(Div. List, No. 104.)

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Trevelyan*) 1041

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

LORD ALCESTER (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY)—RESOLUTION—

Considered in Committee 1075

Moved, "That it is expedient to authorise the grant of a sum of £25,000, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, to Frederick Beauchamp Paget, Lord Alcester, Admiral in Her Majesty's Navy, in lieu of the Annuity of Two thousand pounds per annum, which was proposed to be granted to him in answer to the Message from Her Majesty on the 13th day of April last."

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

LORD WOLSELEY (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY)—RESOLUTION—

Considered in Committee 1075

Moved, "That it is expedient to authorise the grant of a sum of £30,000, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, to Garnet Joseph, Lord Wolseley,

Lord Wolseley (Grant in Lieu of Annuity)—*continued.*

General in Her Majesty's Army, in lieu of the Annuity of Two thousand pounds per annum, which was proposed to be granted to him in answer to the Message from Her Majesty on the 13th day of April last."

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

Supply—Report—Resolutions [24th May] *reported* 1076
Resolutions 1 and 2 *agreed to.*
Resolution 3.—After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*
Remaining Resolution *agreed to.*

Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Lyons, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Findlater*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 202] 1076
[2.30.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, MAY 29.

Criminal Law Amendment—Bill for the Better Protection of Young Girls—Question, Earl Cairns; Answer, Earl Granville 1077

Representative Peers (Scotland) Bill (No. 53)—
Moved, "That the House do go into Committee on the Representative Peers (Scotland) Bill, on re-commitment,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 1077
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—House in Committee accordingly 1079
Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Friday* the 8*th of June* next; and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 66.) [6.45.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MAY 29.

QUESTIONS.

Poor Law (England)—St. James's Workhouse—Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1094
India—Duty on Jewellery—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1094
The Army Medical Commission—Supplies for the Army in Egypt—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1095
Egyptian Expedition—Compensation for Breaking Contracts—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 1096
Army—Roman Catholic Soldiers on Board the "Euphrates" Troopship—Questions, Mr. Bellingham, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington 1096
Poor Law (England)—Repayments for Pauper Relief—Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1097
Army—Armoured Railway Trains—Lieutenant Colonel Campbell Walker—Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1098
Africa (West Coast)—The French at Porto Novo—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 1098
Army (India)—The Indian Staff Corps—Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1099
The Betting Act—Arrests at Newcastle—Questions, Mr. John Morley, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1100
State of Ireland—Proclaimed Districts in King's County—Extra Police—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 1101

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—KING'S COUNTY—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1102

EGYPT—THE DAIRA LANDS—Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1102

MADAGASCAR—THE FRENCH INVASION—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1103

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS—THE SUSPENDED BOROUGHS—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1103

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Craig-Sellar; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1104

SOUTH AFRICA—PROVISION FOR AFRICAN CHIEFS—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1104

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Lord George Hamilton, Viscount Emlyn, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Macartney; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1105

MOTION.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND ORDERS OF THE DAY—

Moved, "That the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill have precedence this day of Notices of Motions and the other Orders of the Day,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*) 1109

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill [Bill 186]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Dodson*) .. 1110

After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* 11th June.

Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment Bill [Bill 183]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. George Russell*) 1188

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 33, Noes 44; Majority 11.—(Div. List, No. 107.)

Original Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Onslow*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. George Russell*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *Tuesday* next.

Lands Clauses (Umpire) Bill [Bill 160]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Whitley*) .. 1192

Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Friendly, &c. Societies (Nominations) Bill [Bill 117]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley*) 1192

Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee:—Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

[*May* 29.] *Page*

LORD ALCESTER (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY)—

Resolution [May 28] *reported*, and *agreed to.*

Instruction to the Committee on Lord Alcester's Annuity Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.

LORD WOLSELEY (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY)—

Resolution [May 28] *reported*, and *agreed to.*

Instruction to the Committee on Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.

[1.0.]

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, MAY 30.

Their Lordships met for the despatch of Judicial Business only. [3.45]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MAY 30.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham) Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Theodore Fry*) 1194

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, while willing to discuss the question of County Government, declines to consider Public Bills affecting only a single county,"—(*Mr. Thomasson,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 153, Noes 57; Majority 96.—(Div. List, No. 108.)

Main Question again proposed 1239

After short debate, Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Tuesday* next.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill [Bill 29]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*) 1240

After debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* 7th June.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Yorkshire) Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Charles Wilson*) 1263

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

QUESTION.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1263

MOTIONS.

Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. John Morley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 203] 1264

Statute of Frauds Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Reid, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Arthur Elliot*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 204] 1264

Commons and Inclosure Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Story-Maskelyne*) 1264

[5.55.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, MAY 31.

London and North-Western Railway (*Additional Powers*) *Bill*—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a" 1265

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a, and *committed.*

Moved, "That it be an instruction to the Committee to which the Bill is referred, that the Railway Company shall not be empowered to appropriate a larger portion of the Parochial Burial Ground of St. James' than is proved to be absolutely required for the necessary convenience of the travelling public, by means of the enlargement of the railway station and of the substitution of a new street in lieu of the existing street which is to be absorbed in the process of the enlargement of the station,"—(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

After further short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 49, Not-Contents 89; Majority 40.

Resolved in the *negative*:—The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 1271

Tithe Rentcharge Bill (No. 22)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Earl Stanhope*) .. 1273

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day six months,")—(*The Lord Bramwell.*)

After short debate, Amendment, Original Motion, and Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER—PETITION OF THE BISHOPS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND—

Petition presented, The Bishop of Lincoln 1283

Petition read, and *ordered* to lie on the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—THE CONVENTION—Question, Observations, Viscount St. Vincent; Reply, The Earl of Derby; Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury 1285

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—HYDE PARK CORNER—RE-ERECTION OF THE WELLINGTON STATUE—Observations, Lord Strathnairn; Reply, Lord Sudeley:—Short debate thereon 1288

Criminal Law Amendment Bill—

Bill to make further provision for the protection of women and girls, and for the suppression of brothels; and for other purposes—*Presented* (*The Earl of Rosebery*) 1294

After short debate, Bill read 1^a (No. 69.) [7.45.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MAY 31.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway (*re-committed*) *Bill*—

Report of Select Committee 1296

Moved, "That the Report do lie upon the Table,"—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*:)—After debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Report to be *printed.*

Oxford, Aylesbury, and Metropolitan Junction Railway Bill (*by Order*)—Notice of Resolution, Viscount Folkestone 1303

QUESTIONS.

EGYPT—DIPLOMATIC ARRANGEMENTS—MAJOR BARING—Questions, Mr. Buxton, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1303

INLAND REVENUE (IRELAND)—SELLING PORTER WITHOUT A LICENCE—Question, Mr. J. N. Richardson; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1304

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE ANTRIM ARTILLERY—Questions, Mr. Biggar, Earl Percy; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1305

LAW AND JUSTICE—COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL—OPINIONS OF THE JUDGES—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Attorney General 1306

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS — HYDE PARK CORNER — Questions, Mr. Gerard Noel, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre 1307

NAVY—H.M.S. "CLYDE"—THE COURT MARTIAL ON CAPTAIN F. MAXWELL-HERON—THE PAPERS—Question, Captain Maxwell-Heron; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman 1307

CITY LIVERY COMPANIES COMMISSION—Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1308

ARMY—GUARDS AND SENTRIES—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1308

SOUTH AFRICA — THE TRANSVAAL — AGGRESSION OF THE BOERS ON NATIVE TRIBES—Questions, Mr. Guy Dawnay, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 1309

EDUCATION (WALES)—CARNARVON TRAINING COLLEGE — Questions, Mr. Richard, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answers, Mr. Mundella 1310

BURIALS ACTS—NONCONFORMIST BURIALS—Questions, Mr. Richard, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1311

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gladstone.. 1312

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACTS—Question, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1316

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1316

ARMY—RIFLE RANGES AT WORMWOOD SCRUBBS—Question, Mr. Tatton Egerton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1317

MOROCCO—SLAVERY AND SLAVE-DEALING AT TANGIER—Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1317

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—ASSISTANT CLERKS—Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Courtney 1318

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—IRISH CROWN SOLICITORSHIPS—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1319

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND) — MR. OWEN RYAN (BELFAST)—Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 1319

POOR REMOVAL (IRELAND)—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1320

POOR LAW (METROPOLIS)—ST. PANCRAS WORKHOUSE—RE-VACCINATION OF FEMALES—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1322

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—REDUCTIONS OF RENT—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1323

MEXICO—RENEWAL OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1323

[*May* 31.] *Page*

Mercantile Marine—Signal Watch-house at Dungeness—Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1323

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (Ireland) Acts—Infected Districts in the Counties of Louth and Meath—Question, Mr. Sheil; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1324

India—Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill—Reports of Local Governments—Questions, Mr. Pugh, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross 1324

Egypt (Military Expedition)—Major Carre (Purchase of Saddlery)—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Brand 1325

Africa (The River Congo)—Action of Portugal—Question, Mr. Slagg; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1326

City of London Livery Companies Commission—Questions, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Mundella 1326

Poor Law (Ireland)—Dunfanaghy Union—Irregularities of Officials—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1327

Explosive Substances Acts—Certificates—Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1327

Law and Police (Ireland)—The Belfast Police—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1328

Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill—Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answers, Mr. Dodson 1328

Law and Police—Case of Francis Redfern (Uttoxeter)—Questions, Mr. H. T. Davenport, Mr. Craig; Answers, Sir William Harcourt .. 1329

Army and Navy Expenditure—"Extra Receipts"—Questions, Mr. Salt, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1330

Egypt (Re-organization)—Reform of Criminal Procedure—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1331

General Assembly of the Church of Scotland—The Lord High Commissioner—Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1331

Inland Revenue—Income Tax on Foreign Investments—Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer.. .. 1333

Parliamentary Representation—The Disfranchised Irish Boroughs—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1334

The Sea Fisheries Commission—Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1334

Western Islands of the Pacific—The Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland—Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Lewis; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 1334

The Judicature Acts—The New Rules—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Attorney General 1335

Parliamentary Oath (The Standing Orders)—Withdrawal of Motion, Lord Randolph Churchill 1335

PRIVILEGE.

Parliament—Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly—Observations, Mr. M'Coan 1336

Moved, "That Mr. O'Kelly do attend in his place To-morrow,"—(*Mr. Gladstone*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 250, Noes 19; Majority 231.—(Div. List, No. 109.)

QUESTIONS.

Parliament—Business of the House—Questions, Mr. Lewis, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Courtney 1343

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £180,546, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Erection, Repairs, and Maintenance of the several Public Buildings under the Department of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and for the erection of Fishery Piers, and the Maintenance of certain Parks, Harbours, and Navigations" 1344

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £173,257, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*:)—After debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 25, Noes 74; Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 110.)

Original Question again proposed 1357

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £164,546, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Molloy*:)—After further short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 9, Noes 59; Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 111.)

Original Question again proposed 1362

After short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £21,000, Royal University, Ireland, Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1365

(3.) £10,000, Science and Art Buildings, Dublin.

(4.) £9,253, to complete the sum for Lighthouses Abroad.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1366

(5.) £22,323, to complete the sum for Diplomatic and Consular Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1367

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS.

(6.) £37,485, to complete the sum for House of Lords Offices.

(7.) £45,057, to complete the sum for House of Commons Offices.

(8.) £49,017, to complete the sum for Treasury.

(9.) £77,904, to complete the sum for Home Office.

(10.) £57,263, to complete the sum for Foreign Office.

(11.) £34,379, to complete the sum for Colonial Office.

(12.) £26,513, to complete the sum for Privy Council Office.

(13.) £100,233, to complete the sum for Board of Trade.

(14.) £30,434, to complete the sum for Charity Commission.

(15.) £25,347, to complete the sum for Civil Service Commission.

(16.) £48,220, to complete the sum for Exchequer and Audit Department.

(17.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £7,019, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Registry of Friendly Societies" .. 1370

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,719, &c.,"—(*Dr. Cameron*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 29, Noes 57; Majority 28.—(Div. List, No. 112.)

Original Question again proposed 1381

After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(18.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £20,509, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Land Commissioners for England, and for defraying the repayable Expenses to be incurred in matters of Inclosure and Drainage" 1382

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £19,509, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 22, Noes 100; Majority 78.—(Div. List, No. 113.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(19.) £381,047, to complete the sum for the Local Government Board.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1389

(20.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a further sum, not exceeding £2,864,950, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charge for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884" 1412

[Then the several Services are set forth.]

[*May* 31.] Page

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Lord Randolph Churchill:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a further sum, not exceeding £2,859,950, be granted, &c.,"—(*Lord Randolph Churchill*) 1422

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 1425

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a further sum, not exceeding £1,487,546, be granted, &c.,"—(*Sir Walter B. Barttelot:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 28*th May*] 1430

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland) Bill—

Order for Second Reading read 1454

Moved, "That the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred till Thursday next,"—(*Mr. Courtney:*)—After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Second Reading *deferred* till *Thursday* next.

Lord Alcester's Annuity Bill [Bill 145]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1455

Bill *reported;* to be *printed,* as amended [Bill 207]; *re-committed* for *Monday* next.

Forest of Dean (Highways) Bill—

Select Committee nominated:—List of the Committee 1455

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) (Leeds) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 206] 1455

[3.0.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, JUNE 1.

Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment Bill—

House in Committee 1456

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Tuesday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 70.)

IRELAND—ARTERIAL DRAINAGE—Question, Observations, Lord Monteagle, The Earl of Longford; Reply, Lord Carlingford 1462

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—COMPENSATIONS—MOTION FOR PAPERS—

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Minutes of Evidence taken in Court, before the investigators, under the Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, and the reports upon which His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has awarded compensation to persons injured and to the families of persons who have been murdered,"—(*The Marquess of Waterford*) 1466

After short debate, Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE X.—BULGARIA—Question, Observations, Earl Stanhope; Reply, Earl Granville 1476

[7.0.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 1.

Page

QUESTIONS.

THE MAGISTRACY (ENGLAND AND WALES)—PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1478

THE FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND) AND THE POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH) DEPARTMENT—EXTENSION OF THE TELEGRAPH TO OUTLYING FISHING STATIONS—Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate .. 1479

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—LURGAN WORKHOUSE—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1480

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY — CHARGE AGAINST SUB-INSPECTOR SMITH (MOVILLE)—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan .. 1481

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882 — THE COMPENSATION CLAUSE —MURDER OF MR. W. M. BOURKE—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan.. 1482

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, MALLOW—Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 1483

SCOTLAND—THE IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE IN GLASGOW—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1484

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION—Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, The Lord Advocate 1484

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE "BLUE RIBBON" IN BOARD SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. S. Morley; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1485

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART — THE REPUTED "RAPHAEL" — Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, Mr. Courtney 1486

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART — THE TAPESTRIES AT HAMPTON COURT—Question, Mr. Montague Guest; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 1486

FRANCE AND CHINA—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1487

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1487

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON—Observations, Mr. Gladstone 1488

PARLIAMENT—PRIVILEGE—MR. M'COAN AND MR. O'KELLY—Mr. Speaker; Reply, Mr. O'Kelly:—Short debate thereon .. 1488

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

INLAND REVENUE (CIRCULAR)—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the General Order of the 3rd January, issued by the Board of Inland Revenue, is an unwarrantable interference on the part of a Public Department in the relations between Members of Parliament and their constituents, and an invasion of the privileges of this House,"—(*Lord Randolph Churchill,*)—instead thereof 1496

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 120, Noes 37; Majority 83.—(Div. List, No. 115.)

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMY (RECRUITING)—"WASTE" OF THE ARMY—Observations, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington:—Debate thereon 1522

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn:*—Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [May 31] *reported* 1566
Resolutions 1 to 6 *agreed to.*
Resolution 7.—After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*
Resolutions 8 to 12 *agreed to.*
Resolution 13.—After short debate, Resolution *postponed* until Thursday.
Remaining Resolutions *agreed to.*

Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Trevelyan*) .. 1568
After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill [Bill 5]—
Order for Committee read 1571
After short debate, Committee *deferred* till *Tuesday* next, at Two of the clock.

Inclosure Provisional Order (Hildersham) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 209] 1573

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) (Didcot, &c) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 210] .. 1573

[1.0.]

LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 4.

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES — Observations, Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Reply, The Earl of Morley:—Debate thereon .. 1574

[7.45.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 4.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY — THE VENTILATORS — METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (DISTRICT RAILWAY)—
Moved, "That the Report from the Committee on the Metropolitan District Railway Bill [presented on 31st May] be now read,"—(*Mr. Marriott*) 1612
Motion *agreed to:*—Observations, Mr. Marriott.
Moved, "That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that leave be given to the Metropolitan Board of Works to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1881,' in relation to the openings or shafts authorised by that Act to be constructed in roads or open spaces within the Metropolis, for the purpose of ventilating their Railways; and for other purposes,"—(*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg*) 1616
Amendment proposed, in line 2, after the word "the," to insert the words "Corporation of London and the,"—(*Sir Thomas Chambers.*)
Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*
Amendment proposed, in line 3, after the word "Bill," to insert the words "or Bills,"—(*Sir Thomas Chambers.*)
Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*
Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Lord Algernon Percy, Mr. Marriott*); *presented,* and read the first time .. 1619

London Commissioners of Sewers (Ventilation of Railways) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. William Lawrence, Mr. Robert Fowler*); *presented,* and read the first time 1620

[*June* 4.] Page

QUESTIONS.

THE CHANNEL ISLANDS—FRENCH CLAIMS—Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1620
INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF AN ENGLISHMAN—Question, Colonel Dawnay; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1620
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. WILLIAM CARSON—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1621
NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) — LEGISLATION — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1622
METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT AND BUILDINGS ACTS AMENDMENT ACT—THE HOTEL METROPOLE—Questions, Mr. Storey-Maskelyne; Answers, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 1622
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACTS—THE ASHFORD MAGISTRATES—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, Mr. Mundella 1624
SCOTLAND—THE HIGHLAND CROFTERS—THE ROYAL COMMISSION (EASTER ROSS)—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir William Harcourt .. 1625
THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—APPEALS FROM THE SUB-COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan.. .. 1626
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (IRELAND) ACT—WESTPORT—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1627
THE STOCK EXCHANGE—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain 1627
METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—WIDENING OF THE ROAD AT KNIGHTSBRIDGE—Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 1627
METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—THE PROPOSED PARK FOR PADDINGTON—Questions, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Boord, Mr. Firth; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg 1628
SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT—Questions, Mr. Callan, Mr. Carbutt; Answers, Sir William Harcourt 1630
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Attorney General 1631
THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE'S TENANTS—Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan 1631
EGYPT—THE EGYPTIAN EXILES IN CEYLON—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley.. 1633
EAST INDIA—CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1634
POST OFFICE—THE AMERICAN MAILS—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1634
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THREATENING LETTERS—JOHN J. REGAN—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1634
ARMY—MILITIA OFFICERS WITH LINE REGIMENTS—Question, Earl Percy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1635
ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — FORAGE ALLOWANCE — MILITIA OFFICERS' HORSES—Question, Earl Percy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington 1635
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE ENNIS POST OFFICE—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1636
PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—MR. O'NEILL, OF RATHFOLAND—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1636
AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS (IRELAND)—THE WEXFORD CORPORATION—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1637
ARMY (INDIA)—JUNIOR MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1638
TREATY OF WASHINGTON—THE "ALABAMA" CLAIMS—THE GENEVA AWARD—Questions, Mr. Coleridge Kennard, Mr. Montagu Scott; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1638

Poor Law (Ireland)—Outdoor Relief—Dunfanaghy Union—Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Colonel Colthurst; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan .. 1639

The Royal University of Ireland—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1641

Army Enlistment—The New Regulations—Questions, Colonel Stanley, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington .. 1641

Dominion of Canada—The Governor General—H.R.H. the Duke of Albany—Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1643

South Africa—Basutoland—Questions, Mr. Bourke, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Gorst, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1644

Madagascar—Protection of the Lives and Property of British Subjects—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1647

Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar—Colonel Maceo—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1647

National Debt Bill—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1648

Parliament—Public Business—Ministerial Statement—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gorst, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1648

Ireland—The Phœnix Park Murders—Memorial to the late Mr. Burke—Notice, Mr. O'Brien 1650

Inland Revenue—The Financial Statement—The Railway Duties—Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1650

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Attorney General 1650

United States—Irish Emigrants—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1650

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 1651

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be committed for Thursday,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*:)—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *committed* for *Thursday.*

Supply—Report—Postponed Resolutions [31st May] *considered* .. 1707

Resolution 10:—After short debate, Resolution *further postponed* till *Thursday.*

Resolution 13:—After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Bill [Bill 202]—

Moved "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Findlater*) .. 1710

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Biggar*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Friday.*

Corn Sales Bill [Bill 95]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Rankin*) .. 1712
After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. J. G. Talbot*:)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* 2nd July.

Land Tax Assessments (Appeals) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Darcy, Mr. Gregory*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 213] 1717

[1.0.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, JUNE 5.

Cathedral Statutes Bill (No. 58)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle*) .. 1717
After debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

Stolen Goods Bill—

Bill to amend the law respecting the Recovery of Stolen Articles; and for other purposes—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 78) .. 1737

Pawnbroker's Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 79) .. 1738

[6.30.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 5.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 1738
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be taken into Consideration upon Thursday,"—(*Viscount Folkestone*) 1739
Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "upon Thursday," in order to insert the word "To-morrow,"—(*Sir Gabriel Goldney,*)—instead thereof.
Question put, "That the words 'upon Thursday' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 37, Noes 73; Majority 36.—(Div. List, No. 116.)
Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill, as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

VACCINATION ACTS—PROSECUTIONS—BRISTOL—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1740

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX ON FOREIGN INVESTMENTS—Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1741

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—EXTRA POLICE AT BALLINALOUGH AND KILTULLY—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1742

ARMY—ROYAL WARRANT, 1882—PENSIONS OF OFFICERS' WIDOWS—Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter 1742

LAW AND POLICE—THOMAS JONES, A CONVICT—Question, Mr. Stewart Macliver; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1743

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—GALWAY—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1743

IRELAND—THE BOWLING GREEN MILLS (GALWAY) COMPENSATION CASE—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Courtney 1744

BOARD OF TRADE—THE COMMITTEE ON LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS—Questions, Colonel King-Harman, Mr. Lea; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain .. 1744

INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—BABOO SOORENDRO NATH BANNERJEE—Questions, Mr. Macfarlane, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross 1747

POST OFFICE—POSTAL SERVICE (SCOTLAND)—Question, Mr. Craig-Sellar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett 1747

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACT, 1879—"THE QUEEN *v.* TAYLOR AND BOYNES"—Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answers, The Attorney General 1748

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE HALF-PAST TWELVE O'CLOCK RULE — BLOCKING — Observations, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, Mr. Speaker:—Short debate thereon 1749

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. M. Brooks, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fawcett 1756

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—WEST CLARE RAILWAY—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1759

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Buchanan; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan .. 1760

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill [Bill 190]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*The Lord Advocate*) 1762

After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* 11th June.

Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill [Bill 5]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1806

After short debate, it being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *this day*.

WAYS AND MEANS—
Consolidated Fund (No. 3) Bill—

Resolution [June 4] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney*) 1808

It being five minutes to Seven of the clock, the House suspended its Sitting.

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION—Resolution, Mr. Rankin 1809

[House counted out] [9.5.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6.

Page

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway Bill (by Order)—

Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered" 1809

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now considered," in order to add the words "re-committed to the former Committee,"—(*Viscount Folkestone,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered;* to be read the third time.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDER 167—

Standing Order 167 read: An addition thereto moved (Payment of Interest out of Capital) (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) .. 1837

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Molloy:*)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 131, Noes 123; Majority 8.—(Div. List, No. 117.) [5.55.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, JUNE 7.

Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Earl of Kimberley*) .. 1895

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

MALTA—REFUGEES FROM EGYPT—MOTION FOR PAPERS—

Moved for, "Papers from the Government of Malta to the Colonial Secretary in connexion with residence and cost of maintenance in Malta of refugees from Egypt during the autumn of year last, and for all correspondence up to the present date,"—(*The Earl De La Warr*) 1896

Ater short debate, Motion *amended*, and *agreed to.* [4.45.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JUNE 7.

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—ALLEGED SEVERITY OF SENTENCE—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1900

EGYPT (MILITARY EXPEDITION)—SUPPLY OF FLOUR FOR THE TROOPS—Questions, Dr. Cameron, Sir Henry Tyler; Answers, Mr. Brand .. 1901

DISPENSARY HOUSES (IRELAND) ACT, 1879—SECTION 8—PALLASKENRY DISPENSARY—Questions, Mr. Synan; Answers, Mr. Courtney .. 1902

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—AFFAIRS OF ASHANTEE—Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 1903

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—THE LOAN—Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley 1903

MAINTENANCE OF MAIN ROADS (SOUTH WALES)—Question, Mr. H. Allen; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1904

THE CASTLE, DUBLIN—ST. PATRICK'S HALL—Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. Courtney 1904

COMMISSIONERS OF WOODS AND FORESTS—THE NEW FOREST—Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1905

[*June* 7.] *Page*

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, CLIFDEN UNION—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan 1905
NAVAL DISCIPLINE AND ENLISTMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—Questions, Mr. W. H. Smith, Captain Price; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1906
ARMY—TROOPS IN INDIA (NUMBERS)—Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross 1907
ARMY—PARADING OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SOLDIERS FOR DIVINE SERVICE ON HOLY DAYS—Questions, Colonel Colthurst, Mr. Macartney; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter 1907
PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—EXTRA POLICE AT KILMALLOCK—Questions, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan .. 1907
SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR—COLONEL MACEO—Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1908
EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—IRRIGATION WORKS—Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice 1909
EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACT, 1883—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL—Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1909
PUBLIC WORKS LOANS—LEGISLATION—Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1909
LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART—SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—THE ART GALLERY—Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Mundella .. 1910
FRANCE AND CHINA—RUMOUR OF IMPENDING HOSTILITIES—Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice .. 1911
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—DETACHED DISTRICTS—Question, Mr. Hastings; Answer, Mr. Dodson 1912
PARLIAMENT—THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—VENTILATION OF THE COMMITTEE ROOMS—Question, Mr. Vivian; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Observations, Mr. J. R. Yorke 1912
POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE—Questions, Mr. Gray, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Fawcett 1913
AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL—INCORPORATION OF CLAUSES OF THE ACT OF 1875—Question, Mr. Newzam-Nicholson; Answer, Mr. Dodson 1917
VACCINATION—SYPHILITIC INFECTION—Questions, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke .. 1918
PARLIAMENT—MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS—SCOTCH BUSINESS—THE EARL OF ROSEBERY—Questions, Mr. A. Elliot, Mr. Dalrymple, Mr. James Stewart; Answers, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Gladstone .. 1919
SOUTH AFRICA—PROVISION FOR THE DISPLACED CHIEFS—VOTE IN SUPPLY—Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1922
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL—Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1922
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—POLICE SUPERANNUATION BILL—Questions, Mr. A. Peel, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1923
AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL—LEASEHOLDERS IN URBAN DISTRICTS—Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, Mr. Gladstone.. 1923
THE CHANNEL ISLANDS FISHERIES—Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Sir William Harcourt.. 1924
PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; [No reply] 1925
LAW AND POLICE—"INFERNAL MACHINES"—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir William Harcourt 1926
THE CENSUS RETURNS, 1881—THE CANAL POPULATION—Question, Mr. Salt; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1927

[*June* 7.] *Page*

PUBLIC HEALTH — NAZARETH HOUSE, HAMMERSMITH—REPORT OF MR. SPEARS—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1927

EGYPT (MILITARY EXPEDITION)—MILITARY HOSPITALS IN CYPRUS—Questions, Dr. Cameron, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Gorst, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter 1927

PASSENGER AND EMIGRANT SHIPS—ALLEGED STARVATION OF EMIGRANTS—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan.. .. 1930

PARLIAMENT—THE HALF-PAST TWELVE O'CLOCK RULE (DROPPED ORDERS) —Observations, Mr. Speaker 1930

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill—

Order for Committee read 1930

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert a new Clause in the Bill charging the returning officer's expenses at Parliamentary Elections upon the rates in boroughs and counties,"—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 80, Noes 247; Majority 167.—(Div. List, No. 118.)

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1944

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the question of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections in Ireland should be reserved for separate consideration,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 243, Noes 31; Majority 212.—(Div. List, No. 119.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee 1981

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Attorney General:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Postponed Resolution [31st May] *considered* .. 1982

Resolution 10.—Said Resolution read a first time.

Moved, "That the said Resolution be now read a second time:"—

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON—Observations, Lord Randolph Churchill; Reply, Mr. Gladstone: —Debate thereon 1982

Question put, and *agreed to:*—Resolution read a second time, and *agreed to.*

MOTIONS.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, SHIPPING, AND MANUFACTURES—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That the Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures have leave to sit on Mondays till half-past Four of the clock, and on Fridays till half-past Two of the clock, during the sitting of the House,"—(*Mr. Goschen.*)

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Beresford Hope:*)—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 34, Noes 99; Majority 65.—(Div. List, No. 120.)

Original Question again proposed 2009

Original Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 97, Noes 30; Majority 67.—(Div. List, No. 121.)

[*June* 7.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 216] 2017

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 217] 2017

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 218] 2017

Railway Passenger Duty, &c. Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Arthur Hayter*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 219] .. 2018

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) [PAYMENT OF COSTS AND EXPENSES]—

Considered in Committee 2018

Resolution *agreed to ;* to be reported *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

[2.45.]

LORDS.

SAT FIRST.

THURSDAY, MAY 31.

The Earl of Lonsdale, after the death of his brother.

MONDAY, JUNE 4.

The Lord Lurgan, after the death of his father.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

MONDAY, JUNE 4.

For *the County of Wexford*, *v.* Garrett Michael Byrne, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6.

For *Leicester County* (*Northern Division*), *v.* Major-General Edwyn Sherard Burnaby, deceased.

For *Derby Borough*, *v.* Michael Thomas Bass, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Fourth Session of the *Twenty-Second Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
appointed to meet 29 April, 1880, in the Forty-third
Year of the Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1883.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 7th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—House of Lords (Construction and Accommodation), Earl Cadogan in place of Earl Stanhope.

Public Bills—*First Reading—*General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Broughty Ferry Paving) * (55).

*Second Reading—*Glebe Loans (Ireland) Acts Amendment * (35); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) * (27).

*Committee—*Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Limerick Waterworks) * (3); Pluralities Acts Amendment (42).

*Third Reading—*Isle of Man (Harbours) * (50); Court of Chancery of Lancaster * (43), and *passed.*

PARLIAMENT—PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE.—RESOLUTION.

LORD BALFOUR, in rising to call attention to the usage of Parliament, whereby proceedings on Bills have not continuance after a Prorogation; and to move—

> "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to make such provision, by legislation or otherwise, as will enable either House of Parliament, if it shall think fit, at any stage of its proceedings upon any Bill which shall have been passed by the other House of Parliament, to adjourn further proceedings upon such Bill to such day, as shall for that purpose be then named, in the first or second week of the next succeeding Session of Parliament,"

said, that perhaps some apology was due from him to the House for bringing this very important subject under its notice. The question was not altogether a new one to their Lordships, because on two former occasions it had been brough tunder the notice of the House by those whose opinions were not the least valued among their Lordships. The circumstances in which this House was placed, and the inconvenience to which the present system led, must be well known to many of their Lordships. Some time ago he thought of preparing statistics to prove to their Lordships the great number of Bills that came up from the other House at a late period of the Session to pass through all the stages of this House; but it was not necessary to prove these facts in detail, because they must be familiar to anyone who took any interest in the Business of this House. As matters now stood, during the first four or five months of the Session, there was little or no Business for the House of Lords to transact. They sometimes heard of "the masterly inactivity;" but he ventured to say that the position of the House was one of compulsory inactivity, at any rate during the first three or four months of the Session; while, during the last four or five weeks, numerous Bills of the first importance were sent up from the House of Commons. These required the most careful consideration; but they were hurried through the House in a way that rendered it necessary, at a very early date, to bring in Bills to amend them. In illustration of his contention, he would refer to the course which had been pursued last Session with regard to the Bills of Exchange Bill, which had been introduced into the other House of Parliament early last Session. That measure was one of the first importance, as it proposed to codify a large portion of the Mercantile Law, which dealt with cheques, bills of exchange, promissory notes, and similar commercial matters. That Bill had been considered for some time by a Select Committee, which included a large proportion of the legal talent of the House of Commons and Members representing the principal commercial centres of the Kingdom. The Bill, which contained 100 clauses, was sent up to that House pretty well on in the month of July, when it was referred to a Select Committee of the House. That Committee had sat day by day, inclusive of Saturdays; but notwithstanding all its efforts it was unable, until the 10th of August, to make its Report, which recommended 100 Amendments to be made in the measure. Inasmuch as Parliament rose on the 16th or 17th of August, the Standing Orders of the House had to be suspended, in order that the Bill should be passed through all its stages before the Prorogation. The result, therefore, of such a system as was now in force was, that the House had either to pass a Bill in a hurry, or else by refusing to pass it they sacrificed all the labours of the Session of the other House with regard to it. That was a dilemma in which this House ought not to be placed. During the present Session, which had already lasted four months, their Lordships had only passed three Bills—namely, the Payment of Wages in Public-houses Bill, the Medical Act Amendment Bill, and the Contempts of Court Bill. In his opinion, the time of the House would have been much more usefully occupied during that time if they had been engaged in considering several of the Bills which had passed the other House during the last Session, and had been hurried through their stages in this House at its close. Various remedies had been devised for this state of things. The Government had been asked whether they would not originate more Bills in the House of Lords; and he thought one real reason why they did not do so was the great jealousy of the House of Commons in regard to its privileges with reference to Money Bills and Bills referring to taxation. He admitted also that the Government might be justified in refusing to introduce many measures of importance in that House—in the first place, on account of their fear of the action of the Conservative majority among their Lordships. It was obvious that it was very undesirable, whether Bills were originated in that House or the other, that their Lordships' House should not have sufficient time to consider them, considering that their House was held responsible by the country for the efficiency and quality of the legislation which was passed. He believed that his proposal would go far to remedy the evil to which he had called attention. The complaint with regard to that evil was no new one, because in 1848 the late Lord Derby had introduced a Bill dealing with it, the Preamble of which was as follows:—

> "Whereas, by reason of the great increase of public business, it is expedient that additional facilities should be afforded for the transaction of the same, and the securing of sufficient time for the due consideration for the Bills submitted:"

He thought that anyone who knew the state of affairs in the other House would know that the lamentable facility of speech and the pressure of Business were the real reasons why Bills did not come up to their Lordships' House until a late period of the Session. The Bill to which he had referred passed through that House and went down to the Commons, where it was referred to a Select Committee; but as they did not report till the 11th of August it was not proceeded with further. Again, in 1869, the noble Marquess sitting near him (the Marquess of Salisbury) had introduced another which was read in this House a second time, and was referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament. That Joint Committee, in their Report, expressly admitted the existence of the evil complained of, and, while condemning the particular remedy for it that was proposed by the Bill, approved the suggestion that some remedy should be devised to meet it. In the body of the Report of that Committee there was no reason given why a Bill of that year should not be proceeded with in the next Session at the stage at which it was dropped, nor was there any general opposition to the proposal as a matter of principle; but it was simply because there was no time that Session to consider it that the proposal did not meet with favour. He should be very glad indeed if the result of the Motion he was making should be to have some substantial objection stated to the plan, in order that they might have an opportunity of considering, and, if possible, of answering it. He had spoken in his Motion of the "usage of Parliament" in this matter, because he found that expression in the Preamble of the Bill brought in in 1869; but he was unable to say when this usage came into force. Like many other parts of the constitution of Parliament, it was very difficult to account for. Probably it arose as a matter of convenience, in much the same way as the taking of the various stages of different Bills; and now these various stages had become as stereotyped as part of their Forms, and were regulated by the Standing Orders. But was there any sense in the practice as it at present existed? He asked why all the work which had to be done in getting a Bill through Parliament should require to be gone through a second time simply because it was not finished in the period allotted to one Session? Why should all the opposition have to be encountered again, all the work of Select Committees, and all the business connected with deputations and other things—why should all that be done a second time if a Bill was dropped simply for want of time? On a former occasion it was contended that the improvement he advocated should be effected by legislation, and the noble Earl on the Woolsack (the Earl of Redesdale) said that he strongly objected to making Standing Orders matter of legislation; but, however effective that might be as an argument against a Bill, it was no argument against the Motion. It was no concern of his whether this improvement was effected by legislation or by Standing Orders. On the whole, he thought that if it could be done by Standing Orders it would be the simpler and readier means of effecting the alteration. The noble Earl had also objected that such a change would lead to rash and hasty legislation, and he hoped the noble Lord would explain more fully how it would do so, because, in his opinion, it was much more likely to mature and improve the quality of the legislation which passed through that House; while, on the other hand, it would give their Lordships' House fit employment for the early period of the Session. Another objection to the proposal was that it would help people who came to Parliament with crotchets—that those who came with measures which they pressed on by all kinds of agitation would have greater advantages than they had now. But what he would point out in answer to that was that no Bill which passed the other House of Parliament was shut out from receiving the judgment of their Lordships' House—they still had to express their opinion upon those measures. He did not claim for this proposal that it would result in an increased amount of legislation, but that it would result in that legislation being better considered and matured. It was urged, again, that if the proposal were adopted it would be an interference with the Prerogative of the Crown. No doubt there was a power vested in the Crown to defeat any proposed legislation by proroguing Parliament before that legislation was passed in all its stages; but was that a power which was likely to be exercised? If, however, it was necessary to prevent any infraction of the Prerogative of the Crown it could be done by enacting that, by Standing Order, or by legislation, the consent of the Crown should be required either before the adjournment to the next Session of the proceedings on a Bill or before they could be resumed. If the principle of the Resolution were approved, he would willingly leave in their Lordships' hands the question whether they should proceed by legislation, or by amendment of the Standing Orders, or by the appointment of a Select Committee to consider how best the proposal could be carried out. He begged to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to make such provision, by legislation or otherwise, as will enable either House of Parliament, if it shall think fit, at any stage of its proceedings upon any Bill which shall have been passed by the other House of Parliament, to adjourn further proceedings upon such Bill to such day as shall for that purpose be then named, in the first or second week of the next succeeding Session of Parliament."—(*The Lord Balfour.*)

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said, that as the noble Lord had referred to him and the opinions which he expressed on a former occasion, he would now state that he did not think that the alteration proposed was necessary. At any rate, that House was not called upon to take the initiative. No doubt they had the power to act in the way which the noble Lord had stated, but it was also in the power of any noble Lord to bring in early in the Session any Bill which had not passed in the previous Session and to send it down quickly to the other House. He thought that there were many great objections to the proposal of the noble Lord. For instance, supposing that a Bill making great alterations, such as a Reform Bill, came before them, it would be very undesirable to have it hanging about for the rest of the year for that House to determine, and then sent back as an amended Bill only to the other House. He did not see that they would gain anything by taking such a course, and thought that it would be far more desirable to allow the existing practice to continue.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK said, it seemed to him that the House would be placed in the most unfortunate position if they adopted the proposal, as they would be always under pressure to go on with those Bills which required the greatest consideration, and would be free only to suspend those of minor importance. It seemed to him that such Bills as the noble Lord on the Woolsack had mentioned were not the only Bills that might be referred to. Suppose a Corrupt Practices Bill was passed in the Lower House, it was most undesirable that the House of Lords should suspend its action upon a Bill of that character, the requirement for which would be urgent. The Motion was of an extravagant kind, and its adoption might involve interference with the Prerogative of the Crown by making a Dissolution of Parliament inconvenient, if not impossible. He would not enter into the terms of his noble Friend's Motion, which spoke of the adjournment of the proceedings to a special day. Such an arrangement would be impossible——

LORD BALFOUR said, he did not propose an adjournment of the House, but an adjournment of that particular Bill.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK said, he understood, on reading the Motion on the Paper, that it was assumed that a Bill would be adjourned to a particular day. It really seemed to him that without the assent of both Houses of the Legislature to some course satisfactory to each, it would be most unwise to pledge themselves to any abstract Resolution on this question; in fact, it was obvious that the matter could not be dealt with without legislation. Without it their Standing Orders would have to be recognized by the House of Commons, since they would affect the proceedings of the Lower House. Discussion on more than one occasion was not necessarily disadvantageous, and in regard to complaints that 30 or 40 hours were sometimes more than once occupied in the discussion of a particular Bill, Mr. Bright had said that his experience was that by such deliberation the seed was gradually matured and became useful fruit. Again and again Bills had been introduced and had failed to pass, and in each succeeding Session they became better Bills and more suitable to the interests of the public. He hoped, under these circumstances, the House would not assent to the Motion.

EARL GRANVILLE said, the noble Lord had stated fully and clearly the arguments in favour of the Motion he had made; at the same time, he was bound to say that he could not see what rejoinder could be made to the two answers of the noble Lords who had just spoken. He did not intend to speak then with authority as representing the Government, because he could not say that the Government had considered this particular remedy for the evil complained of. They did not think it was so serious an evil as to call for an immediate remedy, and he doubted whether the adoption of the proposal of the noble Lord would accelerate legislation. He was the more confirmed in that view because he remembered that when a great authority, the late Lord Derby, made a similar suggestion, not only was it opposed by the Government of the day, of which he (Earl Granville) was a Member, but it did not meet with any general acquiescence on the part of their Lordships' House. For these reasons he hoped the noble Lord would not press his Motion to a division.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, the noble Earl who had just sat down made one speech on this question in 1869, and another just now, and he confessed that he preferred the speech of 1869. On that occasion the noble Earl said that, following the example of Lord Lansdowne, he should vote, as he had always voted, for this particular principle; but now it appeared that for some reason or other a change had come over the sentiments of the noble Earl. For himself, he was formerly of the opinion held by the late Lord Derby, that some change was necessary in order to facilitate and improve the proceedings of the House; and if he did not venture to express the same opinion so confidently now, it was rather because he did not see any sufficient agreement in that House, and still less in the other, to make such a remedy at all practicable. He was wholly unable to agree with the noble Earl that there was no evil to correct, for it appeared to him that the evil was one that must concern all who took an interest in the position and character of their Lordships' House. What happened was this—that during five months out of six during which the Session lasted their Lordships' House, practically, had no Business at all to transact; no measure was brought before them. But towards the end of the six months, when the month of August came, and when certain circumstances to which he need not then particularly allude were apt to thin the Benches of the House, there came, as with a rush, the whole of the legislation which the House of Commons had contrived to get through during the Session, and it was then passed through their Lordship's House with scarcely a semblance of consideration. He did not blame the Government for that state of things; but it was undoubtedly the fact that measures which occupied the other House during many nights, which required anxious consideration, and which had been discussed in every part of the country with great animation, were very often, from mere lack of time, passed over without anything more than a perfunctory debate, and without that inquiry, by means of Select Committees and otherwise, for which their Lordships' House was so eminently qualified. He would not admit that the present state of things was satisfactory; but whether the precise remedies proposed by his noble Friend were the fittest, he admitted was a question removed from the region of practical discussion by the well-known disinclination of the House of Commons to entertain it. On the former occasion to which he had referred, it had passed their Lordships' House without a division; but they had found in the Committee of the House of Commons the strongest objection; and that had been recently renewed. A Gentleman on the Conservative side of the House of Commons (Mr. E. Clarke) had made a Motion in that House on this subject, and he had received no support, or no considerable support, from his political Friends or from his political Opponents. He (the Marquess of Salisbury) thought that both Parties in the House of Commons were averse to any such change in their procedure. The Conservatives held an opinion which might be summarized by the view that there had been too much legislation, and that it would be increased by such an arrangement. He was not a great enthusiast himself for too much legislation, and he did not lament the fate of those crotchety Bills which the present practice had had the effect of stifling. It was very desirable that they should be put a stop to; but he did not feel altogether satisfied as to the mode in which to get rid of them. But the Liberals, he thought, had an equal objection to any such change, and their view was that the present state of things practically disarmed the House of Lords. If measures were sent up in May or June or July, there would be a sufficient number of Peers in the House and sufficient time remaining to enable them to give that careful consideration to the Bills which might make them genuinely the product of the wisdom of both Houses. As matters were, by the dispersion of Members of the House, and still more by the shortness of time, their Lordships' House was practically ousted from any effectual share in a great part of the legislation; and as the Liberals in general had not a full confidence in the entire sympathy of their Lordships' House on all possible subjects, he thought they were glad to see the House partially disarmed. The existence of these two feelings made him strongly recommend his noble Friend to withdraw his Motion, because in the present state of things there was no chance of success; and he frankly admitted that experience rather led one to look to another remedy, if remedy ever should be found for this evil. A Motion associated with the name of the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees (the Earl of Redesdale) used to be made many years ago, that the House should not proceed to read a Bill a second time after a fixed date. The real remedy could only be adopted when the opinion of the House was thoroughly in unison with such a proposal. That it was not so in unison at present was proved by the fact that that Motion, adopted in deference to the noble Earl's authority in the House, was so eaten out by frequently recurring exceptions that it was found necessary to abandon it. He hoped that as the time went on the House would feel more deeply how little consonant with its dignity and power the present state of things was; and when that feeling should have thoroughly pervaded it, he had no fear that any jealousy on the part of the other House of Parliament would prevent its taking a full and effective share in legislation. If it did not take that share now, he was compelled to think that it was very much because Members of the House did not think it necessary that it should be claimed.

Lord BALFOUR said, there was in this country a growing feeling of dissatisfaction with the failure of Parliament to meet the demands of the people for legislation. He felt that, considering the words of the late Lord Derby, he had been fully justified in placing the Motion upon the Table in its present form. After what had been said, however, he would ask leave to withdraw the Motion.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

NAVY—H.M.S. "HECLA"—THE SUEZ CANAL.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Viscount SIDMOUTH, in rising to ask, Whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to construct any vessel or vessels expressly for the purposes to which H.M.S. "Hecla" had been converted; and whether, in the construction of vessels of war, the proposed draught of water, with reference to the depth of the Suez Canal, was an element of consideration? said, the *Hecla* was quite different from any other vessel in the Service, and had been purchased from the Merchant Navy by Mr. Smith, and therefore the present Board of Admiralty were not responsible for her. She was fitted up as a torpedo defence vessel, and was intended originally as an experiment, to be followed up by vessels of the same class if she were successful. He condemned the practice of purchasing merchant vessels for the Navy, as he believed that practice to be expensive and inexpedient in the long run; and he had received information that the *Hecla* was not quite what she had been intended to be. Before putting the Question, he should like to ask the noble Earl, who he believed was responsible for *The Navy List*, whether it would not be possible to introduce a little more information into it; and also whether he considered that the one naval *attaché* was sufficient, when other Powers sent an *attaché* to every country in the world? The Russian Government had sent a naval *attaché* to this country for the purpose of ascertaining the method of construction which prevailed in our Dockyards, and they actually had obtained possession of certain information which this country desired to conceal from them. Then, again, the draught of water of our large iron-clads was a matter of the utmost importance in connection with the depth of the Suez Canal. The Canal had a depth of only 24 feet 8 inches. One foreign Power had 11 iron-clads of the first class capable of passing through the Suez Canal, and seven or eight others were being built. This he regarded as a standing danger to our commerce in the absence of lighter draught vessels of the same magnitude in our Navy. It was quite possible, in the event of war, that sudden attacks might be made upon our commerce, and if they were they ought to be in a position at once to send powerful vessels through the Canal. He would now, in conclusion, ask the Question of which he had given Notice.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: My Lords, the noble Viscount asks me whether, in the construction of vessels of war, their draught of water is an important consideration in reference to the Suez Canal? It is, of course, an element of consideration; but in the case of first class iron-clads, it is not possible to construct them with a draught sufficiently light to enable them to pass through the Suez Canal. In the late operations in Egypt we had several vessels in the Canal; and since that time two iron-clad ships of considerable power—the *Ajax* and *Agamemnon*—have been greatly advanced, and they, as well as two others now in course of construction, will be able to pass through it. I may say that its depth is not 24 feet 8 inches, but something over 26 feet; 24 feet 8 inches is the limit of draught permitted by the Canal regulations to vessels which enter it. The noble Viscount has referred to the *Hecla*. We do not think it advisable to spend more money in constructing a class of vessels which can readily be bought at any time. With regard to the question of additional naval *attachés*, I may say that at present we have only one, and not two, as the noble Viscount imagines, and we think for our present purposes one is sufficient; he is at present stationed in France. The fact is, the reason why foreign nations send *attachés* into this country is because they think they have much to learn from us. We do not deny that we may have something to learn from them; but we do not think we can obtain from them as much information as they can from us, and therefore we do not think it necessary to station a naval *attaché* constantly at any foreign Court. We send one to any place where there is reason to expect a particular advantage. With respect to the free admission of foreign *attachés* into our Dockyards, the fact is, it is impossible, in the case of great ships and great guns, to keep anything secret, so we consider that the best plan is frankly to show whatever we have to show in the way of shipbuilding. There is no difficulty placed in the way of our naval *attachés* visiting the Dockyards and ships of foreign nations, and this country is bound to act in a reciprocal spirit. As to the proposal to give additional information respecting Her Majesty's ships in the Navy List, that list has a tendency to get more and more bulky, and the noble Viscount will, I am confident, find the information he requires in other official documents which have peen published.

ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEC. 17—ANNUAL DRAINAGE INSTALMENTS.

QUESTIONS. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in rising to ask the Lord President of the Council, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government had been called to a letter which recently appeared in the Dublin "Daily Express," signed by Mr. Thomas W. Webber, showing the unjust effect of the Arrears Act on those landlords who were liable to the payment of annual drainage instalments; and whether the Treasury would consider the expediency and justice of remitting such instalments proportionate to the amount of arrears of rent cancelled? said, he had put the same Question to the noble Lord the Lord President of the Council last week, and was then told that further Notice of it would have to be given. He now ventured to put the Question again. The case he referred to was one of the greatest hardship. The statement by Mr. Webber showed that he was agent to a gentleman who had laid out a very large sum of money upon what their Lordships' House and various Governments had always encouraged in Ireland, the improvement of tenants' holdings. The total amount borrowed from the Public Works Department since the year 1863 for that purpose was £19,993 11*s*. 5*d*., of which £8,695 15*s*. 10*d*. was laid out on farm buildings and cottages, and £11,297 15*s*. 7*d*. upon drainage. That money bore interest at the rate of 6 per cent, amounting to £1,168 a-year; but as soon as the Arrears Act had passed a sum of £1,248 was at once wiped off. Of course, he looked to his rents to pay the interest; but the Government, while they deprived him, on the one hand, of the means of paying it, served him with writs with the other for the amount of interest due upon this loan. He could hardly believe there could be such a case of injustice, or that the report he had seen was true, so he brought it under the notice of his noble Friend the Lord President of the Council (Lord Carlingford). Since that time an answer had been given in the House of Commons which was most unsatisfactory. The answer was that the public charges referred to were not public charges under Section 17 of the Arrears Act. When the Bill was passing through the House they understood that the 17th section covered these cases. That section applied to "quit rent, tithe rent, and other charges."

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL): Such other charges.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, he thought that the words were intended to cover the case he put. It seemed, however, that such charges were not to be covered, and while the rent had been wiped off by the Government, the unfortunate landlord had to pay at the same rate. The practice of the Sub-Commissioners in Ireland had been to wipe off any increase in rent made under any circumstances during the last 10 or 15 years, so that the landlord who had spent money in improving his property, and put on an increase of rent to recoup himself, had it all wiped away by the Commissioners. He thought it a hardship upon those landlords who had laid out the money in the interests of their tenants that they should be compelled to pay burdens which the tenant was relieved from. He hoped the noble Lord would give them some information, as great interest was taken in these matters.

THE EARL OF BELMORE said, that before an answer was given he should like to ask the Lord President if the instalments of tithe rent charge payable by landowners in Ireland who might have commuted the charges on their estates under the Irish Church Act, 1869, would be treated as ordinary payments of tithe rent charge in connection with the section of the Arrears Act of 1882 which entitled landowners to a remission proportionate to the amount of arrears cancelled? He put this Question because it dealt with a kindred subject. There was the slight difference that the question to which his noble Friend referred dealt with the loans for improving the land and dwellings, while the charge to which he referred was the tithe rent charge commuted, and which had now become simply a public tax. He thought the case of those landlords who had not commuted their tithe rent charges should not be different from those who had done so.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, that both Questions should, strictly speaking, have been answered by his noble Friend who represented the Treasury; but he had communicated with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and was glad to be able to answer them himself. He must remind the noble Marquess and the noble Earl of what the provisions in the Arrears Act on these matters were, because the answers to both Questions depended upon the actual wording of those provisions. The section of the Act quoted by the noble Marquess named the public charges which might be remitted under the Act in the proportion of the arrears wiped out, and those public charges consisted of tithe rent charge, income tax, and quit rent, or any of such charges—that was, any one of the charges thus enumerated. The words of the Act could have no other meaning. That was the sense in which the Treasury read the section, and it was the obvious meaning. The Treasury had no power, therefore, to remit any other charges than those mentioned. The answer to the noble Earl (the Earl of Belmore) was that the payments referred to by him were not tithe rent charges, but instalments of the charges into which tithe rent charges had been commuted under the Church Act. As to the loans for drainage referred to by the noble Marquess, they also clearly did not come under the terms of the Act, and no remission could, therefore, be allowed; but he (Lord Carlingford) was assured by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that so far as the time of repayment was concerned, no hardship would be inflicted upon landlords, nor undue pressure be brought to bear, in cases where arrears were still unpaid, or where grants under the Act of last year had been delayed.

PLURALITIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Bishop of Exeter.*)

(NO. 42.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON asked for some explanation of the necessity for the Bill.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER said, that experience had shown that change was necessary in many cases. It was found that there were benefices which it was unquestionably better should be held in plurality, but which could not be so held under the present Acts. These Acts included churches within three miles of each other, the value of one of the benefices not exceeding £100. The Bill proposed to extend the distance to five miles, and to allow one of the benefices to be of the annual value of £200. As things now stood, benefices were frequently vacant for years, because no one could be got to take them. Another reason for this Bill was the impossibility of getting curates at £80 per year, as in former times.

House in Committee (according to order); an amendment made; the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 7th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—£937,100, Expense of Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines—R.P.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders * [153].

Considered as amended—Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) [156].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—∽o∽—

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL BILL.

SIR JOSEPH BAILEY moved—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Manchester Ship Canal Bill that they have power to inquire and consider whether the powers respecting the Canal can be properly granted, regard being had to the question whether, to make the Canal effective, a low-water channel in the estuary of the Mersey be necessary, and whether the formation and maintenance of such a channel is reasonably practicable."

Motion *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

—∽:o:∽—

NAVY—ENGINE-ROOM ARTIFICERS.

CAPTAIN PRICE asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is the case that the recent circular with regard to engine-room artificers having been placed before the men (entered before November 1882), in order to ascertain how many of them would accept its terms, the returns already received show that less than five per cent. are willing to accept them, and that these are in special employment; and, if this is so, will the Admiralty consider the advisability of withdrawing a circular so obnoxious to this class, with the view to the introduction of a more beneficial one?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: As I stated, in answer to a Question by my hon. Friend the Member for Plymouth (Mr. Macliver) a few days ago, we have not yet received complete Returns as to the extent to which the new terms offered to engine-room artificers are accepted. It will be some time before we can tell the ultimate result.

CAPTAIN PRICE: Will the hon. Gentleman tell us what number of the men have already accepted the Circular? I understand that upwards of 200 have already expressed their opinion against it; and as I shall raise the point on the Estimates it will save time if the information is forthcoming.

[No reply was given.]

AFRICA (RIVER CONGO)—ACTION OF PORTUGAL.

MR. BOURKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, notwithstanding the answers that have already been given in this House upon the subject, the Governor General of Angola has caused notice to be given to the agents of the British mail steamers at St. Paul de Loanda that a Portuguese official had been appointed at Banana to put the visé on their bills of health; whether the Governor of Angola had also notified to the agents of British mail steamers the appointment of a Portuguese postmaster at Congo, and stated that all correspondence which those steamers might bring for the Congo was to be delivered to that official; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to request the Portuguese Government to instruct the Governor General of Angola to withdraw these orders so far as they affect British vessels, subjects, and mails going to the Congo and to neutral ports outside the possessions of Portugal?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's Minister at Lisbon has been informed by the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs that, as there was no direct telegraphic communication between Lisbon and Angola, instructions to the Governor General of that Province, in the terms of the information contained in my reply to the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright) on the 23rd ultimo, had been sent by the first vessel leaving for that place. At the request of Her Majesty's Minister, the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs has further promised to telegraph these instructions to the Portuguese Consul at the Cape of Good Hope, with directions to forward them to Angola.

IRELAND — COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION — MR. OWEN RYAN, ASSISTANT TEACHER IN THE BELFAST NATIONAL SCHOOL.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the salary has been withheld, up to the present, from Mr. Owen Ryan, who was appointed as seventh assistant in the Milford Street Male National School, Belfast, on the 10th day of October 1882, and whose appointment was notified to the Board of Education on the 21st day of February 1883; and also if it is not true that the said Owen Ryan was previously employed in the capacity of principal teacher at the Clonmore Male National School, county Tipperary, where the Commissioners, by their letter of 24th August 1882, granted him provisional classification, pending next annual examination to be held in July 1883; and, if so, if he would explain why his salary has been withheld?

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, the average attendance was not high enough to qualify the Milford Street School for assistance. The circumstances with regard to Mr. Owen Ryan were as stated; but they had no bearing upon the refusal to pay his salary as teacher at the Belfast school.

POST OFFICE—MAIL CARTS AND NEWSPAPER PARCELS.

Mr. MACARTNEY asked the Postmaster General, Whether he cannot relax the prohibition to the contractors for mail carts and cars to be employed by the Parcels Post with regard to their carrying parcels under the weight of seven pounds for the public, so far as to permit of private arrangements being made by the proprietors of newspapers for the carriage of small parcels of newspapers as heretofore?

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Postmaster General, If mail carriers will be forbidden in the North of Ireland to carry newspaper parcels as heretofore, except at postal parcel rates; and, if he is aware that such a prohibition will virtually double the cost of country newspapers?

Mr. FAWCETT: With the view of preventing any interference with the cheap and early circulation of newspapers in rural districts, I have, after giving the subject careful consideration, decided to allow contractors for mail carts and cars to continue, as at present, to enter into private arrangements with newspaper proprietors for the carriage of parcels of newspapers; but on the understanding that the carrying of newspapers in no way interferes with either the Letter or Parcel Postal Service.

Mr. MACARTNEY, Will the right hon. Gentleman say, if possible, when he expects the new Parcels Post to come into operation?

Mr. FAWCETT: It has been decided that the Inland Parcels Post shall come into operation on Wednesday, the 1st of August. A Circular will be issued to the public this afternoon as to the dimensions of parcels, the rates, and other particulars.

POST OFFICE—THE PARCELS POST—APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. KENNY asked the Postmaster General, in anticipation of the Parcels Post coming into operation shortly, Has any of the superior appointments under it yet been made; and, if so, what has been the mode of selection, and has any undue preference been given to the Postal over the Telegraph branch of the Service, complaint having arisen that such was the case on the promulgation of the late scheme; and, will any of the appointments fall to the share of those telegraph clerks who, owing to the requirements of the Service, have long service in provincial offices, and who have not fared so well under late revision as some of their more fortunate brethren, of equal service, attached to larger offices?

MR. FAWCETT: I do not, at present, anticipate that the introduction of the Parcels Post will necessitate any appointments of the kind which I presume the hon. Member has in view; at any rate, the number will be very small, and in making selections for them care will be taken to promote the best qualified.

POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—TELEGRAPH CLERKS, BELFAST.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, If it is true that there are a number of telegraph clerks in the Belfast office with from nine to twelve years' service, performing night and Sunday duty, who are only allowed two weeks' annual leave, while others in the same office with only six or eight years' service, performing exactly similar duties, are granted an annual leave of three weeks; if this be so, why is this distinction made between members of the same staff of the Belfast office; and will he have the anomaly removed; and, if it is not also a fact that clerks in the Dublin office, with similar service and performing precisely the same duties, are allowed three weeks' leave in the year?

MR. FAWCETT: I stated, in reply to a Question put to me last year, that the telegraph clerks at Belfast had been found to be enjoying exceptional indulgence in the matter of annual leave of absence, and this indulgence, while continued to those who already enjoyed it, was not to be extended to others. The officers referred to as having only a fortnight in the course of the year, though of longer service than some who have three weeks, have entered the Belfast office since the difference between that office and others has been discovered. As regards Dublin, I may state that some time since it was decided that future entrants into that office would be allowed only the same period of annual leave as the staff at Belfast.

INCOME TAX—ASSESSMENT OF PROFITS MADE ABROAD.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Inland Revenue Commissioners are justified in calling upon residents in this Country to return for assessment to the Income Tax profits arising or accruing to their credit from property, trade, or manufactures, such profits being made abroad under the protection of and subject to the taxation of Foreign or Colonial Governments, except for the proportion of such profits as may have been received for expenditure in this Country?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Yes, Sir; there is no doubt whatever that, by law, residents in this country are required to return for assessment the full amount of their profits made abroad, and not only the amounts remitted for expenditure in this country. The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Macfarlane) is, I believe, about to raise this question on the 8th clause of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, and I shall then be able, I hope, to show how untenable the apparent contention of my right hon. Friend would be.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, that when the Motion was discussed he would draw the attention of the House to the grievances to which his Question alluded.

MR. MACFARLANE asked at what hour the right hon. Gentleman would get Progress reported on the Navy Estimates, so that the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill might be discussed?

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman still persisted with Part 3 of that Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, the conduct of Business was not in his hands. With regard to the Question of the right hon. Baronet, he would prefer not to make any statement until the Bill was before the House.

SOUTH AFRICA—LANGALIBALELE.

MR. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What efforts have been made by Her Majesty's Government to take advantage of what was regarded in November 1882 as "the present opportune moment" for releasing the Chief Langalibalele from captivity; whether Her Majesty's Government still entertain the hope they did in 1880 that "there are no insurmountable obstacles to that Chief's early return to Natal;" and, whether he will lay any Correspondence on the subject upon the Table of the House?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir Henry Bulwer has been requested to prepare and transmit the conditions which are thought necessary to be attached to the return of Langalibalele, and as soon as the Legislative Council of Natal reassemble they will be informed of the details of the proposed arrangement, which will then, I hope, be carried out without delay. The Correspondence in the matter will be laid on the Table with the next collection of Natal Papers.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS FOR CASTLEBLAYNEY—THE PAPERS.

Mr. O'KELLY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will produce the papers relating to or connected with the inquiry ordered by the Local Government Board, and held at Castleblayney Workhouse, 9th September 1882 concerning the election of Poor Law Guardians for Castleblayney Division in June 1882; and, what decision the Local Government Board came to in this matter?

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, there was no objection to produce the Papers; but the Correspondence was very voluminous, and extended over four months, and he would rather show it to the hon. Gentleman privately. The evidence was very contradictory, and the Local Government Board did not feel justified in coming to any decision on the matter.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—ROSSCLARE PIER AND HARBOUR.

Colonel COLTHURST asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether his attention has been directed to a letter from the Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, dated 30th January 1883, to the Earl of Granard with reference to an application for a fresh loan towards the completion of Rossclare Pier and Harbour, county Wexford, in which His Excellency declines to recommend such application until the amount of traffic on the unfinished pier has been ascertained, or until collateral security for a further loan is offered; whether the Commissioners of the Harbour have not stated that the unfinished state of the Pier and Harbour exclude the possibility of increased traffic; and, whether he will recommend an inquiry into the truth or otherwise of the above statement?

Mr. COURTNEY: I have seen the letter referred to, and also a subsequent Memorial from the Harbour Board to the effect stated in the second paragraph of the Question. This application, being for a loan under the Harbours and Passing Tolls Act, falls to be dealt with by the English Public Works Loans Board, who have inquired fully into the matter, and have declined to accede to the application for a fresh loan. I should hesitate before in any way interfering with their discretion; but I have satisfied myself that in this case they have arrived at a right conclusion.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—MR. J. F. L. M'FARLANE, J.P.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that an action was recently brought against Mr. James Francis Lennox M'Farlane, J.P. Morien, Dundrum, county Dublin, before Chief Baron Palles, for blowing up a portion of his neighbour's premises with dynamite; whether a verdict for £100 was found against him; whether he settled the action by going through the Bankruptcy Court and has never paid the costs; and, whether he will continue this gentleman in the Commission of the Peace?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The facts of this case are not before me; but I am aware that they are at present under the consideration of the Lord Chancellor.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—DONEGAL WORKHOUSE—THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAIN.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he is aware that the Catholic Chaplain of Donegal Workhouse has resigned in consequence of the refusal of the Protestant majority of the guardians to permit the presence of any Catholic official or to pay a Catholic Catechist for the instruction of the Catholic children; and, what steps he proposes to take to provide for the rights of conscience of the Catholic inmates, numbering nearly ninety per cent. in Donegal Workhouse?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am informed that it is the case that the Roman Catholic Chaplain of Donegal Workhouse has resigned on the ground stated. The Guardians, I understand, persist in their refusal to appoint a Catechist, one ground of their refusal being that some years ago the salary of the Chaplaincy was increased by £5, partly on account of his having to catechize the inmates himself. I have already stated that the Local Government Board consider the application for the appointment of a Catechist reasonable, and regret the action of the Guardians; but they have no power to appoint a Catechist. I can only express my hope that the Guardians will alter their decision in the matter.

GENERAL POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT)—ACCOMMODATION.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is proposed to enlarge the accommodation of the Telegraph Department of the General Post Office by adding a story to the present building; what height from the ground the new story will be; how many persons will be located in the building when completed; and, what precautions against fire it is proposed to take?

MR. FAWCETT: In reply to the hon. Member, I may state that the height of the floor of the new story in the Telegraph Department above the pavement is 76 feet. The maximum number of persons employed in the entire building is about 2,500. Of course, the whole number are not employed at one time. About 300 are employed at night. The building is fire-proof, and every precaution is taken against fire by having large tanks on the top of the building and hydrants on each floor. The means of exit are so good that it is considered that the whole staff at the busiest time of the day could leave the building in 10 minutes.

In answer to a further Question from Mr. RITCHIE,

MR. FAWCETT stated that, to the best of his belief, no more than 2,000 persons were ever employed in the building at the same time.

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—PROCURATORS FISCAL AND PRIVATE PRACTICE — CASE OF WILLIAM MEIKLE.

DR. CAMERON asked the Lord Advocate, Whether his attention has been called to a Petition for inquiry into his case, sent to the Home Secretary by William Meikle, accountant in Edinburgh, convicted, in April 1881, of breach of trust and embezzlement; and, whether there is any truth in the statement made therein that Robert Laidlaw Stuart, Procurator Fiscal of Court of Midlothian, at whose instance the prosecution against Meikle was undertaken, was a partner in the firm of Messrs. Stuart and Cheyne, W.S., who had been employed as agents in the civil disputes out of which the charge of breach of trust and embezzlement originated; and, if so, whether he will urge upon the Government the necessity of adopting means to prevent public prosecutors compromising their position of neutrality by engaging in private practice in districts where they prosecute in the public interest?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): A Petition was received from William Meikle, who was convicted of breach of trust and embezzlement in 1881 by the unanimous verdict of the jury. The presiding Judge reports the case to have been a very bad one, and Meikle was twice previously convicted of the same offence in the Sheriff Court of Lanarkshire in 1876 and 1877. Mr. Stuart, Procurator Fiscal of Mid Lothian, is a partner of the firm of Stuart and Cheyne, W.S. Mr. Stuart reports that his firm never were, to his knowledge, employed as agents in any civil dispute connected with the matters out of which the charge of breach of trust and embezzlement arose. But Meikle has forwarded a letter which shows that he had had correspondence with that firm on a subject which had a connection, though not a very direct connection, with the criminal charge. In the present case, I cannot find the slightest indication that the interests of justice have suffered by Mr. Stuart's partnership in a professional firm. But I am of opinion that it is desirable, where possible, that Procurators Fiscal should not engage in private practice as solicitors. An absolute rule to this effect would involve a heavy demand on the Treasury. But on the occurrence of recent vacancies, wherever the salary has admitted of it, provision has been made for the separation of the public duties from private practice.

NAVY—IRON-CLADS FOR FOREIGN POWERS.

CAPTAIN PRICE asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will state the number of ironclad vessels building in the private yards of this Country for Foreign Powers, their size, probable armament, and the dates on which they will probably be completed?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We are aware of only one ship, of 5,700 tons displacement, being built in this country for a foreign Power. She is well advanced, and I understand that another ship of the same character has been recently ordered.

INDIA—DEBATES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked the Chairman of Ways and Means, Whether, as Tuesday next is the only day during the past two years when any opportunity has been found to discuss any matters relating to India, except on the day of the Budget Statement at the end of August, he will postpone the Motion which stands in his name, at the time of Private Business, to some other day?

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY), in reply, said, he fully recognized the importance of the subject to which the hon. Gentleman had referred in his Question; but he had also received a letter from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter), who was Chairman of the Committee appointed by the House last year to examine into the matters which were regulated by Standing Order 167, informing him that he had been suddenly summoned to Scotland, and would be unable to attend to-morrow to take part in the discussion of his (Sir Arthur Otway's) Notice of Motion. Under these circumstances, he would postpone the Motion till another day.

SOUTH AFRICA—(THE TRANSVAAL)—MURDER OF MR. J. S. M'GILLORAY.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he has yet received any details of the barbarous murder of Mr. James Scott M'Gilloray and another Englishman by the Boers in the Transvaal last September, as recorded in the Colonial Papers brought to the knowledge of the Colonial Office so long as last January?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Our despatch to the High Commissioner instructing him to make inquiries relative to the death of Mr. M'Gilloray and another Englishmen on the borders of the Transvaal crossed despatches from Sir Hercules Robinson in which he informed the Secretary of State that the matter had been brought to his notice by the Cape Government, and that he had instructed Mr. Hudson to make a representation on the subject to the Government of the Transvaal State. We have not yet heard anything further in the matter.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONERS.

COLONEL COLTHURST asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, during the Whitsuntide Recess, the Government will consider the advisibility of appointing one or two additional Land Commissioners, so as to form a second Court of Appeal, and to thus dispose of the large number of appeals (over 4,000) within a reasonable period?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, this is a very important matter; but the Government really consider that they cannot make any statement with regard to it.

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS — THE BOARD OF TRADE—RESIGNATION OF PROFESSOR TYNDALL.

MR. GIBSON asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is true that Professor Tyndall, D.C.L., F.R.S., has resigned his position as Scientific Adviser to the Board of Trade and the Lighthouse Boards; and, if so, what reasons he has assigned for so doing?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I am sorry to say that Dr. Tyndall has resigned his position as Scientific Adviser to the Trinity House, the Irish Light Commissioners, and the Board of Trade. He has not stated very precisely his reasons for so doing; but no doubt they are indicated in a lengthy Correspondence which has taken place between Dr. Tyndall and the Board of Trade. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman thinks the production of these Papers sufficiently important I shall not oppose the Motion.

MR. GIBSON: I will move it. Will the right hon. Gentleman include in the Correspondence that with the Trinity House, the Board of Trade, the Commissioners of Northern Lights, and the Irish Lights Commission?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I will inquire, and communicate with the right hon. and learned Gentleman.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS — THE METROPOLITAN POLICE.

MR. GORST asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What are the intentions of Her Majesty's Government with reference to those officers of the Metropolitan Police Force who have been employed in the administration of the Contagious Diseases Act?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, the Government, in consequence of the vote which the House came to the other night, had thought it right to repeal such portions of the Acts as might appear to be optional with the Government. The employment of the Metropolitan police was merely optional, and therefore it had been discontinued.

MR. GORST: Will those men so previously employed be retired, or will any consideration be shown to them?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Certainly, Sir. These men will not suffer in their employment owing to the step the Government has taken.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: I should like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether the ordinary police in garrison towns are still to be employed for carrying out the Acts?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. and gallant Member must know that I have no voice in that matter. The Secretary of State has no authority whatever over police in boroughs, I can give the local authorities no instructions as what to do or what not to do.

ARMY—SOLDIERS' ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN.

MR. SEXTON asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been drawn to the following statement in a letter from the Rev. F. W. Taylor, Chaplain of Maidstone Union, to the editor of the "Times":—

> "I speak from experience, and information, that on a low average the number of children unlawfully begotten by soldiers would be four in each 500 unions out of 632, thus giving a population of 2,000 illegitimate children annually, for the maintenance of which neither the mothers nor the ratepayers have any redress;"

and, whether the Government will make any proposal to remedy the state of things described?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The writer of the letter in *The Times* would seem to have been unaware of a fact, which is no doubt well-known to the hon. Member, that, under the Army Act, a soldier is liable to a payment of 1*s.* 9*d.* a-week for the maintenance of an illegitimate child, and that in cases where the paternity is properly established, this payment is always enforced. After full consideration, it was decided that 3*d.* a-day was the utmost that a soldier's pay could bear.

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIVER SHANNON—DRAINAGE WORKS AT MEELUK.

MR. MOLLOY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If the drainage works at Meeluk have been stopped although still incomplete; and, whether it is the intention of the Government to resume these works and to carry them to completion?

MR. COURTNEY: Assuming that the Question of the hon. Member relates to the works on the Shannon at Meeluk, I have to say that those works have been substantially complete for some time. Some few accessories could not be finished while the river was in flood; but they are now being dealt with, and the works will be very shortly brought to a final conclusion.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY PANEL, DUBLIN.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it a fact that Mr. George Bolton, Crown Solicitor, on receiving the jury panel for the present Commission in

Green Street from the Sheriff on the 5th of April last despatched a messenger with a copy of the said jury panel to Mr. Welch, now or at one time an official of the Leinster Street Conservative Association; and, whether Mr. Welch has received £5 5*s*. for his services in connection with the panel, together with further fees for subsequent searches; and, if so, what was the nature of the services so rewarded?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I stated, in reply to a former Question, that I must decline to make any statement as to the steps which the Crown Solicitor, for the proper discharge of his duty, thinks it necessary to take to obtain confidential information in matters of this kind; and I must adhere to that decision.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Then the right hon. Gentleman declines to state what part the Secretary of a Dublin Conservative Association takes in ordering Catholic jurors to stand aside?

Mr. HARRINGTON: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the confidential information refers to the religion of the jurors?

[No reply was given.]

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEC. 14—POLICE SEARCHES.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that on the 22nd of February last Mr. Dagg, Sub-Inspector Royal Irish Constabulary, in company with Constable Steward, of Ventry, made a search, lasting for several hours, through the papers of the Reverend C. M'Carthy, M.A., the Protestant clergyman, which search was continued through the following day, and that on the 24th February Sub-Inspector Dagg informed the reverend gentleman that the police had received information identifying him with Carey and the Phœnix Park assassinations; whether he approves of these proceedings; and, whether he means to take any notice of them?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The Rev. Mr. M'Carthy, I may mention, is a gentleman who has been prohibited by the Archbishop of Dublin from performing any ecclesiastical duties. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Gentlemen say "Oh, oh!" but that appears to me to bear upon this question, that he has been prohibited from the discharge of his duties. ["Oh, oh!"] I do not know why hon. Gentlemen groan at that statement, as it is not likely the Archbishop would make such an order without proper reason. The charge against the rev. gentleman was that he was concerned in a fraudulent transaction, and that bears, in my opinion, very strongly on this case. I am informed that his lodgings were searched on the 2nd of March. He has no house of his own, and the papers which were examined were handed to the police by his landlady, who had seized them for debt. It is not the case that the search was continued on the following day, and the Sub-Inspector reports that it is not true that he made any reference to Mr. M'Carthy about the Phœnix Park murders, or any statement that he had received information identifying him with them. From the information before me, I see no ground for expressing any disapproval of the action of the Sub-Inspector, or of taking any further notice of the matter.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Perhaps I may be permitted to state, if the House will allow me, that I should not have put this Question on the Paper if I had not received a distinct statement from the clergyman referred to, in which he sets forth the matters contained in the Question, and states in express terms that the Inspector informed him that he had received information identifying him with Carey and the Phœnix Park assassinations.

Mr. TREVELYAN: I do not think the Question requires any explanation from the hon. Member.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SUICIDE OF A CONSTABLE.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Constable Graham, a man of thirty years' service in the Royal Irish Constabulary, lately stationed at Carros Hut, county Mayo, committed suicide there, about three weeks since, by shooting himself with his own rifle; whether, notwithstanding his length of service, this constable had recently been removed from Claremorris, where his wife and children live, to Newport, and, on appealing to County Inspector Carey to be allowed to return to Claremorris, that officer took the course of sending him to the hut at Carros, still further away from Claremorris; whether there is reason to conclude that the constable committed suicide through depression, resulting from the course pursued towards him by County Inspector Carey; and, whether the Government approve of the conduct of the County Inspector in this case, and will inquire into the course adopted by him, in numerous cases, with regard to the separation of married constables from their wives and children?

MR. TREVELYAN: I think the hon. Member will be glad to hear the answer to this Question. Constable Graham committed suicide as stated. He had been stationed at Claremorris, in order that he might be in a place where his wife and family could get accommodation; and it was at his own request that he was transferred from that station to a protection post, as his eyesight was not good, and he was unequal to all the writing that he had to do at Claremorris. It is not the case that the County Inspector had, in numerous instances, transferred married constables to stations where they could not obtain accommodation for their families.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CARRICK ON SHANNON UNION—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in the last election of a Poor Law Guardian for the Gorrel Electoral Division of the Carrick on Shannon Union, the police left the voting papers of the following nine electors, Michael Horan, James Mulherin, Luke M'Laughlin, Patrick James Mulherin, Francis Murphy, Richard Brennan, Michael Mulherin, Patrick M'Laughlin, and John Morton, not at their own houses, as prescribed by Law, but at the house of Mr. Arthur Harrison, Sub-Sheriff of the county Leitrim, who is agent of the property on which these nine voters are tenants, and who was himself a candidate in the election; whether Mr. Harrison, having obtained possession of the voting papers, caused the electors named to attend at his house, and there induced them to vote for him; and, whether the Government will take notice of the conduct of this public official, and will protect the voters from intimidatory courses by instructing the police to leave the voting paper for each elector at his place of abode, and nowhere else?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have received a Report from the Sub-Inspector of the district, from which it appears that the constable at the Leitrim station received the voting papers from the Clerk of the Union, accompanied by a written request from the voters named in the Question that the papers should be left at the house of Mr. Harrison, as they feared that, if left at their own houses, they would be defaced in their absence. The constable complied with this request. In doing so he was technically wrong; but he bears a high character, and his officers are persuaded that he acted in good faith. Whether or not these electors voted for Mr. Harrison I am unable to say; but that they intended to do so when they made the request above-mentioned seems pretty clear. The incident had no effect on the result of the election, as Mr. Harrison was not elected.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in leaving the papers in this way, the police do not leave the people open to intimidation; and whether, in all cases, they should not leave the papers at the voters' own houses, and nowhere else?

MR. TREVELYAN said, that that was his view of what should be done.

LICENSING ACTS (IRELAND)—DUBLIN.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether section 12, sub-section 2, of the 37th and 38th Victoria, c. 69, enacts that certificates for beer dealers' licences shall only be granted at annual licensing sessions in October of each year, unless in cases where special circumstances are shown to exist; if he will state on what special grounds Mr. John A. Curran, Q.C., one of the divisional magistrates, granted such a certificate to Mr. Edward Quinn, of Newport Street, on the 13th June 1882, out of annual sessions, Quinn having previously lost his licence for habitual violations of the Law; whether, as reported in the "Freeman's Journal" on the 20th of April last, Henry Skelton, Spirit Grocer, Curzon Street, Dublin, was prosecuted by the police authorities before Mr. Curran for supplying intoxicating liquor to a constable while on duty; whether Mr. Skelton had previously been charged with a similar offence, and, if his defence on this occasion was that the drink supplied was by way of a treat; whether this is an offence against the Statute, and if Mr. Curran dismissed the summons; whether Skelton was a previous client of Mr. Curran at licensing sessions; whether on the same day Mr. Patrick Bagnall, publican, of Thomas Street, was charged with a like offence before Mr. Curran, and pleaded guilty; whether Mr. Curran dismissed this summons also; and, if Mr. Bagnall was also a client of Mr. Curran's at licensing sessions?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The hon. Member does not accurately quote the words of the statutory provision to which he refers, which says nothing about special circumstances. The words of the Act are —"In such cases as may seem fit to the Justice." I have already explained, in reply to a former Question, the circumstances under which Mr. Curran saw fit to renew Mr. Quinn's licence. The charge against Henry Skelton was not for supplying intoxicating liquor to a constable, but to an ordinary member of the public. The defendant was examined, and swore that the drink was given by him as a treat, and was not paid for. Taking this and the defendant's respectability into account, the magistrate dismissed the case. Patrick Bagnall was charged with having supplied drink to two constables on duty. He pleaded guilty, and threw himself on the mercy of the Court; and he was "cautioned" by Mr. Curran. This caution can and will be quoted against him in the event of his being again prosecuted. The police are quite satisfied with the decisions in these cases. I am not aware whether these persons were former clients of Mr. Curran, nor do I think it necessary to inquire. Mr. Curran, like every barrister who is appointed to a judicial office, is liable to decide on cases connected with former clients of his own. I may add that Mr. Curran is a magistrate of whose integrity and ability the Government entertain a high opinion.

LAW AND JUSTICE (INDIA)—COURTS OF LAW—MR. JUSTICE NORRIS—CONDITIONS OF ADMISSION FOR NATIVES.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If his attention has been directed to a statement in the "Times of India," that a native magistrate has prohibited natives from appearing in court with shoes on; whether a native pleader who contravened the order was turned out of court by order of the magistrate; whether the Deputy Commissioner being appealed to decided that—

> "The native pleader had a right to enter court without removing his shoes, provided they were of European design;"

and, under what Law has such a regulation been authorised?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: The India Office has no information on the subject beyond that derived from the newspaper report referred to by the hon. Member. On the general question of the wearing of shoes in the Courts of British India, I have nothing to add to the statement which I made in answer to the hon. Member on the 12th of March last, except that it is the custom not to require Natives wearing European shoes to remove them under ordinary circumstances.

INDIAN PENAL CODE—NEWSPAPERS—THE "CALCUTTA ENGLISHMAN."

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If his attention has been called to the fact that the "Calcutta Englishman" has published the following among other advertisements—

> "Wanted — Sweepers, Punkha-Coolies, and Bhisties for the residents of Saidpur. None but Bengali Babas who have passed the Entrance Examination need apply. Ex-Deputy Magistrates are preferred. Applications should be forwarded to the postmaster of Saidpur, with testimonials;"

whether the provisions of the Indian Criminal Code punish insults intended to stir up resentment and animosity between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects in India; and, whether Government intends to take notice of the conduct of the "Calcutta Englishman" in placing educated Native gentlemen, and Native servants of the Crown, on the same level with the lowest menials?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: I have seen the very disgraceful advertisement quoted by the hon. Member. Under the Indian Penal Code—

> "Whoever intentionally insults and thereby gives provocation to any person, intending or knowing it to be likely that such provocation

will cause him to break the public peace, or to commit any other offence,"

is punishable with imprisonment and fine. The Government of India will, doubtless, exercise its discretion as to whether or not it will take any steps in the matter.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—MR. PHILIPS NEWTON.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. Philips Newton, now acting as Land Sub-Commissioner in Kerry, is the same gentleman who acts as coroner for the county of Wicklow; and, if so, whether he can discharge both duties satisfactorily at the same time; whether he is the same Mr. Philips Newton who, as Court valuer in the case of Toole *v.* Fisborne, valued the farm 113 per cent. over the Government valuation, 80 per cent. over the judicial rent fixed, and 90 per cent. over the rent as fixed on appeal; and, if so, whether he will continue Mr. Newton in his position of Sub-Commissioner?

MR. TREVELYAN: Mr. Newton, a Sub-Commissioner employed in the county of Kerry, is one of the Coroners for the county of Wicklow. I do not think that he can satisfactorily discharge the duties of both offices at the same time, and I shall communicate with the Land Commissioners on the subject. Mr. Newton informs me that he did not act as Court Valuer in the case of "Toole *v.* Fisborne," but was examined as a witness for the landlord. I must decline to attempt to review his evidence.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—SENTENCE ON JAMES M'CLASKEY.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether a man named James M'Claskey was, on the 4th January, at Armagh, sentenced to two months' imprisonment; and, whether there was any other charge against him except that of having put out his tongue at the sub-inspector?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have received a telegram stating that James M'Claskey was on, January 4 last, ordered to find sureties for his good behaviour, and, in default, to be imprisoned for two months for persistently putting out his tongue and grinning at the Sub-Inspector—such offensive conduct being calculated to create a breach of the peace. He was unable to give bail, and sent to prison. I will have the case looked up.

MR. HARRINGTON: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he means that the Sub-Inspector was likely to break the peace because James M'Claskey insulted him?

[No reply was given.]

SOUTHPORT FORESHORE.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether he will afford an opportunity to the House of discussing the sale of the Southport foreshore to certain landowners before the sale is completed?

MR. DODSON, in reply, said, he begged to point out, in the first place, that the rights of the Duchy to this foreshore was in dispute with the riparian proprietors; and, therefore, if the Corporation had acquired it, they would still have had the riparian proprietors to deal with. In answer to the Question, he was afraid he could only repeat what he had said before, that there was a binding contract from which the Duchy could not recede. The sale was in equity complete. He did not know whether the hon. Gentleman was aware—if not, he would be glad to hear—that the riparian proprietors had offered to the Corporation those portions of the foreshore opposite the town, which were required for sanitary or recreation purposes, at a nominal price. That being so, he ventured to hope that an arrangement between the parties might, before long, be arrived at on amicable terms.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether the seal of the Duchy had been attached?

MR. DODSON said, he stated the other night that the seal of the Duchy might not be put in requisition for some time to come; but the contract entered into was none the less binding, and it was not one which it was in his power to recede from, even if he wished.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether he was to understand that the right hon. Gentleman had agreed not to attach the seal until the question had been brought under the notice of the House? ["No!"] He wished also to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that the written Report of the Surveyor General of the Duchy was to the effect that the

Duchy had full powers, and that the so-called riparian owners had no rights whatever? This was a question of life and death to Southport. Was the right hon. Gentleman aware that the landowners had refused to name the nominal price; and, further, that as regarded the borough of Preston, which was in precisely the same position, the landowners had already refused an increase of 100 per cent on what they had paid to the Duchy for the land?

Mr. DODSON said, he was not aware of the transaction with regard to the borough of Preston to which the hon. Gentleman had referred. With respect to the opinion which the hon. Gentleman stated that the Surveyor General of the Duchy had expressed as to the rights of the riparian proprietors, he would point out that the Surveyor General was not a legal authority, nor one by whose legal opinion he ought to be guided. The contract, as he had said, was a binding one; and he could not refuse to attach the seal of the Duchy when he was called upon to do it.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that it appeared from the Correspondence that Mr. Whittaker, the Legal Adviser of the Duchy, agreed with the Surveyor General that the lords of the manor had no right whatever to the foreshore?

Mr. DODSON said, he was not aware that Mr. Whittaker had ever laid that down. At all events, the position was this—the Duchy had a dispute as to rights with the riparian proprietors, and that dispute was not unlikely to lead to a lawsuit. It was not for him to question the validity of the right which the Duchy asserted.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS was proceeding to put further Questions, when——

Mr. SPEAKER said, that several Questions which had already been put had been fully answered, and that Notice of any further Questions ought to be given.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said, he would again put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman on the subject to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he has already asked several Questions, and has received answers; and if he desires to put further Questions on the matter, I submit that Notice should be given.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS gave Notice that to-morrow he would ask a further Question on the subject.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. PULESTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is prepared to adopt some scheme now to mitigate the evils likely to arise from the present action of the Government in annulling the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Acts?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: The action which I stated the other day the Government proposed to take is with the view, not of annulling the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Acts, but of retaining as much of those provisions as we can reasonably expect to receive the support of the House in retaining. The Lock Hospital will remain, and the power of detention of women who are found to be diseased will also remain in force. I also stated that we are considering whether it will be possible to adopt any of the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1871, which, in their opinion, might be applied, not only in these districts, but more generally with a prospect of improving the health of the troops and of the population generally.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked whether the statement of the noble Marquess, that the employment of the Metropolitan Police under these Acts was permissive, and not obligatory, was given after consultation with the Law Officers of the Crown?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: It was after consultation with the Law Officers of the Crown.

In answer to Sir R. Assheton Cross,

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that he had no control over local bodies of police. Over the Metropolitan Police, however, the Executive had authority; and the principle upon which the Executive had acted was that after the recent decision arrived at by the House they were bound to discontinue enforcing so much of the executive portion of the Acts as it was in their discretion to enforce or not to enforce. Of course, the word "police" in the Acts included the two classes of police, one being that over which the Executive Government had authority, and the other that over which they had no authority.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS wished to know whether the authorities over the local police had the power to exclude from the duties of that police the execution of the Acts in question?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that was a question upon which he would rather not give an opinion, as it was one with which he had nothing to do, and with respect to which he ought to say nothing regarding their legal rights, or the rights they might choose to exercise.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not quite follow his meaning, which was, whether there was any difference between statutory duties imposed upon the Metropolitan Police and statutory duties imposed on local police? If statutory duties could be withdrawn from the one body, why not from the other?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the local authorities were not under the same—what word should he use?—pressure from the House of Commons as the Executive Government was. The House of Commons had control over the Estimates from which the payment of the Metropolitan Police must come; and, consequently, the House could exert great pressure upon the Executive. The payment of the local police did not depend upon the Estimates, and thus the House could not exert the same pressure in the case of that body.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL observed that, by the 15th and 16th sections of 29 *Vict.*, c. 35, local Justices of the Peace might, on the information of a Superintendent of Police, order compulsory examination in a given locality. He asked whether the Government had the power to interfere with the discretion of the Justices of the Peace?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT replied, that he had no power, by Circular or otherwise, to interfere. If he were to give instructions to the local police they would not be bound to respect them. In local boroughs the autonomy with respect to the local police was absolute. The Secretary of State had a slight remnant of authority over the county police; but the local authorities were entirely independent of the Secretary of State.

Mr. GORST asked whether the House was to understand that no Vote would be proposed in the Estimates with a view to the carrying out of the Acts?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that it was the intention of the Government to substitute revised Estimates for the administration of the Acts, as he had already stated. When the Votes were moved there would be a convenient opportunity for discussing the matter.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—TEARING DOWN NATIONAL LEAGUE PLACARDS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that Sub-Constables Burke and Mulholland, on 29th April, tore down from the pillars of Toames Chapel gate, in the parish of Kilmichael, county Cork, a placard, of which the following is a copy:—

> "Irish National League. A Public Meeting to establish a branch of the Irish National League will be heldon Sunday, May 6th, 1883, at 2 o'clock, at Toames Chapel. Deputations from Dublin and Cork will attend. Irishmen of all classes are invited to co-operate in a movement to save the Irish Race from death and expatriation; to revive and encourage the Industries of the Country: to secure fair wages and cleanly accommodation to the Irish Labourer; to the Irish Farmer the full fruits of his Industry; and to the Irish people the right to make their own laws in a Native Parliament. Prudence, courage, and union were never more necessary for Irishmen than at the present moment. God Save Ireland;"

and, whether steps will be taken to prosecute Sub-Constables Burke and Mulholland for their conduct, or otherwise express their disapproval?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The constables did take down the "placard," which they believed to be of an inflammatory character. In doing so, they took, in my opinion, a wrong view of their duty; and I have directed that they shall be so informed.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CASE OF JOHN FLANAGAN, A LUNATIC.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to a former Question, Whether he has received any further information tending to show that the lunatic, John Flanagan, was removed by his father from Ballyshannon Workhouse; whether it is true that a record appears on the minutes of the Board of

Guardians to the effect that he had been discharged by the master, on his own application, in error, having been mistaken for a night lodger; whether the Local Government Board were aware of the fact when furnishing him with the reply he gave, and had already censured the master for his culpable negligence, by letter dated 5th January last; whether it is true that, some days prior to the murder, Hugh Flanagan was brought before the local magistrates charged with being a dangerous lunatic, and that they declined to commit him, although warned by a medical man that the case was dangerous; whether it is true that the body of the murdered man lay for several days awaiting the coroner's convenience, and that decomposition had set in before an inquest was held; whether it is a fact that, on the face of the Scotch transfer warrant, the lunatic was simply described as a pauper, his lunacy being referred to in an almost illegible endorsement in red ink, which the master says he overlooked; and, whether, if the facts are as stated, he will condemn the conduct of all who are responsible for these painful occurrences, or supplying incorrect information in regard to them?

Mr. TREVELYAN: From the fuller information now before me it appears that John Flanagan was not removed from the workhouse by his father, as I had been led to believe; I was not so informed by the Local Government Board, but by the police, who had themselves been misled on the subject. The facts as to the man's discharge in error, and as to the censure passed on the master, are as stated. When the master found out his mistake on the day following the discharge, he at once sent to John Flanagan's father, who refused to allow his son to return to the workhouse. There was nothing in his appearance to indicate insanity. Two months prior to the murder, Flanagan was brought before the magistrates, who declined to commit him as a dangerous lunatic, not being satisfied that the circumstances would justify them in doing so. He was carefully examined by these magistrates, one of whom was surgeon to the County Infirmary, and he was re-examined in their presence by the doctor who had previously declared him to be insane, and the conclusion arrived at by the three gentlemen was that he was not a lunatic. The body of the murdered man lay from the 17th to the 20th awaiting an inquest, the Coroner being unable, from illness, to attend. An inquest was held as soon as possible by two magistrates. The Scotch transfer warrant was as described, and the master of the Ballyshannon Workhouse did not at first observe the words "Insane case" noted on it. I think if the hon. Member desires to make any complaint as to the action of the Scotch authorities it should not be addressed to me. They are not under my control.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—EXECUTION OF PATRICK JOYCE AND PATRICK CASEY.

Mr. HARRINGTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is true that the solemn declarations made by Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey previous to their execution in Galway Gaol, and afterwards communicated to the Lord Lieutenant, were made at the solicitation of the clergyman who attended them to prepare them for death; and, whether, having regard to the public feeling in Ireland upon this matter, he will cause copies of these declarations to be laid upon the Table of the House? The hon. Member hoped he might be permitted to explain that a portion of the Question was omitted, which the right hon. Gentleman would, no doubt, have answered had he seen it. It was, whether these declarations were made with the avowed object of saving the life of Myles Joyce? He wished to state that had received letters from several Catholic clergymen, thanking him for having asked this Question—["Order!"] He hoped also he would be permitted to say—["Order!"]—that he had addressed this Question to the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. ["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question was, in its original form, irregular, and was revised under my authority. The addition now made is not in Order.

Mr. HARRINGTON stated that he would postpone the Question if the Prime Minister could not answer it, as he had not been satisfied with the answers of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. TREVELYAN: As the Question is on the Paper I am bound to answer the first portion of it, and my answer is, that His Excellency is not aware whether the statements referred to were made upon the solicitation of any person. I have already, on a former occasion, answered, perhaps, somewhat over fully in the case of a Question of this description, and I can add nothing to what I then said.

MR. HARRINGTON: Arising out of the right hon. Gentleman's answer, may I ask whether His Excellency, not being aware of the fact, had made any inquiry regarding it?

[No reply was given.]

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

MR. FIRTH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he would be able, before Whitsuntide, to state the intention of the Government with respect to the introduction of the Government of London Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE: My answer to my hon. Friend will embrace other subjects besides that to which his Question refers. Our first duty, after the long period of time occupied by the debate on the Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) Amendment Bill, has been to examine into the state of Supply. That is in a backward condition, and we are certainly under strong pledges to the House to do our best to put forward Supply in a more satisfactory manner than was possible either in the last Session or last but one. With that view, it will be absolutely necessary to appropriate several Government nights—certainly not less than three, and probably four—after the Recess to the subject of Supply. That being so, it would take us to the close of the month; and I do not propose, therefore, under those circumstances, to make any further statement in relation to what I may call the principal Government Bills. We have, of course, got those Bills before the Grand Committees; but in regard to the principal Government Bills, with which no progress has been made, I do not propose, until after Whitsuntide, to make any further statement. Then, there is one subject which I wish to mention, because I believe that many Members connected with Scotland are desirous to leave town before we come to the day of adjournment. I have to say that, on an early day after Whitsuntide, my right hon. and learned Friend the Home Secretary will ask leave to bring in a Bill with a view to make further provision for the despatch of Business relating to Scotland. Lords Alcester and Wolseley's Annuities Bill being a matter upon which Questions have been asked, I will state on Friday the exact course which we will take with respect to that Bill. I have already said that we intend to alter the basis of the Bill, by substituting capital sums for annuities. I may say, as the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) asked me a Question, and made a proposal on Friday with respect to South African affairs, that I am afraid it will not be in our power to make arrangements for meeting that proposal, which I take to be one of a new description; but I will state again on Friday the reasons which have led the Government to that conclusion.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: The right hon. Gentleman has not mentioned one measure, the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill, and the House is very anxious to know what has become of it.

MR. GLADSTONE: I did not mention that, or the Tenants' Compensation Bill; but I have already declared that on Thursday my right hon. Friend (Mr. Dodson) will ask for leave to introduce the Tenants' Compensation Bill—the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill is already before the House—and these were the Bills which I had in view when I said that I would not be able until an early day after Whitsuntide to make a statement.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — LORDS ALCESTER AND WOLSELEY ANNUITIES BILLS.

MR. GORST: I wish to ask you, Sir, a Question upon a point of Order in reference to the Bills for providing annuities to Lord Alcester and Lord Wolseley. The Prime Minister, I understand, proposes to convert the annuities originally proposed into the payment of what is called a "lump sum;" and I want to know, Sir, if that can be done by the right hon. Gentleman in the present Bills without bringing in new Bills?

MR. SPEAKER: In the event of its being proposed to convert the annuities into what is called a "lump sum," it would be necessary that the Committee should be instructed to take that course.

PARLIAMENT—DEPARTMENT OF THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE.

MR. JAMES HOWARD asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Department for Agriculture about to be created will comprise branches for dealing with the questions of cattle disease, agricultural education, agricultural statistics, and the investigation of special subjects which may arise; and, whether, in order to insure the efficiency of the Department, the permanent officials, or any of them, will be chosen for their special knowledge of agricultural and rural affairs?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, this Question does not admit of a specific answer in detail, because we have to feel our way as to particulars, and especially in regard to the particular qualifications which may be required for any persons who are to discharge the business under the direction of my right hon. Friend; but, speaking generally, I should say that undoubtedly he, in his Office, will take over from the Privy Council, as now constituted, questions of cattle disease, questions of agricultural statistics, and likewise the investigation of special subjects which may arise. With regard to agricultural education, that is a matter of consideration, on which I can give no positive answer at present.

MR. JAMES HOWARD: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the arrangements now in contemplation are expected to be completed?

MR. GLADSTONE: What I hope is that my hon. Friend will derive adequate information respecting the proposed arrangements upon the Vote which it will be our duty to submit, and he will then be in a position to give full consideration to the matter.

EGYPT—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—AHMED BEY KHANDEEL.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government will instruct Her Majesty's Representative at Cairo to impress upon the Government of the Khedive the necessity, in the interests of justice in Egypt, of allowing the counsel of Ahmed Bey Khandeel and others, generally charged with complicity in the massacres of the 11th June at Alexandria, to have free access to the prisoners for the purpose of preparing and assisting them in their defence? He asked this Question of the Prime Minister because it was by his interposition that the life of Arabi was saved, as if he were left in the hands of the Foreign Office he would undoubtedly have been hanged.

MR. GLADSTONE: If the courteous—or what he intends to be the courteous—announcement with which the noble Lord concluded his Question was its real basis, I ought to decline to answer it, as I claim no such merit as he gives me in the matter in contradistinction to any of my Colleagues. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in his answer to this Question the other day, referred entirely to the preliminary inquiries; but the arrangement made is that counsel will have access to the prisoner for the purpose of his defence before the court martial at Alexandria.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the Prime Minister, whether he was aware that the Hon. Mark Napier, who was retained as counsel for Ahmed Bey Khandeel, had left Alexandria, having been refused access to his client, who was, therefore, left absolutely without any counsel whatever?

MR. GLADSTONE said, that the Government had no official information on the subject. He would be extremely sorry if what the noble Lord stated were the case; but, if it were so, of course the matter was beyond the control of the Government.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE BILL—LOCAL COLLECTORS OF INCOME TAX.

In reply to Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said: What I said in the Financial Statement was that we proposed that this change as to the collectors of Income Tax should take place gradually, dealing with each case separately, so as to produce as little friction as possible. I have since been asked by hon. Members on both sides of the House whether it would not be possible to carry out the proposed changes as vacancies occur in collectorships, and not to anticipate them by being obliged to compensate existing collectors. I have decided to do so, and the change in the arrangements as to the collectors will only take place as vacancies occur.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD asked whether this would necessitate any fresh legislation, or whether Part 3 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill would now be dispensed with?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) was understood to say that it would be impossible to carry out the changes if Part 3 were dispensed with.

In reply to a subsequent Question by Mr. RITCHIE,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that what he proposed was simply this—that no substitution for the present system should take place, except on the voidance by death, or other circumstance, of the present offices.

MR. HICKS asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would place upon the Paper the Amendments he proposed to introduce into the clauses in the Bill relating to this subject?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he did not intend to do so, as the general principle sufficiently appeared from the clauses.

MR. HICKS gave Notice that he should move an Amendment on the subject.

PARLIAMENT—NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE—RULE OF BLOCKING NOTICES.

MR. ANDERSON: I wish, Mr. Speaker, to put a Question to you of which I have given you private Notice, in reference to the interpretation which is to be placed upon the new Rule relating to the blocking of Bills. As you are aware, Sir, one of the Rules passed in November last places a limitation upon the arrangement which previously existed in regard to blocking, by providing that any Blocking Notice, unless renewed, should lapse at the end of a week following the day on which it was given. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether these words are to be interpreted literally and exactly; or if, under any circumstances, it can be possible for any Blocking Notice to last not only through the week following that in which it was given, but also into the second week following that on which it was given?

MR. SPEAKER: By a strict construction of the Standing Order in question, no Notice of opposition would be operative on the first day of sitting after any adjournment exceeding one week. I cannot think that this could have been the intention of the House. In order, therefore, to conform to what I believe to have been the intention of the House, I should feel bound to hold that an allowance should be made for an intervening adjournment of the House, and that a Notice of opposition, given after the adjournment has been agreed to, would not lapse until the end of the week in which the House resumes Business. This course is in conformity with that taken by the House with respect to Notices of Motions given under the ballot.

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—MR. SHELDON AMOS.

MR. MOLLOY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is a fact, as stated in a public telegram from Egypt, that Lord Dufferin has appointed Mr. Sheldon Amos to be the English Member of a Committee of three to arrange measures for giving effect to His Lordship's scheme for the establishment of a Constitution in Egypt; whether he has read an article in the October number of the "Contemporary Review," entitled "Spoiling the Egyptians, revised version," in which the writer applauds the "seemingly severe determination," in the days of the first Control "that the coupon must at all hazards be paid," and further states that such determination "was based on well founded apprehension for the country generally if the slightest show of indulgence was admitted;" and, whether Her Majesty's Government will sanction the appointment of a gentleman holding those views?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I informed the hon. Member on the 26th ultimo that as soon as a reply had been received to an inquiry on this subject which had been addressed to Sir Edward Malet, I would be prepared to answer his Question as to the appointment of Professor Amos. Up to the present time, however, no reply has been received.

INDIA—PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN OFFICIALS.

Mr. CARBUTT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Under what circumstances Major F. Firebrace, R.E. the Under Secretary of the Railway branch of the Indian Public Works Department, who is at present in England on leave of absence, is employed as Secretary to the Bengal and North Western Railway Company (Limited), as appears from an advertisement in "Engineering" of 16th March 1883; if Major Firebrace has not left Her Majesty's Service, whether he could state how he is remunerated, and what is the amount of his military pay as an officer of the Army, his civil pay as an officer of the Indian Public Works Department, and if he is aware what may be his pay as Secretary of the Company; and, if Her Majesty's Government approve of the employment of officers in the Indian Service by private Companies in India, whose interests may not always be coincident with those of Government?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Major Firebrace, being on furlough, is acting as Secretary to the Company mentioned by my hon. Friend, with the concurrence of the Government of India. He is in receipt of the furlough pay to which he is entitled under regulation—namely, 828 rupees a month, which is treated as a Civil charge. I have no knowledge of the salary allowed him by the Company. Under ordinary circumstances, the Government of India do not object to civil or military officers, while on furlough, taking employment under Companies engaged in carrying out railways in India.

NAVY—THE "CLYDE" COURT MARTIAL.

Captain MAXWELL-HERON asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether he would object to lay on the Table of the House the letter written by the solicitor of the late Commander of H.M.S. "Clyde," urging the Admiralty to refer to their counsel for revision of sentence and proceedings of the Court Martial under which he was condemned, on the ground that the evidence was both interested and misleading?

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN in reply, said his impression was that the letter could be laid on the Table; but he would take a day longer to consider it.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEC. 14—POLICE SEARCHES.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the House of Mr. Charles Shenan, of Eshvaugh, Glengevlin, county Cavan, was searched by police on Saturday last, 28th April; whether anything objectionable was found in his house; and, what was the reason for the search?

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, that the house was searched on the day named, but that nothing of a compromising character was found. He must decline to state the grounds upon which the police exercised their legal right of search in this case.

RUSSIA—CORONATION OF THE CZAR—THE EMBASSY TO MOSCOW.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the Estimate for the expenses of the Embassy to Moscow in connection with the Coronation of the Czar would be presented; and, whether the Vote would be taken with the other Diplomatic Votes, or separately?

Mr. COURTNEY, in reply, said, that the Estimate in question had been presented that afternoon. It would be discussed in ordinary course with the other Votes.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PULESTON said, that in view of the answer of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War to the Question he had addressed to him a few nights ago, he desired to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the withdrawal by the Government of Officers duly appointed to carry out the the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Acts.

Mr. SPEAKER asked whether it was the pleasure of the House that the hon. Member be heard; and afterwards called upon those supporting him to stand up in their places.

And not less than 40 Members having accordingly risen in their places:—

Mr. PULESTON said, that he should not have taken the course he had done but for the great misunderstanding which prevailed in the House and the country as to the effect of the action which had been taken by Her Majesty's Government since the Motion of the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) on the subject of the Contagious Diseases Acts had been carried. He wished particularly to refer to the speech made by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War when that Motion was before the House. The noble Marquess then said that the Government were at variance with one another on this question; but the Secretary of State for War, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and the Home Secretary—the three Ministers who alone had the administration of the Acts—were entirely antagonistic to the Resolution. Reading from carefully prepared notes, the noble Marquess went on to say that, whether the Resolution was carried or not, it would make no difference whatever in the carrying out of the Acts. The advocates of the Acts did not ask for their extension. They simply wished them let alone. A great deal had been heard lately in favour of Local Option and Local Self-Government; but in this case, notwithstanding the unanimous wish of all political parties and all creeds in the towns where these Acts were in force for their continuance, they were not to have the option of continuing them. It was said that there was an attempt to make this a Party question. He would tell the House what the Liberal newspapers in the towns affected said. *The Western Morning News* said that a more disastrous blow at the efficiency of the Army and the Navy had not been struck for years. Opinion in the three towns was, it said, unanimous as to the improvement effected by the Acts; and the sweeping them away, without the substitution of any regulation or legislation, would have a most prejudicial effect on public order and morality in those places. *The Western Daily Mercury*, also a Liberal paper, expressed the view that the health and the morality of Plymouth and the neighbourhood would suffer severely from the withdrawal of the Act. The inhabitants of the three towns were almost in a state of panic. [*A laugh.*] It was all very well for the hon. Member opposite to laugh; but he knew nothing about it. The minority of the Members of the Committee all belonged to Associations avowedly established for obtaining the repeal of the Acts; and they utterly ignored the overwhelming evidence given by the witnesses from the subjected districts, who were practically unanimous. The Mayor of Plymouth had just sent him a telegram to the effect that the magistrates at a meeting earnestly protested against the recent decision of the Government. But the serious question for the House of Commons was, whether an abstract Resolution was for the future to have the force of law? There had been no more important question raised on the floor of this House than this, and that from the several standpoints of the working of the Acts, their vital consequence to the garrison towns, and the still greater consequence to this House, and to the country at large, as to whether an abstract Resolution was to be allowed to override an Act of Parliament? He supposed the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War had not changed his mind with regard to the beneficial action of those Statutes. It was remarkable that those who presided over the three Departments of the Government more immediately connected with the working of the Acts were strongly in favour of their continuance, and opposed to the views of the Prime Minister and of the other Members of the Government. It had been stated that the Government had recently discovered that the Acts were of a permissive character, and that, therefore, they had the power to suspend their operation. If that were so, he hoped the Judge Advocate General, or some other Member of the Government, would discuss the question from that legal standpoint. The hon. Member concluded by moving that the House do now adjourn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Puleston.*)

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was not quite certain what was the object of the hon. Member's speech, for it was impossible that any conclusion could be arrived at by discussion. The

Resolution that had been passed by the House could not be reversed that evening; and no definite decision of any kind could be come to. He did not understand that the hon. Member desired to obtain fuller information as to the intentions of the Government than was contained in the answer given on Friday night to the Question of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill). He could not help thinking it was inconvenient that the ordinary Business of the House should be interrupted by a Motion such as this, which did not go directly to any definite object, but was simply a means of expressing the dissatisfaction felt by the hon. Member, and, he (the Marquess of Hartington) did not doubt, by a large number of his constituents, at the Resolution of the House the other night.

Mr. PULESTON said, he had moved the Adjournment in the hope that the Government would be able to say something definite which would relieve the intensity of feeling in an important constituency.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he did not gather that there was any particular point on which the hon. Member desired information other than that which was given on Friday night. The Motion appeared to be made solely to express dissatisfaction with the Resolution of the House and with the action of the Government. The hon. Member said that the working of the Acts had given great satisfaction, because they had produced great improvement in public order and morality. But these considerations were very much beside the question. The Acts were not passed for the promotion of order and morality in certain districts. If that had been their object, why should they have been confined to those districts? Their object entirely was the preservation of the health, as it was hoped, of Her Majesty's soldiers and sailors. ["Hear, hear!" *and* "No!"] He repeated that the object of this legislation was not the improvement of public morality. If that were the object, why were not the Acts made general?

Mr. PULESTON said, they were not made general because they were intended for garrison towns.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON replied, that that was exactly what he said. The object was not the preservation of public order and morality in garrison towns more than anywhere else; it was the promoting of the efficiency of the Public Service, as large numbers of soldiers and sailors quartered in certain towns suffered greatly from the effects of immorality. He did not doubt that the Acts were popular, and that they worked well, as far as the morality and order of the towns in question were concerned; but he could not admit that the principles of Local Option and Local Self-Government, which had been referred to, applied to this matter in any degree. It must be remembered that these Acts were administered at a considerable expense to the State. He could well understand that it would be advantageous and popular in a district that some of its police duties for the preservation of order and the morality of its citizens should be effected at the cost of the Consolidated Fund. The popularity of the Acts in certain places was, therefore, not a conclusive argument that those places ought to have the decision of the question whether the Acts should be retained or not. No doubt, their local popularity and efficiency were elements in the discussion of the question; but the decision must be come to on general principles. The House had condemned compulsory examination; and the advantage conferred on a locality by the Acts would not, in his opinion, induce the House to reverse that Resolution. The power of an abstract Resolution as against an Act of Parliament was, as the hon. Member had said, an important question; and he was inclined to agree with him that it could not be held to have the force of law. The Acts gave the Government certain powers; but it was not compulsory on the Government to execute them. There were many such Acts, both with regard to the Government and to local authorities. But, however that might be, Parliament had placed in the House of Commons an absolute power of deciding whether these Acts were to be administered or not, because all the expenses of administration had to be defrayed out of money voted by Parliament. Therefore, it was in the power of the House of Commons, and it must have been intended to be so, to bring the operation of the Acts to a cessation by simply refusing to vote the money necessary for their administration. If the Resolution had been passed in January or February it would have been a question whether the Government ought to take any immediate action in withdrawing the Police Force, as the money for the administration of the Acts to March 31 was voted last year. But they were now in a new financial year; no money had been voted for the Acts, and from the Resolution of the other evening it was exceedingly doubtful whether, if the Government had not made some concession to the strong feeling of the House on the subject, any money would be voted to the Government for their administration. It was, therefore, necessary to consider whether the funds required for the certified hospitals, and the detention of diseased women in them, should be risked; and the Government thought it was not desirable to risk them, and that the most practical course was at once to suspend the periodical examination, which was the only part of the Acts directly condemned by the Resolution of the House. There did not appear to be anything un-Constitutional in that course; on the contrary, what they had done seemed to him to be quite conformable to the Constitution and the law. As to the panic alleged to exist in the towns in question, he would point out that a large part of the good done by the operation of the Acts was of an indirect character, and that the local authorities might retain that advantage by directing their police to exercise much of the control over the houses and women which had been exercised, under the Acts, by the members of the Metropolitan Police. The moral influence of the Metropolitan Police was distinctly apart from their duties under the Acts, and there was no reason to think that a large part of the good done by them could not be effected by the local police acting under the local authorities.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that his hon. Friend's object in moving the Adjournment of the House was to call attention to what had been done by the Government, and, in particular, to the statement made by the noble Marquess in the course of the debate a few days ago, that, in his opinion, the efficiency of the Army and Navy depended on the continuance of these Acts.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I said I thought these Acts had contributed to the efficiency of the Army; but it is quite impossible that I should have stated that the efficiency of the Army and Navy depended upon these Acts.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, there was no doubt that the noble Marquess had used the words that the efficiency of the Army and Navy was bound up with these Acts. ["No, no!"] If the noble Marquess was not strong enough, he was sure the Judge Advocate General was in favour of this Bill. There was no doubt the Judge Advocate General had given the House to understand that the efficiency of the Army and Navy could not be kept up without those Acts.

The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. Osborne Morgan) explained that what he did was to give the figures showing the extent to which the efficiency of the Army and Navy was affected by the operation of these Acts.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, it appeared to him that the noble Marquess and the right hon. and learned Gentleman were anxious to imitate the course sometimes adopted by the Prime Minister with far greater skill, of informing the House that the expressions which fell from them were totally misunderstood. The noble Marquess did not seem to be aware that the Business to be discussed that night was the Navy Estimates; and, therefore, this was a most excellent night to bring on the topic on which the efficiency of the Army and Navy depended. His hon. Friend's Motion had had one result—that of enabling the House to hear the noble Marquess making two speeches—one speech the other night strongly in favour of the Acts, and one that night strongly against them. It was only another instance, to his mind, of the infinite squeezability of the Whigs, and also that the noble Marquess was one of those who, according to the President of the Board of trade, "neither toil nor spin," but who was, nevertheless, ready to swallow any amount of stuff which the Radical Caucus offered to him, and, rather than he should get into a row with the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) and the Birmingham Caucus, the Army and Navy of England could go to ruin. He was prepared to maintain that it was a snatch vote. He did not know that 99 per cent of hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House had the slightest idea that the Government would have taken the line they did. No intimation had been given that the Government were going to treat this as an open question; and he ventured to say that upon an administrative Act of such importance no Government was ever known to have adopted such a line as they did. What did the Prime Minister do? He retired from the House at 11 o'clock, having selected a respectable Conservative borough Member who would fill the office of pair; but, curiously enough, that pair had never appeared in the public journals. It was simply a snatch vote, and numbers of hon. Members would have come to the House to prevent it had they suspected the policy of the Government. Since that vote was taken the noble Marquess had said that it was useless to enforce the Acts because the House would not vote the money. But how did the noble Marquess know that, and why need he have been in such a hurry to show that he had no opinions of his own, but was influenced by Birmingham and the Caucus? The whole administration of the entire law depended on money voted by Parliament; and if an abstract Resolution were carried on matters relating to the Courts of Justice, would the Home Secretary suspend the action of the Courts on the ground that it was useless to ask for the money? It was monstrous that an abstract Resolution, carried by a snatch vote, should supersede the law of the land, without the other House of Parliament being consulted, and that the Government should abandon the law for fear of the right hon. Member for Halifax and his sentimental agitation. The fact was, and it was becoming clearer every day, that Her Majesty's Government had not the confidence of the House of Commons [*Ironical Ministerial cheers.*] All he could say was, that on the important question of faith and morals Her Majesty's Government had not the confidence of the House of Commons. How could they have the respect and confidence of the House, when they presented such a pitiable sight of administrative tergiversation?

Mr. MOSS said, there could be no doubt the House and the country had been taken by surprise. Public feeling in Winchester, where the Acts had been operation for many years, was strongly in their favour, and he had never heard a single complaint of the manner in which they had been enforced; and he knew, on the other hand, that they had been the means of restraining many women from entering on an immoral course of life. If each locality had its option in the matter, he ventured to say they would all adopt the Acts without exception. No doubt, they were passed originally for the protection of the Army and Navy; but they had also very greatly benefited the civil population of the places where they were carried out. He trusted that the Government would reconsider the matter, and would not allow the new Act to be so permissive as the House was at present told it was likely to be.

Dr. FARQUHARSON, however much he personally deplored the result of the recent division, would not at this moment offer any factious opposition to the course of the Government. In fact, he felt strongly convinced that the Government had acted only as they were impelled to do by the large majority of the House of Commons; and he must reserve any opinion he might have to offer for a future stage when the Estimates were under discussion.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, that the speech of the Secretary of State for War made it almost imperative that the debate should be prolonged, because he had asked what was the object of taking the present course. The first object was to enter a strong protest against the action which had been taken, not in obedience to a decision of the House, but to a vote of 180 Members, many of whom differed in important points from one another. The result had been arrived at by surprise, and the current of the debate was almost wholly unexpected by those interested in the subject. It was scarcely possible, after hearing the speeches of the Judge Advocate General and the noble Marquess who was responsible for the efficiency of the Army, to expect that at the last moment they should hear a speech from the Chancellor of the Exchequer in which he tossed aside the opinions of all those of his Colleagues who were immediately responsible in the matter. The right hon. Gentleman's speech also pointed to a future occasion on which the deliberate judgment of the House should be invited on the matter; he spoke of the Bill of 1872 as one which would have modified for the better the operation of the Acts; and he practically suggested that the effect of adopting the Amendment would be to give the House an opportunity of discussing the matter. If the statement in the Plymouth papers was correct, he could not understand this speech of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War. Unless that statement was deliberately untrue the Government had interfered with portions of the Act over which they had no jurisdiction at all. Great advantage in the administration of the Acts had been found in the employment of careful and responsible officers of the Metropolitan Police. Not a single instance of abuse had been discovered even by the vigilant opponents of the Acts; and yet the services of the officers of the Metropolitan Police were to be dispensed with, and in their place local police were to be employed, who might be subject to local influences, and exposed to imputations which would seriously interfere with the efficiency of the Acts. He ventured to say that not one of the 19 Members who were directly representative of these places would get up and say that he represented the opinion of even the substantial minority of his constituents by opposing these Acts. Speaking in the presence of his hon. Colleague (Mr. Stewart Macliver), he would say that the people of Plymouth, the ministers of religion, magistrates, and those who were charged with the administration of justice were all of one accord, to whatever political Party they belonged, as to the benefit of these Acts. The noble Marquess had said that the Acts had not been put on the Statute Book for the protection and orderly behaviour of the towns, but for the protection of the Army and Navy; but why should not both objects be effected? It was not because 180 Members, in a haphazard division upon an abstract Resolution, supported the Motion that Government should take the course they now proposed to do. If the case were to be brought forward again with due notice, the result would be very different. If it had been imagined that the Resolution would have produced the disastrous effect now contemplated, there would have been, not a majority in its favour, but a substantial majority against it. Therefore, as the Acts were on the Statute Book, it was the duty of the Government to carry them out until they were repealed. Parliament never intended to leave it at the will of a Secretary, or of two Secretaries, of State whether the Acts should be enforced or not. It was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to let the Acts stand, and the Estimates come before the House in the original form, and in that way to give the House an opportunity of expressing a definite opinion on the question.

Mr. STEWART MACLIVER said, the representation made by the last speaker with respect to the public feeling of Plymouth was quite correct. Without discussing the merits or the demerits of the Acts in the abstract, he would only say there was a large preponderance of opinion in favour of continuing them. He had just received a telegram from the Mayor of the town saying that at a meeting of magistrates an earnest protest had been made against the repeal of the Acts, and a hope expressed that he would support in the House the views of the meeting.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he felt compelled to make a few observations upon the subject before the House, as he represented the largest town (Portsmouth) affected by the Acts under consideration. He wished to know how it was that if the whole operation of these Acts hinged upon compulsory examination and the employment of the Metropolitan Police Force in the administration, the ordinary police were also employed? The real question, however, they had to consider was, whether Acts of Parliament which had been in force for 16 years should be abrogated by a Resolution which had not the support of more than one-third of the Members of the Whole House—Acts, the beneficial effects of which had been acknowledged, not only by the Judge Advocate General, but also by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and the Home Secretary. As regarded the Prime Minister—the real Prime Minister was the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain), in whose presence they could not say their souls were their own; but the right hon. Gentleman who was the nominal Prime Minister retired from the House during the discussion, and left the question to drift where it might. He had received a letter from Admiral Chads, stating that, in that gallant officer's opinion, the abolition of compulsory examination would deprive the Acts of their efficiency; that the inhabitants of Portsmouth were convinced that the Acts had had a beneficial effect, and that the power entrusted to the police had not been abused. The operation of the Acts, it should be borne in mind, had resulted in the reclamation of many women. The Vicar of Portsmouth, a Liberal in politics, had deposed in evidence that, in 1877, 52 girls were sent to their homes from Portsmouth; in 1878, the same number were sent home; and in 1880, 44 were sent home, and 83 were sent to their friends. The noble Marquess and the First Lord of the Admiralty had issued orders for the immediate abolition of the operation of the Acts. Before that was done, he thought the Government might have passed the measure for the better protection of young persons. There had been precipitancy in this matter, for which it was difficult to account. The change in the action of the noble Marquess that night was most extraordinary. The noble Marquess always handled a question in a conscientious manner; but when he found that there was a majority against him he turned round in a way which was not statesmanlike, and which was unworthy of the high position which he filled. In the name of his constituency he protested against the precipitancy which the Government had shown in this matter.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he had no desire to enter into the merits or demerits of the subject; but he wished to protest against the precipitancy of the action of the Government. They had had Acts of very great importance in force for 16 or 17 years, and these Acts had been repeatedly discussed, not only in that House, but before Commissions and Committees, and had caused a good deal of sensation generally. Yet, acting upon a single vote given on a Resolution, the Government at once set aside the whole of the substantial part of those Acts. It did seem to him that, considering what an Act of Parliament was, how much thought was given to it, and how many opportunities had been devoted to the discussion of its details, a little more time, and care, and formality were required than were afforded by the passing of a single Resolution. If the Government were of opinion that, in consequence of the recent vote, or in consequence of opinions of their own, it had become their duty to modify the law, they ought to have submitted a Bill to Parliament, or, at least, they should have submitted their Estimate for the administration of the Act as it was framed before the Resolution was passed. He thought it was a matter which ought to be noticed, not as regarded that particular subject, but as regarded the principle involved in the action of the Government in setting aside an Act of Parliament upon the mere passing of a Resolution of the House.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman and of other Members had shown that there were considerations of great importance involved in this subject, not merely with regard to the merits of the Acts, but with regard to the conduct of the Government. He was anxious that the pledge given by the Government with regard to the discussion of the Estimates should not be frustrated; but points had been made in the discussion which he could not pass without notice. He felt, in the first place, that it was an exaggeration to describe the vote which the House had lately come to as a snatch vote. It had been said that the number of persons by whom this matter had been decided amounted to less than one-third of the strength of the House. He should like to know what number of questions, in the course of a Session, were decided by a greater number than one-third? In 19 out of 20 of the cases in which divisions took place—perhaps in 49 out of 50—the majority was not greater than the majority which had decided this question. Then it should be remembered that the Members who paired upon this subject, and who declared their opinion just as much as if they had voted, when added to the number of Members who did vote, brought that number up to a moiety of the whole House. The vote was not an insignificant one so far as the very considerable majority by which it was agreed to was concerned, nor was it an unexpected vote, for the question had been before the House for years. He would, therefore, dismiss from consideration any question as to this having been a snatched vote. With respect to local sentiment, which had been so strongly insisted upon, he did not at all doubt that the balance of opinion in those towns was in favour of the system that had existed; but it was a remarkable fact, if local sentiment was so overwhelming and so overpowering, that not more than one-half, or rather less than one-half—eight out of 17—of the Members representing these constituencies should have taken part in the division. That did not look like overpowering local sentiment. He did not deny the existence of local sentiment; but he could not agree that the Executive Government ought to be guided by that sentiment. With regard to the division of opinion in Her Majesty's Government, he was not aware that any Member of it held extreme views. For his part, he had not always voted against the Acts, nor had his noble Friend always voted in their favour. That the Government should be divided in opinion on an administrative question was, no doubt, a matter of considerable inconvenience; but some consideration ought to be shown them under the circumstances. It should be remembered that the majority of the Members of the present Cabinet were parties to a Bill which they introduced into the House, and which went the whole length of abolishing compulsory examination under these Acts. Therefore, it could hardly be a matter of surprise if some of the Ministry thought it necessary to act according to their opinions on this question. Most unfortunately, though from the very best motives—from the desire to prevent public discussion on a subject not fit for proper discussion—these Acts were passed almost without the knowledge of anyone. He was a Member of the Government at the time they were passed; but he did not know how they passed, or by whom they were carried through the House.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, that the Acts were all referred to Select Committees.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that there was, at any rate, no discussion in the House and no collective Resolution of the Government upon the question, nor was there any opportunity of informing the public mind; and it was the obscurity with which the Bill was agreed to, combined with the extreme novelty of the subject, which had led to what was a very inconvenient state of things, and one which he hoped would not recur. It had been suggested that the Government should submit the Estimate as it was framed before the Motion was carried. Had the effect of that proposal been considered? Had it been considered that the Government, as a body, would have to do a collective act against doing which a number of the Members of the Government had voted, and which would reverse a decision of the House solemnly arrived at? If there was any one act done by a Government which was more a collective act than another, it was the submission to the House of Commons of the Estimates necessary to carry on the Services of the year.

Mr. PULESTON observed, that in the debate on the Motion the noble Marquess had expressly told them that, if the Resolution passed, until an Act was brought in to repeal the Acts they they would continue to be carried out.

Mr. GLADSTONE believed that it was perfectly true that the noble Marquess had said that. Undoubtedly, he described the general principles upon which the Government ought to act. But the application of those general principles must depend upon the particulars of the case. He thought that he had shown that, the submission of the Estimates being a collective act, the Government, if it had submitted the original Estimates to the House of Commons, would have been carrying out what Members of the Cabinet disapproved — the compulsory examination under the Acts—and would have been contradicting and reversing the decision of the House of Commons. The Government could take no such course. With regard to the notion that it was the duty of the Government to let everything go on until a Bill was passed altering the present law, what did that come to? His noble Friend had pointed out that the constructors of these Acts had deliberately and advisedly left it in the hands of the House of Commons to determine whether, year by year, Votes should be provided by means of which the Acts should be administered, or whether they should be withheld, the effect of which would be to reduce the law to a dead letter. That construction of the Acts did not express the will of the House of Commons, but of the Legislature, which had thus left the House of Commons to determine what course should be taken respecting the carrying out of the Acts. It must be taken that the Legislature intended that the operation of the Acts should depend upon the will and judgment of the House of Commons. He would admit, however, that the principle was not of universal application. The contention of the Opposition was that a Resolution having been passed by a large majority of the House, declaring against compulsory examination—a Resolution having been passed expressing the will of the House—the Government ought to have spent the money of the people in administering Acts condemned by that Resolution. [Mr. R. H. PAGET: Until you had brought in a Bill.] Until they had brought in a Bill, they were without the authority of Parliament to spend money raised by taxation from the people, for purposes directly condemned by a Resolution of the House of Commons. That was a doctrine in which he thought the hon. Gentleman had surpassed almost anything he had heard from that quarter of the House for a considerable time. The Government would be prepared, as soon as they could, to bring in a revised Estimate and submit it to the House. He believed they had a Vote of Credit for three months; but he was bound to say he thought it would be felt by all that a technical point of that nature ought never to avail against any matter of principle involved in the Estimates. That would be fatal to all Votes of Credit. Certainly it was the distinct and undivided opinion of the Government that they could not, without the authority of the House of Commons, spend this money in exercising a power made discretionary to them by the law. That, in their opinion, would be a course quite impossible. They were compelled to believe that the majority in favour of the Resolution expressed the view of the House of Commons. The hon. Gentleman said he was perfectly certain, if there had been full notice, and it had been supposed that the Government would take some strong course in reference to the Acts, the result would have been different. The fact was, full notice was given; and as to the course of the Government, why was it to be supposed that the President of the Board of Trade was the cause of it when the right hon. Gentleman was not a Member of the Government which brought in the Bill of 1872? There had then been no manifestation against these Acts, and that Bill was acceptable to the friends and the opponents of the existing Acts. This was not a question of arresting the operation of the law simply because there was a vote of the House of Commons. The language of the law was that the Government might make certain payments essential to the administration of the Acts; but it was admitted that it was not compulsorily made; and the centention of the hon. Members opposite was that the Government ought—in face of the Resolution passed by a large majority—not only to have proposed an Estimate, but ought to have continued the exercise of their discretion, which was dependent entirely on money which they had a right to believe the House would not vote, and also to exercise their discretion in the employment of officials whom they had a right to consider it certain the House of Commons wonld refuse to pay for. If it was the judgment of Parliament that this proposition was tenable—that such a course of conduct could be supported on Constitutional grounds—then the Government were wrong; but they believed that was an opinion which would not, and could not, be sustained on any side of the House.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: I have listened from the first to the last of the right hon. Gentleman's speech (Mr. Gladstone's) with great attention, and never was more disappointed than I am now. I admit that he did perfectly right when he paired the other night and went away from the House. No one will grudge him taking all the rest in his power; but he is wrong when he says the House was perfectly aware of all the circumstances of the case, and knew that the Government were divided on this question.

MR. GLADSTONE: I did not say the House knew.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: If the right hon. Gentleman did not say so in so many words, he implied it. Until the Judge Advocate General rose in his place, no one knew the course the Government were going to take. It astonished the whole of the Conservative side of the House. Then the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War rose in his place and stated that the three most responsible Ministers in the Cabinet, who had control of these matters—namely, himself, as representing the Army; the noble Earl in "another place," the First Lord of the Admiralty (the Earl of Northbrook), as representing the Navy; and the Home Secretary, were all in favour of these Acts, I say it was an extraordinary statement for the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General to have to get up and say that the Government were divided on this question.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): I did not say that. I said I had personally no mandate to speak for the Government.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: We immediately inferred from that that the Government were divided upon the question. Whatever the right hon. and learned Gentleman may have meant, that was the way it was understood in the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister has stated clearly that the Estimates are the collective view of the whole Government, and must be voted for by the whole Government. He also stated that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) had this Notice down on the Paper for weeks before it came on. But the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government must have known perfectly well that that Notice was upon the Paper when the Estimates were introduced into the House; and if the Government were divided in opinion regarding this subject, he ought to have been prepard to say that he would withdraw this particular Estimate, the Government having changed their mind regarding these Acts. Year by year the Estimate for carrying on these Acts has been brought in and passed with the entire consent of Her Majesty's Government; but what did they now find? The right hon. Gentleman, who was now Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers)—although when he was Secretary of State for War, and when this Estimate came on year by year and could be called in question every year, he was one of those who signified, by his vote and voice, that he approved of these Acts—got up the other night and said his view was that a certain portion should be carried out, but not the whole of them. This he did, although his noble Colleague (the Marquess of Hartington) declared that they were an absolute necessity to the Army. On such questions we have a right to expect that the Government should know its own mind; and if it is their opinion that these Acts ought not to be carried out, they ought to have the courage of their opinions, and tell us so. I go further than that, and say the House was taken by surprise, and that the right hon. Gentleman knows it was taken by surprise. I do not know whether there was a Whip out on the other side. Perhaps it was a very strong Whip, and perhaps it was a Government Whip; but we had no Whip whatever. We did not know the Government had altered their opinions; and we believed the law was perfectly safe in the hands of the Government, and that they would support what they had hitherto supported. Into the merits of these Acts I do not propose to go, except to say this—that I have had many communications on the subject, and I think the people over whom they are exercised are the best able to give an opinion on them. The Metropolitan Police, who have carried out these Acts, have done their duty with admirable discretion, and the Acts have been administered to the great benefit of the towns where they have been exercised. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that it was an evil precedent for the Government to be divided upon an administrative question of this kind. If it is an evil precedent, surely we have a right to know of the fact, and the Government ought to take the responsibility of getting these Acts repealed. Nothing of that kind has taken place. I admit that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) has always consistently advocated the repeal of these Acts; but we were never for a moment allowed to suspect that the Government, without going into the merits of the question, and merely because they believed a large section of their supporters would vote against them if they supported these Acts, would follow in the wake of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax, and without bringing in any Bill to repeal the Acts would stop their operation. The Prime Minister admitted the justice of the remark of an hon. Member. He said how much more satisfactory it would be if we had only time to bring in a Bill—he admits that a Bill ought to be brought in—to repeal the Acts. But he cannot wait for this, he cannot even wait until the House of Commons has had the Estimate before it; he must at once withdraw the police, who alone are able to carry out the delicate provisions of these Acts. He thereby places, I venture to say, the Goverment in a false position before the House and before the country.

Colonel MAKINS remarked, that it was by no means usual for a Government to give immediate effect to abstract Resolutions, and an example might be seen at once in the case of the proposal to establish 6*d*. telegrams. When the Motion in that instance was carried, the Government did not at once promise to give effect to it, but agreed to bring in a Bill in due time. So, it was rather strange that the Government were putting this Resolution into force as soon as ever it was passed, instead of waiting to deal with the question in well-considered legislation.

Mr. T. C. BRUCE said, that his constituents at Portsmouth were almost unanimously in favour of the Acts, and that opinion was held most strongly by those who had the best means of judging as to their effects. He was surprised that the Government should have taken advantage of a chance division practically to put an end to their operation.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he could not allow this debate to close without expressing his very deep regret that the Government had thought it right to take the particular course they had done. He deplored the necessity for measures of this kind; but he satisfied himself, before he would consent to administer them, that they were necessary, and conducive to the cause of religion and morality. He was convinced they had been most beneficial to the unfortunate women themselves. The mischief that had already been done by the action of the Government was of a most grave and serious character, and had produced feelings of consternation and alarm in the towns most interested. If the Government had come to the House and had said that, having based their Estimates on the faith of the continuance of an Act of Parliament, they would be bound to administer that Act until it had been repealed or modified, he believed even the opponents of these laws would have been satisfied. There was yet time for the Government to reconsider the question, and he hoped they would give it their earnest attention.

Mr. WARTON said, he had read through the whole of the evidence which had been published as to the effect of the Acts, and he had come to the conclusion that they were absolutely essential to the welfare and morality of the districts to which they applied. Though, as a rule, an opponent to the principle of Local Option, that principle was rightly applicable to that case, as all the towns affected after long experience were strongly in favour of the Acts. The Resolution of the House was not equivalent to an Act of Parliament, and as long as an Act existed it ought to be enforced. Until an amending Bill was brought in and accepted, the Government were bound to administer the law as it stood, and to refuse to do so was to cease to become Ministers, and to place the Ministry above the law. It was not for the Home Secretary to shirk his duty by withdrawing the Metropolitan Police, who had acted with so much judgment that there had been only two ridiculous complaints, and these had collapsed on investigation. It was mere political cowardness to act as the Government had done, and he could not help saying that he considered their shilly-shally conduct in connection with those Acts most contemptible. [The hon. and learned Member was proceeding to comment upon the course taken by the Government in appropriating for Government Business a private Members' night, and thereby preventing a discussion from taking place upon the Vaccination Acts.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston) has moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose of calling attention to the Contagious Diseases Acts. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) is bound to confine himself to that question.

Mr. WARTON said, he was only seeking to explain himself, but he would bow to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK observed, that if the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston) needed any justification for bringing forward the matter, it was to be found in the remarkable speech of the Prime Minister who, in taking up the cause of the repealers of the Acts, had selected from their armoury the weapons which they had been using of late years. It was surprising to him to hear it said that the original Act was passed *sub silentio*, seeing that the Bill was twice referred to Select Committees, and that there was afterwards a discussion in the House, followed by a division. However, now the main point was the attitude of the Government in the recent debate. The sense of the House was not taken, because the Opposition had no knowledge of what the views of the Government were. He desired to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to an answer he had given to a Question in the House, for that answer showed that the Judge Advocate General did represent the Government on the recent Committee. Having himself been a Member of the Government when the Committee was appointed, and being placed upon it as a Member of the Government, it was his duty to prepare the evidence and to see that the case of the three Departments—the War Office, the Admiralty, and the Home Office—was properly put before the Committee. If he had not conscientiously believed that the Acts were justifiable, he should not have taken that course, and he should have resigned his place on the Committee. In reply to a Question, the Prime Minister said that the Government were originally parties to the arrangement under which the First Commissioner of Works was placed upon the Committee, that in a certain sense he represented the Government, and in the same sense the Judge Advocate General represented the Government, for the purpose of assisting the proceedings of the Committee, but by no means in the sense of representing any official opinion, which the First Commissioner never represented. That might be true as regarded the First Commissioner, because he was on the Committee in 1879-80, and after the Dissolution and the change of Government, he was re-appointed, but the Judge Advocate General did represent the Government, and the evidence of that was what he said and did, the course he pursued, and the efforts made to secure that the Departments were properly represented in the evidence which was adduced. After the Committee had agreed to its Report, on the 19th July, the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) brought forward his Motion for the repeal of the Acts; and in the debate the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that it would be the duty of Government to study the Report and the evidence, and to consider what course they would recommend the Government to adopt. That was nine months ago. What had the Government been doing since? Had they followed the course thus indicated? If they had intended to propose the repeal of the Acts, or what was tantamount to it, it was not their duty to take the House by surprise, as they did in the recent discussion. The right hon. Gentleman said that he had not changed his mind on the subject; but if that were so, he supposed it was the only subject on which he had not changed his mind. The other night there was a great banquet at the Aquarium, at which the future of the Liberal Party was discussed. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. and learned Gentleman is not confining himself to the question before the House.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK observed, that he was going to make a citation from the speech of the hon. Member for Newcastle—that was to say, the new Member (Mr. John Morley)—in which he spoke of these Acts as being a connivance by the Government at a state of immorality. He wondered whether the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War agreed with that? He was unaware whether the noble Marquess was present at that banquet; but if it were true that the maintenance of these Acts had been a connivance at immorality, on the Benches opposite they would find those who were the connivers, and the greatest conniver of all was the Prime Minister, who had just left his place. The House was never more surprised than when the Judge Advocate General said he had no mandate to speak on behalf of the Government, and when it was afterwards stated that the Government treated this as an open question. The division was a snatch division and an unfair one, because they had no indication whatever what the Government were going to do. Under these circumstances, they had cleared the ground a good deal as regards the future. They had seen the

Government halting between two opinions, and finally deciding to go against that which for the last 15 or 16 years had been acknowledged on all hands to have conferred the greatest possible benefits. It was high time that Members of the House should think a little more for themselves, and take care that the present Government did not set about the abrogation of some of those measures which had been of lasting benefit to society.

The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said, he wished to explain, as briefly as possible, what had been his position on the Select Committee, as that position had been somewhat misrepresented and misunderstood. In July, 1880, his right hon. Friend the then Secretary of State for War (Mr. Childers) had requested him to join the Committee, not for the purpose of officially representing the Government, but in order to watch its proceedings, and, if possible, assist in its investigations. His right hon. Friend at the time informed him of his own views on the subject, which were exactly those expressed in his speech the other night. But on the evidence which came before the Committee the case for the Acts appeared to him so overwhelming—on this point he could not retract a word which he had uttered in his former speech—that he was forced to bend to it, and he so informed his right hon. Friend, and even requested him to relieve him from the duty of further attendance on the Committee. And it was only on the express understanding that he was to be left perfectly free and unfettered that he consented to remain a Member of it.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∞○∞—

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £937,100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884."

Mr. Cavendish Bentinck

Lord HENRY LENNOX, in rising to call attention to the state and condition of the Iron-clad Navy, said: The subject I have to bring before the Committee is one of the most important that can occupy the attention of Parliament; but, seeing that this is the dinner hour, I cannot expect to have a large audience, especially as the question is not one at this moment of an exciting character. The question also wants something else to attract the attention of the House of Commons. It lacks the flavour of that bitter political partizanship which alone fills the Benches of this House. Although my indictment in regard to the Navy must be addressed to the Members of the present Board of Admiralty, yet I shall have, in the course of my task, to comment upon the action of those by whom the present Board were preceded in Office. I wish at once, before entering into the subject, to state that I have no wish to make any remarks that may be considered personally offensive to any Member of the Admiralty in this House or to any Member of the Board of Admiralty at Whitehall. Having taken now for the last 14 years a great interest in everything connected with Naval Administration, I feel myself compelled not to allow the Statement made the other day by the Secretary to the Admiralty to pass unchallenged. I consider the statement made by the Secretary to the Admiralty on that occasion to be of the most unsatisfactory character I ever heard from any Representative of the Board of Admiralty in this House. The Secretary to the Admiralty, it is true, talked of "maintaining our position, and securing our maritime supremacy;" but while he expressed his confidence in this respect, he does not give us any of the data on which he bases his confidence in our maintaining our position and securing our maritime supremacy. They were nothing more than relative terms. If I should be able to show to-night that at the end of 1883 England would have 41 iron-clads built and building, and if, happily, the Secretary to the Admiralty could get up and tell us that the French Government would have only 21 built and building at the same period, then, indeed, our maritime supremacy would be assured, and I should not be standing here to-night. But if I can show, as I hope to do, that at the end of 1883 the English Government will have

41 iron-clads built and building, and that the French Government will have 37 built aud building, then the Secretary to the Admiralty, in coming down to the House and talking about our maritime supremacy being secured, makes use of a mere phrase, calculated greatly to mislead the public. It has always been held that our English Navy should be double the Navy of France, and that it should be able to cope, under any circumstances, with any possible or probable combination. The other day I saw a letter in a newspaper from a gallant Admiral—Admiral Elliot—who puts that matter much more clearly than I can; who describes what our position would be if the French Fleet was ever allowed to get into a position of superiority, and who points out that in such an event we are bound to lose either the command of the Channel or of the Mediterranean. I have spoken of the apathy which prevails in the House of Commons. I do not at this moment even see any Dockyard Member present. That apathy arises, I believe, from the over-confidence which the English nation possesses in the strength of the Fleet. "Rule, Britannia!" is still for them one of the shibboleths of their existence, and they do not believe that anything can shake the truth of that patriotic song. Unfortunately for that feeling we know that the same spirit of confidence prevailed in 1870, in a country which is a near neighbours of ours—namely, France. I have the authority of a very distinguished Friend of mine—(Dr. Russell)—for saying that when he went over to Paris on his way to become a War Correspondent in connection with the Prussian Army, he was met with questions on all hands, not as to whether the French would be beaten by the Prussians, but how long it would take for the French Army to get to the Rhine, the places they would occupy when they crossed it, and the terms on which they would occupy Berlin. Indeed, the French went so far as to ask whether there was any Prussian Army at all against whom they had to compete. They had the same overweening confidence in their Army as we have now in our Navy. Although, no doubt, confidence is much better than half-heartedness, it is not impossible that confidence may be too far strained when it comes to be looked to in connection with that Service on which our national life depends. In the early part of this century, the late Duke of Wellington laid it down as a necessity that the English Fleet should be double that of the French, or of any other nation. At that time there was very little danger of competition. France had no Navy of consequence to combine against us. Our ships were as good, and our guns were as good, as those of France and Spain, whilst our sailors and the *personnel* of the Navy—our blue-jackets—were infinitely superior to those of any other country in the world in gallantry, in discipline, in seamanship, and in all those characteristics which ensure success. I am, therefore, surprised and exceedingly sorry to hear the dictum uttered by one whose words on this subject at this time must command great attention—the highest Admiralty authority in the country—in which he said that the Navy of the future will not depend so much on the number of ships as upon the discipline, daring, gallantry, and other high qualities of our seaman. Now, I cannot help thinking that the noble Lord who made that assertion must be aware that from the nature of our modern iron-clads those high qualities of the British seamen are less and less called into action every day that we live. The iron-clads of to-day and of the future will not depend so much on our blue-jackets, I regret to say, as upon gunners and stokers. The sailing power of our battle ships is daily and hourly disappearing. The result of all this is, that whereas in our old wars, at the beginning of the century, we had a great superiority both in the number of our ships and in the quality of our guns, and an enormous pre-eminence in the quality of the *personnel* of our Navy, at the present moment we are losing, or have lost, that superiority in the number of our ships; and the great qualities of the British seamen, on which we formerly depended, are of less and less account every year. In considering the condition of our Fleet, I will simply call the attention of the Committee to a statement made by a gallant Admiral—Sir Edward Fanshawe. He tells us that in 1805 England had 88 line-of-battle ships in commission, while the French had 37, and the Spanish, 24. But such little reliance could be placed on the whole of our Fleet—owing to the necessity for providing for the defence of our Colonies and of our trade—that Sir Edward

Fanshawe tells us that at that time, when our Colonies were less numerous, and less widely scattered than now, and when our commerce was not one-hundreth part of what it is to-day, out of 83 line-of-battle ships we could only bring 27 ships into action at the decisive battle of Trafalgar against 33 ships of France and Spain combined, the remaining 58 ships being engaged all over the world in defending our commerce and our Colonies. I have no wish to weary the Committee; but I should like to give some slight idea of what the commerce is which our Navy has to protect. The gross steam tonnage in the world amounted, in 1881, to 6,700,000 tons, of which 4,200,000 tons was British, 630,000 tons American; whereas that of France—whose Navy is now closely approaching our own—is only 420,000 tons, or one-tenth of ours. The value of British shipping at that time amounted to £100,000,000; and the value of British commerce now to be protected, should war take place, amounts to the gigantic sum of £800,000,000 or £900,000,000 sterling. In fact, upwards of 70 per cent of the sea-carrying trade of the world is carried on in English ships. Therefore, I am here to-night to tell the Government that they should increase our Navy, and take some further steps than they have hitherto thought it right to take in order to ensure that command of the sea, which is necessary, I might almost say, for our daily bread. If I have the temerity to urge this upon the Admiralty to-night, I think the figures I have given in regard to our commerce, shows some slight reason for the action I am taking. The Secretary to the Admiralty, I have no doubt, will tell me, as his Predecessors have told me before, that it is very unpleasant and unwise to wound the susceptibilities of foreign nations, and to alarm them; but that is a very one-sided view of the case. Now, I do not think that foreign nations care a farthing about wounding our susceptibilities or of alarming us, because they go on year after year spending enormous sums of money for the purpose of building up gigantic Navies, when they have neither commerce nor Colonies, to speak of, to defend. There is another reason why I wish the Admiralty to look the matter in the face, and to make some further additions to the Navy. In olden days the cost of a line-of-battle ship, and the time required to build her, were not a third of what it takes now to build an iron-clad line-of-battle ship of the present day. Further than that, in the olden days, there was always due notice of a war coming on. Wars did not then come upon the country suddenly, as they do in these days. In those days wars and diplomatic relations were spoken of and coming on for days, and months, and years, during which time England, with her vast resorces, could build what line-of-battle ships she thought necessary. But in these days no Member of the present Board of Admiralty, nor my right hon. Friend the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), who sits by my side, need be told that war, like a man's hand, first appears in the horizon scarcely a speck, and then breaks out all over Europe in a war involving us in one of those panics which lead to a ruinous and profitless expenditure of money, and induce us to add to the Navy ships which at other times we should be ashamed of. I say, therefore, that maritime supremacy is a relative term, and that we cannot tell whether we have ensured our maritime supremacy. We cannot tell whether we are maintaining our position as mistress of the seas, unless we look round and see what our foreign neighbours are about. It is for that reason I have taken upon myself the task — perhaps the obloquy — of drawing the attention of the Committee to what is going on around us in foreign countries. I am not going to weary the Committee by going into details as to the Russian preparations that are now going on so rapidly for the reviving of her Navy. I will not more than allude to the enormous and expensive fleet of torpedo boats which the United States are building. I will not even touch upon the smaller Powers, which now appear to think they cannot be looked upon as Powers at all unless they can more or less provide themselves with an Iron-clad Fleet. What I wish to do is to draw the attention of the Committee to nations nearer home, and especially to nations whose greatness, whose ambition, whose geographical position, induces, and I will say entitles, them to think they ought to have a voice in the settlement of every great European question. First among these great nations is Germany. Since 1876 she has added 12 iron-clads to her Fleet. In 1871 she passed an Act of compulsory enlistment for that Navy, so that whenever it is required there is the material to man the Fleet at once; and now she has just given an order for a fleet of most powerful torpedo cruisers—steel cruisers, armed with the heaviest guns. I come next to a country which was thought not to be in such a condition of financial prosperity that she was likely to be induced to expend any large sum of money. On this point I have obtained my information from a Spanish newspaper, which relates what took place in the Chamber of Madrid. We are told that in Spain the new Minister of Marine is about to ask the country to raise a loan of £16,000,000 sterling, which is to be applied to what he is pleased to call the re-organization of her Navy. The scheme of the Minister of Marine is to apply this money in making a very large and powerful addition to the *personnel* of her Navy. It is to be expended in the purchase of iron-clads, torpedoes, in the fortification of her arsenals, and her forts, and, above all, in the purchase of guns of the most modern type and of 40 and 80 tons calibre. These guns, we are told, are to be put up at Ceuta, Tarifa, and Algesiras, and other places; and, to use the words of the Minister of Marine, they are to be mounted in such positions as will best and most effectively command the Straits of Gibraltar. Now, I am not afraid of Spain, and I do not suppose that any Member of this House is afraid of Spain; but I only mention these facts to show the feeling that exists all over Europe, and how every country of the world, except England, is taking steps to defend herself in case of war. The third country I will mention is one which affords, certainly, one of the most extraordinary instances in modern history—namely, the rapidity with which Italy has placed herself in the front rank of European Powers by her marvellously rapid creation of a most powerful Iron-clad Navy. In 1875 the Italian Government applied themselves to the re-organization of the Navy. That re-organization was to consist of seven monster iron-clads, armed with guns 39 feet long in citadels. Two of them are already in commission, while two others are in a forward state of progress, their engines having been ordered of Messrs. Maudsley, in England, while the composite iron plates necessary for her armour are in the hands of Messrs. Cammel, of Sheffield. The Italian Fleet, I may remind the Committee, is numerous besides these vessels. I come now to the nation which is most in my mind, and the last I am going to mention to-night—namely, France. No one will deny—not even Her Majesty's Government will deny—that France has made, not only rapid, but gigantic strides of late years in the creation of a Navy. That very Blue Book of Estimates now lying on the knees of my hon. Friend the Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Sir Thomas Brassey) tells us of the strides which the French Government have made. In 1870, after their crushing defeat by Germany, they had no ships and no Navy at all. What have they now? They have a Navy worthy of the consideration of the British Admiralty and of my hon. Friend the Civil Lord of the Admiralty. I have not the slightest wish to exaggerate the strength of the French Navy, and still less to underrate the strength of our own Navy. Eighteen months ago I first brought to light these French ships and the rapid progress being made by France. Since that time many and most exaggerated statements as to the strength of the French Navy have appeared, partly through ignorance, and partly fostered by the extraordinary reticence of the Admiralty authorities, I have no wish whatever to exaggerate the strength of the French Navy. What I desire to-night is to lay before the Committee, in a calm and dispassionate review, an actual *resumé* of what the Navy is and will be of our most powerful and most restless neighbour. Before I go into the question of a comparison between the French and English Navies, I should like to say a few words explanatory of my meaning in this matter. We are often in the habit of hearing a good deal of talk about tonnage. Now, one sort of tonnage is one thing, and another sort of tonnage is another. I do not think there prevails in the public mind a sufficiently clear idea of how far one system of tonnage goes, and where the other stops. There are two kinds of tonnage, and I will sketch out what is really meant by tonnage. One kind of tonnage is called a tonnage of displacement—that is to say, the ships with engines, coals, guns, provisions, and everything on board. Then there is another kind of tonnage, which merely consists of the weight of the hull, and is merely the shell of the ship. The former—the tonnage of displacement—if I am not wrong, and I see the eye of my hon. Friend who was my first instructor in naval matters upon me—the tonnage of displacement is generally half as much again as the tonnage weight of hull. I have taken down two ships from the Estimates this year. One is the *Conqueror*, and the *Conqueror's* complete tonnage of displacement is 6,200 tons, whereas her tonnage weight of hull is only 4,200 tons. The other ship is the *Rodney*. The *Rodney's* tonnage of displacement is 9,600 tons, and her weight of hull only 6,005 tons. But in order to make it quite clear, and to assure the Committee that I wish to be perfectly impartial in the matter in any of the weights I give in regard to French ships, I have reduced the French ships to a corresponding weight of hull; so that when I speak of an English ship and a French ship, both are calculated upon the weight of hull. Having stated that, I have no desire to exaggerate the condition of the Navy, and having informed the Committee upon what principle I intend to take the tonnage, I will now go on with my comparison between the English and French Navy, In the year 1882, on the 16th of March, the hon. Gentleman who was then Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Trevelyan), and who has since distinguished himself so much by the ability with which he has discharged the duties of Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, made his statement upon the Navy Estimates in this House. The hon. Gentleman told us that he was going to lay down four iron-clads. I remember well that my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the Wigtown Burghs (Sir John Hay) said that, after all, they would see that the Government were awake to their position, and that they were going to have four iron-clads laid down. But let us see what these iron-clads were. There was, first of all, the *Howe*, which was certainly not to have an alarming advance made upon her, seeing that it was only 13 per cent. Next came the *Benbow*, which, although she had been put out to contract, was only to be advanced 7 per cent. The *Camperdown* was to be advanced 3½ per cent, and the fourth ship, that redoubtable ship, the *Anson*, was to be advanced 0·3 per cent. At that time I ventured to say to the Committee that I looked upon the *Anson* and its advance of 0·3 per cent as nothing more than a paper ship. The year has now gone round, and the keel of the *Anson* is not yet laid. Then let us see what, for the same period, the French Government were going to do. I may mention that, in the case of both countries, in the year 1882-3, the Government promised to lay down four iron-clads. Before I go on to compare the state of things in this country with the French programme, I should like to make another remark, because I am quite sure that many Members of the Committee will not know that whereas the English financial year goes from the month of April until April in the next year—or from April, 1882, to April, 1883—the French financial year runs from January, 1882, to December, 1882. Therefore, whatever work the French Government had to do in the financial year corresponding with ours, they had three months advantage of us, which in these days of sudden wars and troubles is a very great advantage. The French programme for the year 1882, corresponding to that brought in by the present Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, consisted of four first class barbette ships of 10,000 tons each, armed with very heavy breech-loaders of modern type, which were to be ready when the ships were ready to take them on board. Now, upon that point I must dwell for a moment or two. In April, 1882-3, the English Government proposed to advance the *Howe* 13 per cent, the *Benbow* 7 per cent, the *Camperdown* 3½ per cent, and the unhappy *Anson* 0·3 per cent, but which faded into nothing. The French Government, in 1882, proposed to advance four large barbette iron-clad ships —the *Magenta*, 14·5 per cent, the *Neptune*, 16½ per cent, the *Hoche*, 17½ per cent, and the *Marçeau*, 30 per cent; so that the least advance of a French ship at that time was more than the greatest advance proposed to be made in any of our four ships by 1½ per cent. I should like to go a step further, and to point out the condition of the Estimates in regard to these ships in that year. The Estimates, as I have already said, were brought in with signal ability the other night by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty, and the hon. Gentleman boasted to the House of the large increase which was going to be made in the iron-clad tonnage over that proposed by his Colleague (Mr. Trevelyan). He said that his Colleague only proposed 11,400 tons, whereas he was going to add 13,200 tons; but in the very next sentence the Secretary to the Admiralty, with a *näivete,* which I fully commend, said, "I think it is only fair to say that in these 13,200, I include two protected ships"—which, in my opinion, had no right to be called iron-clads at all. As these two ships were to be advanced 1,000 tons, it is necessary, therefore, to strike them off the magnificent programme of 13,200 tons, which reduces it to 12,200 this year, against 11,400 proposed by the hon. Gentleman's Predecessor, or an actual increase of 800 tons. I feel bound to say another word upon this subject; and I will ask the Committee to look at the French Estimates for this year, because it is only fair to say that everything connected with tonnage at all is an estimate. The Secretary to the Admiralty estimates that he will add to the Navy 12,200 tons of iron-clad ships in the course of the year. The French Secretary to the Admiralty, or the Minister of Marine, estimates that in a period, which will end three months before ours, he will add no less than 17,200 tons to the French Navy, or 4,000 tons in excess of that which was proposed to the House of Commons with such a splendid flourish of trumpets by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty. I once had the honour to be connected with the administration of the affairs of the most powerful Service of the world—namely, the Royal Navy of England—and, therefore, I am perfectly aware that these Estimates are only Estimates, and that neither the English Estimates of 12,200 tons, nor the French Estimates of 17,200 tons, may be realized. Having said that, it will be well to examine what really the probabilities are of the one programme being carried out or the other; and I am fortunately able to place my case before the Committee both upon the British and the French Estimates. In the English Dockyards we have 18,000 men employed, whilst in the French Dockyards there are 23,000. England is building one ship by contract—the *Benbow;* France is building three large iron-clads by contract—the *Marçeau,* the *Requin,* and the *Neptune.* Well, then, France has 28,000 men, and we have only 18,000; and what are our 18,000 men to do? Have they not a large demand upon their time, which does not exist in the French Dockyards, for the repair and refitting of various ships as they come home? I shall have more to say about repairs later on; but if the Committee will realize for one moment that we have only 18,000 Dockyardmen, and that France employs 23,000; that we have one ship building by contract, and that they have three; and that our Dockyardmen are, every year, more and more wanted for repairs and refits, while France has very few ships to repair or refit, they will be able to form a very good estimate as to which of the two programmes is most likely to be fulfilled in the course of the year. I will endeavour to make our position a little clearer. I hope I am not wearying the Committee too much; but I may say that, during the two years from April, 1882, to April, 1884, England will have laid down four first-class iron-clads; while from January, 1882, to January, 1884, the French will have laid down seven first-class iron-clads. In April, 1884, there are four English ships, which may be advanced 4,500 tons; in December, 1883, seven French ships will have been advanced 10,000 tons. Now, Sir, I have something more to say than that. If the French programme of the year does not really produce this advance on those seven ships, and which, as far as I can make out from the Estimates laid on the Table a few weeks ago in Paris, has not been maintained on the four ships which were to have been advanced by the end of the year 1882, so also the advance on our ships has not been maintained. It is alleged that the amount expended on the advance of these four ships—the *Hoche,* the *Magenta,* the *Neptune,* and the *Marçeau*—has not been equal to the Estimate. But what have the French done instead? They have laid down, or are about to lay down, two large iron-clads, one called the *Brennus* and the other the *Charles Martel;* and not only that, but they are going to lay down eight large armoured gun vessels, possessing great speed, I presume, because I see the engines are to be of the same power as those in the large iron-clads. Therefore, when we talk about the French programme and the English programme, it simply comes to this—that whilst the English Government have, this year, what I must call dished up the *Anson* as the only iron-clad we are to have new this year —and dished up I call it, because the *Anson* was approved in the Estimates proposed by the present Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant—this year the Government give us in their programme only one iron-clad and two protected ships; whereas the French set forth in their programme two large iron-clads and eight armoured vessels of great power and speed. At the end of 1883, as far as my calculation goes—and I have tried all I can to be correct in this matter—England will have building and completing 11 first-class iron-clads; whereas France will have 17 at the same period. At the risk of wearying the Committee, and in order to prove the accuracy of my statement—in regard to which I challenge contradiction—I will, with the permission of the Committee, run over the names of these iron-clads. The 11 English iron-clads building and completing at the end of 1883 are the *Colossus*, the *Conqueror*, the *Edinburgh*, the *Howe*, the *Impérieuse*, the *Warspite*, the *Rodney*, the *Anson*, the *Camperdown*, the *Collingwood*, and the *Benbow*. The French ships estimated to be built by September 1, 1883, are the *Amiral Baudin*, the *Neptune*, the new ditto, the *Formidable*, the *Indomptable*, the *Hoche*, the *Brennus*, the *Magenta*, the *Charles Martel*, the *Marçeau*, the *Furieux*, the *Terrible*, the *Caïman*, the *Requin*, the *Vauban*, the *Du Guesclin*, and the *Tonnant*, plus eight armoured gun vessels and four torpedo vessels. I have a very great dislike to disagree with anyone, and it is a very great pleasure to me when I can find myself at one with my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty. On this particular occasion, if the programme I have just read out—that programme in which the poor *Anson* is again dished up—is made to do duty against this formidable list of French ships, I am certainly at one with the Secretary to the Admiralty; because I am satisfied there is no one in this House, let him sit on whatever side he may—there is no naval officer on half pay or full pay, wherever he may be stationed, who will not agree with me in feeling that the Secretary to the Admiralty, on the night he made his Statement, made an assertion which no one could differ from, when he announced, to use his own words, that the policy of the Earl of Northbrook was neither of a startling nor an ambitious character. Anything less startling, anything less ambitious for an English Minister of Marine to present to Parliament, I do not think any House of Commons ever heard. But the worst of all this is that, miserable as this programme is, there is something still more disquieting —namely, that even these promises are never carried out—that is to say, that in the last 10 years only on two occasions have the promises of the Board of Admiralty been fulfilled. During the greater part of my political life I have had the privilege of sitting here, and upon one occasion it was my duty to answer the Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty, at the request of my late lamented Friend the Earl of Beaconsfield. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen) came down and made one of the best speeches he ever made, and in that speech he proposed to build a largely increased amount of tonnage, without providing for an increase in the number of Dockyard workmen to carry out his scheme. I warned the right hon. Gentleman that he would not carry his programme out unless he was a conjuror. A year passed by, and the hon. Gentleman again came down with his Estimates, and he said, with perfect frankness—"I must admit that the noble Lord the Member for Chichester was correct." Sir, I am no conjuror; but I knew that it was impossible to carry out that programme. I am deeply indebted to the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty for one part of his speech the other day. He gave the House a most excellent example of how utterly these programmes are unfulfilled, and how little the Admiralty authorities know whether they are fulfilled or not. On that occasion the Secretary to the Admiralty, with the greatest *bonhommie* and desire to please and interest the House and the public, told us that a certain amount of iron-clad tonnage had been added to the Navy since the years 1877, 1878, and 1879. Now, the corrections I desire to make in the Secretary to the Admiralty's figures are simply drawn from the Navy Estimates, laid on the Table by the hon. Gentleman himself. In 1878-9, said the Secretary to the Admiralty, 8,430 tons were added to the Navy; but according to the Navy Estimates it was only 4,506 tons. In 1879-80 the hon. Gentleman says that 7,327 tons were added; but according to the Navy Estimates only 6,314 tons were added. In 1880-1 the calculation of the Secretary to the Admiralty is that 9,235 tons were built; but I cannot find that more than 7,833 tons were built in that year. In the year 1881-2, according to the statement of the hon. Gentleman, 10,748 tons were built; but according to the Navy Estimates only 9,802 tons were built. In 1882-3 the hon. Gentleman says that 11,466 tons were built; whereas, according to the Navy Estimates, only 9,733 tons were built. The total number of tons, according to the hon. Gentleman, was 47,206; whereas the actual number of tons was 37,188, making a difference of 10,018 tons.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Does the noble Lord include the ships built by contract in the total amount of tonnage built and added to the Navy in those years? I believe the figures are given in the Expense Account.

Lord HENRY LENNOX: Oh, yes; and I shall have something to say about the Expense Account by-and-bye. The Estimates laid on the Table this very year, compared with those introduced by the Secretary to the Admiralty, show a diminution in the tonnage building over the tonnage promised of no less than 1,235 tons of iron-clad shipping; while in one case alone—that of the *Benbow*, which is a ship building by contract—there is a deficit of 285 tons out of the small amount of 450 tons ordered and promised to Parliament this year. Therefore, this shipbuilding by contract in this year, 1882-3, was out by nearly one-half of the tonnage promised. The hon. Gentleman was good enough to remind me of the Expense Account; and, in passing, I must say that the hon. Gentleman has not been very much disposed to give me information, because when he based one of the great arguments in his speech upon the Report of a Committee superintended by Mr. Hamilton, he based his arguments on the Report of an Admiralty Committee, which, when hon. Members asked for it, so that they might see if there were two sides to it, as there are two sides to everything, they were told that it was a confidential Report, and could not be given up. Now, only twice in the last 10 years has the Dockyard iron-clad building been maintained in anything like the tonnage promised. In 1873-4 there was a deficiency of 2,513 tons; in 1875-6 there was a deficiency of 268 tons; in 1876-7 of 490 tons; in 1877-8, 3,766 tons; and in 1878-9 of 5,325 tons. Now, on that point I wish to say a word. That was the time when the Admiralty was presided over by my right hon. Friend near me (Mr. W. H. Smith), and the late Secretary to the Admiralty made some capital out of that fact last year, when he was addressing public meetings in the country. He said—"Why, you see, we have ordered so many iron-clad vessels, and the late Government also ordered a certain number; but the late Government took only a small sum for that purpose, whereas we have taken a large one." Now, I say that the failure of tonnage, while my right hon. Friend was in Office, was creditable to his feeling of patriotism, and to the proper motives of economy by which he was actuated, because I know that at that time the most elaborate and the most crucial trials were going on to test the penetrating power of armour, and the question was being considered whether it was better to have plain armour plates or plates combined of steel and cast-iron. Until that vexed and most anxious question was properly settled by my right hon. Friend, he was perfectly right not to put money into the Estimates for buying armour-plates which might prove to be useless. Now, I thought, when I found that in 10 years there was actually a deficiency of iron-clad tonnages to the extent of 15,160 tons, that I had got at the bottom of the case; but I was very much mistaken—indeed, I was confronted at that period by a most remarkable Report from a most eminent man, whose authority, ability, patriotism, and intelligence, no Member of the present or of the late Board of Admiralty will dare to question. It is a Report of Mr. Hamilton, who was at that time the Accountant General of the Navy, and whose services have since been found to be so valuable and useful, that the Government have attached him permanently to the Secretariat of the

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Now, what does Mr. Hamilton say? He discloses the fact that from 1869-70 to 1879-80 there was a deficiency of iron-clad tonnage added to the Navy of 9,409 tons beyond the deficiency admitted in the Navy Estimates. As that is rather a startling statement to make, perhaps I shall be excused if I read the two lines in which it is contained. Mr. Hamilton says—

> "The total number of tons calculated to have been added during the period from 1869-70 to 1879-80 was 206,545 tons, which, compared with the quantity provided for in the Estimates, leaves a net deficiency of 13,165 tons."

As regards armoured vessels, an endeavour has been made to compare and calculate the quantity promised with the actual additions to the Navy during this period, with the result that a further deficiency has been discovered, which amounts to 5,409 tons. In other words, while it has been calculated that during the last seven years, 83,770 tons of new armoured vessels have been added to the Fleet, and the money has been formally voted for this purpose, it has only been found possible to add in actual vessels 74,361 tons. I regret to say that the same deficiency is still going on, and the inquiries I have made have all been made upon the Navy Estimates themselves. I find that, not content with the deficiency of 13,165 tons of which I have spoken, and taking only the 10 years, without going as far back as Mr. Hamilton's Report—namely, from 1872-3 to 1882-3—there is a further deficiency of nearly 7,000 tons more, making together 21,665 tons of deficiency in the iron-clad tonnage given by the Dockyards of the country to the Queen's Navy in 10 years. And what does that represent? It represents in weight of hull at least five ships of the *Conqueror* type, of which the Queen's Navy has been deprived. The Secretary to the Admiralty has a right to ask me how I arrived at this conclusion. Now, a ship, after all, can only be of a certain size; I have looked down the list of ships added to the Navy, and I find that the amount is 65,556 tons during those years. In that I do not include the *Northampton* or the *Nelson*, which, although useful ships, can hardly be included in the iron-clad ships of the Navy. To summarize matters, there have been in the last 10 years, 88,471 tons ordered by Parliament. The Admiralty, in their Estimates, have taken credit for 73,307 tons—that is, that the Admiralty admit a deficiency of 15,146 tons. On looking over the various ships which are being built, and which have been built, and going on the principle that no more can be put into a vessel than her actual size, which is an incontrovertable fact, I find that the amount actually built is 66,806 tons; and that is the way in which I get at the real deficiency of 21,665 tons, or, as I have said, five line-of-battle ships of the *Conqueror* type. I make no charge against anyone. But I think it is time that the country should be made aware of what is going on, and that we should not be told that we are perfectly safe; that our iron-clads are going on well; that we are adding a large number of tons every year; that one Secretary to the Admiralty is adding more than another Secretary; that the supremacy of the country is quite secure; and that there is no chance of our dreams being disturbed. I think I am only doing my duty, as an independent Member of Parliament, when I disclose facts which nobody can controvert. And now I pass to another part of the subject, and one in regard to which I have always felt very strongly, and which enters very largely into the argument of my speech to-night. My objection is that the Iron-clad Navy of the country is always, owing to Treasury supervision, and perhaps to a wish to flatter the vanity of the Prime Minister of the day, if he wishes to have a good Budget, kept under the mark. These are facts which nobody can controvert. We have heard a good deal about thrifty administration; but I do not call that so which, at a moment when there is a cloud of danger, lands us in a violent panic, in consequence of which bad ships are obtained at a ruinous expenditure. When the war broke out between France and Germany, and an European war was threatened, we were seized, in the month of August, with a violent panic. Our Navy was not sufficiently strong to protect the interests of the country in the Mediterranean, if the war was to take a wider range; and the consequence was that the Minister came down and asked for a Vote of Credit of £2,000,000 to increase largely the *personnel* of the Army and the stores of the Army, £500,000 being handed over to the

Navy. I should like to show—and I hope the Committee will allow me to tell them—what happened in regard to that £500,000. That £500,000 went, in a great measure, towards building what were by courtesy called four coast defence ships—the *Hydra*, the *Hecate*, the *Gorgon*, and the *Cyclops*. Now, the *Cyclops* cost £154,026; the *Gorgon*, £138,567; the *Hecate*, £140,593; and the *Hydra*, £141,372, making a total for those four coast defence ships of £574,558. These ships, very naturally, did not meet with the approval of the Admiralty or the Naval Authorities, and accordingly a Committee, presided over by Admiral Ryder, was appointed to report upon them, the conclusion arrived at being that the vessels which had cost £600,000 were not safe to go even from one port to another, except in very fine weather. Now, Sir, I think that was a wretched mistake. To keep your Iron-clad Fleet below its proper strength until there comes a time of danger, and then, telling Europe that you are not strong enough, to rush in and buy four ships at a very heavy cost by way of defending your coasts, that are only fit to move in fine weather, is, in my opinion, a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, that no Admiralty in the world but ours would be guilty of. In saying this, I feel sure I shall have the cordial support of my hon. Friend opposite. It was said that the sum of £15,000 or £20,000 additional was about to be spent in altering the *Hecate*. I have not heard whether that alteration has been made. [MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It has not been made.] Then, I would ask my hon. Friend when it will be commenced; and whether the contemplated alteration is of a character that would lead us to suppose that a similar additional sum will have to be spent upon the three remaining ships of the same class? The next panic followed eight years after the time I have just referred to—in 1878-9—when a victorious Russian Army was marching on Constantinople, and when my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) was First Lord of the Admiralty, and the Earl of Beaconsfield Prime Minister. That was a grave state of affairs; but it was still more grave that the Authorities of the day had no confidence in our Navy being strong enough to resist any combination which might be brought against it. What was done? Four ships, the *Superb*, *Orion*, *Belleisle*, and *Neptune*—ready-made ships—that had been ordered and made for other Governments, were bought at a very large cost. Now, ready-made articles are never likely to be as good as those made to order, and certainly not so in the case of such a complicated machine as a modern iron-clad. I do not blame the Government of that day any more than I blame the Liberal Government of 1870 for coming down and doing what they could to provide for the deficiencies of the Navy; but, Sir, I do object to what I think the mad policy—the parsimonious views—that for many years kept down our Navy to so low an ebb in order to save money, and which, as soon as a cloud arose over Europe, obliged us to go and add to our Navy four ships of the kind I have described. I am told that the *Orion* rolls even in harbour, and that when out of harbour her normal condition is to roll 28 degrees in a smooth sea. The Committee will be familiar with the voyage from the coast of Ireland made by the *Belleisle*, the only iron-clad we had at the time on this side of Gibraltar to defend our coasts. I will not, however, go into details. But what is the history of the *Neptune*, a vessel which, no doubt, is of good design, because it was designed by my hon. Friend who sits opposite? The *Neptune* was bought for £614,000, because she was ready to go to sea at a moment's notice; she has stores, fittings, guns—Whitworth guns, by the way—engines, and even provisions on board. That was in 1878; but from that time the *Neptune* has never been to sea until last week, when she was sent on her trial trip. Having Whitworth guns on board, as the Admiralty must have been aware, it was found that there was no Whitworth ammunition at any of the Mediterranean Stations. Accordingly, having bought the vessel in 1878, because she was ready to go to sea, the Admiralty had to set to work upon her, taking out her fittings, stores, guns, and, in short, dismantling her, and this operation has added the nice little sum of £70,000 to her original cost of £614,000; while, as I have already stated, except for the purpose of trial last week, she has never been to sea. I do not call that good economy. But I wish to make an appeal to the Secretary to the Admiralty, It is rumoured that the *Neptune* is to be sent to the Mediterranean; and, if that be true, I would express the hope that before she is sent to sea my hon. Friend will have her bottom examined in dry dock, for I understand that those who are called upon to serve in her did not feel over anxious to trust themselves in her at sea until that operation has been performed. It may be asked what is the cause of this perennial failure in building our iron-clad tonnage? Why is it that the Admiralty cannot build the amount of tonnage which they put in the Estimates with the money and men at their disposal? The answer is obvious. The Secretary to the Admiralty has not been long in Office; but he has been there long enough to know that there is no quantity so unknown as the amount that will be required for repairs—refitting, and making good defects in ships—nevertheless, there is no item in the Estimates the cost of which is calculated to so great a nicety, and that fact alone is sufficient to show that there is no *bona fides* in the whole transaction. I hold in my hand the Estimates of this year; and if hon. Members will turn to page 189, they will find the charge of £279,971 for Repairs and Refitting. The Committee will observe that this unknown and varying quantity is actually calculated down to £71. Then there is, for making good defects in the Channel Squadron, the charge of £123,086; and the same remark applies to this item. There are the further sums of £12,375, added under letter A, for repairs at Malta and other places in the Mediterranean, and £28,052, under letter B, for making good defects in the Channel Squadron; the total for the year for Wages and Repairs being £443,584. All these unknown and uncalculable quantities are set forth with the greatest minuteness; the calculation in the case of this large sum being brought down to £584. Now, I think it is altogether wrong, and, moreover, quite contrary to Parliamentary practice and Constitutional usage, that men for whom credit is taken in the Estimates for the purpose of shipbuilding should be transferred from that to the work of repairs and refitting without the knowledge and sanction of Parliament. I do not say that there may not be times when an extra amount of work thrown upon the Dockyards would render it advisable that some latitude should be given to Superintendents in this respect; but I point out to the Committee that this practice, which certainly to my mind is unconstitutional, is not the result of accident, but the annual and perennial rule. But the men having been transferred in the manner I have described, this question presents itself—Are the repairs and refitting for which that transfer is made completed? I am afraid not. I believe the repairs are rather behindhand; but I shall be glad to hear from the Secretary to the Admiralty that the contrary is the case. I should like to ask what is the position of the *Raleigh*, the *Shah*, and the *Inconstant*, which are oxidizing in our creeks and harbours for want of men to bring them forward, even although men have been taken from shipbuilding and put upon repairs and refitting? Passing from this to the question on which my right hon. Friend the Member for Westminster has often addressed the House—namely, that of the guns, I will remark that about 18 months ago I was astonished at the late Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Trevelyan), who made what, to my mind, appeared the startling assertion that the English Fleet was being armed with weapons equal to the most powerful of any Fleet in the world. Sir, I was at the time in a position to object to that statement, and I did so on the ground that I knew there had not been a single breech-loading gun supplied to any of our ships; whereas all the French ships were armed with breech-loaders of more or less approved type and with many of the newest type. And a gentleman of the highest distinction, whose name commands respect in this and every other Assembly—Sir William Armstrong—confirmed this view when, shortly afterwards, he said, in his address at the British Institute—

> "Our Navy is at present armed with guns which could not be expected to contend successfully with the best modern guns that could be used against them. Happily, most of the older ships of Foreign Powers are in the same position; but all their new vessels, and some of their older ones, are being armed with artillery which, weight for weight, is superior in power to that of our Navy. Our Service guns have simply been overtaken in that rapid progress of artillery which has been going on for the last eight or ten years."

Soon after this spurt between the late Secretary to the Admiralty and myself, it was officially announced that the Navy was to be armed with breech-loaders at no distant date, and the Secretary to the

Admiralty came down with confidence and exuberance of feeling, as though he were going to carry everything before him, and expressed the hope that during the current calendar year the *Conqueror* would be supplied with 43-ton breech-loading guns. Now, the year had passed away, and, I ask, where are the *Conqueror's* breech-loading guns? The fact is, no heavy guns have been supplied. Well, the other night, my hon. Friend the new Secretary to the Admiralty came down to the House, and, apparently in even a more sanguine frame of mind than his Predecessor, said, flatteringly, in effect—"If you will only be patient for another year, I think we can supply you with 11 43-ton guns." I shall believe in the realization of that hope when I see the guns in the ships, and not until then. But this is not all, for the late Secretary to the Admiralty, at the end of 1882-3, went so far as to tell the House and the country that by the present time 174 guns of all sizes and of the new type would be delivered to the Navy. But not a single breech-loading gun, except of small type, has been issued to the Navy. I ask, where are the 174 guns promised by the late Secretary to the Admiralty? Again, the House has been told, in an official speech, that the *Rupert* was to be armed with new 18-ton breech-loading guns. But, if I am not mistaken, the *Rupert* has not received any 18-ton guns of the kind; she has muzzle-loading guns on board; and if she had to be sent to sea it would be with those guns, and not with the 18-ton breech-loading guns promised. I wish to show the Committee, from the Estimates themselves, the great danger which results from the dilatoriness of the War Department in the supply of guns to the Navy. My right hon. Friend beside me long ago settled with the Secretary of State for War that new 43-ton guns should be supplied to the Navy. Will the Secretary to the Admiralty tell me whether those guns have been tested, or whether even their pattern had been approved? I am told not. The Secretary to the Admiralty stated the other night that the *Conqueror*, which was in other respects ready for commission, was incomplete for want of her armament that was promised18 months ago; and, at the same time, he stated that several other large iron-clads were delayed through the same cause. But the hon. Gentleman rather titillated our palates in telling us that not only the 43-ton guns were to be supplied, but that some ships of the *Admiral* class were to be supplied with 63-ton guns. In the Army Estimates of this year I do not find provision for a single 63-ton gun; and as long as the guns are not in the Estimates, I think we should be living in a fool's paradise if we suppose they will be supplied at all. But, Sir, the position in France is the reverse of this. There the patterns of their breech-loading guns have been approved, and the guns themselves tested, of which there is an abundant supply. The new French iron-clads are all supplied with these very 43-ton breech-loaders. Now, Sir, not only have our ships been delayed by the want of the guns, but they have been delayed by the Dockyard authorities not even knowing the nature of the guns to be supplied to them, for which reason they cannot employ themselves in settling the nature of the requisite carriages and fittings. I wish also to draw the attention of the Admiralty to the delay that has occurred year after year in the supply of armour-plates promised to be delivered by the contractors within a certain time from the date of the order. This is a question which merits serious attention on the part of the Admiralty; and I say that if there is one thing more than another that should be made binding upon those who undertake to supply us with armour-plates, it is that they should serve us before all others, and deliver the armour-plates at the time contracted for. This question of Naval guns is one which, as the Committee is aware, has interested me for some time past; and in the spring of last year I stated, in a humble pamphlet, that more than a year before attention had been drawn to the fact that nothing was more unbusinesslike, and less conducive to economy, than that our Naval guns should be ordered from, or supplied by, the War Office. I urged, also, that these monstrous and ruinous delays could never cease until an Ordnance Board was established for the Navy; that the guns should be supplied by that Naval Ordnance Department; that they should be ordered by the Naval Authorities, and paid for out of sums voted for the purpose in the Navy Estimates; and that this was the only way to fix upon the Admiralty, who now shelter themselves under the plea of War Office responsibility, the real responsibility for the guns of the Navy. Sir, I am much pleased that I expressed those views, because my right hon. Friend the Member for Westminster last year spoke warmly on the question, and actually proposed to ask for a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject. I was delighted at that—first, because I was sure that this great subject, having been handled by my right hon. Friend, would be influentially and effectually dealt with; and, secondly, because I felt somewhat flattered that the suggestion I made some six months before was taken up and endorsed by my right hon. Friend. Now, Sir, how many systems of guns have we in the Service at this moment?—and I would at this point impress upon the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty the necessity of doing something to simplify the number and different descriptions of guns in the Naval Service. There are now no less than four distinct systems in use in the Royal Navy, including, under those four systems, 37 different sorts of guns, each requiring its own particular ammunition and fittings. I ask the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he thinks that such a condition of affairs would be likely to be dealt with easily in a time of panic or in a time of war? I congratulate him on having gone a step forward in taking part of the fittings of the guns out of the War Office Estimates and putting them on the Navy Estimates. I was delighted to see that, because it was the first step in recognizing the advantage of a policy of which I have always been a humble but consistent advocate. But, Sir, I do regret very much that the Admiralty, by their Estimates of this year, do not seem to have realized the state of our Navy, either with regard to Foreign Navies or the state of affairs in Europe. In 1883-4 the Admiralty proposed to build an amount of tonnage, including unarmoured ships, less than last year. In 1882-3 we had 20,140 tons, as against only 19,424 tons for 1883-4, and yet we are told that the number of Dockyard workmen is increased by 1,700. I will tell the hon. Gentleman that when he comes down to the House next year, although he has a diminished amount of tonnage to deal with, and has employed 1,700 more workmen, he will not have completed his programme. I am very sorry that an old and valued friend of mine, a distinguished Member of Her Majesty's Ministry, is not present in the House to-night. I am sure I could make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I wish he was here. I should claim his support for my contention that 19,424 tons, which the Secretary to the Admiralty proposes to add to the Navy this year, is utterly inadequate for the safety of the Empire. It is 12 years ago that the right hon. Gentleman filled the Office of First Lord of the Admiralty. At that time, Sir, France lay bleeding in the dust, without a Navy; Germany had no Fleet; Spain had not negotiated the loan of £16,000,000, and, as was also the case with Italy, she had no Fleet. At that time we were in a state of profound peace, arising from the very exhaustion of other European Powers; and what was then the *dictum* which the right hon. Gentleman wished to lay down for the future? He said it was not safe, for the simple wear and tear of our Fleet, to add less than 20,000 tons yearly to the Navy. Now, Sir, at a time when the world is bristling with iron-clads, with the gigantic Navy of France close upon us, the Secretary to the Admiralty asks us to accept, as a great favour, 400 tons less than the First Lord of the Admiralty 12 years ago told us was necessary. I am aware that there are those in this country who believe in no danger; and, were wars of slow growth and long duration, I might assent to that doctrine. But I know that wars in these days are begun and finished before the dormant resources of the countries engaged in them can be called into action. Armour-clads and guns cannot be produced in a hurry; and, therefore, I say that the argument of there being no danger is most destructive, inasmuch as its effect can only be to foster a reckless confidence. It is clear to me, and it must be clear to the Admiralty, that the French are successfully aiming at pre-eminence over ourselves in regard to our ships in speed, weight of armour, and certainly in power of guns. If that be so, I, for one, as an Englishman, cannot imagine that anyone, however steeped in red-tape officialism, would think it right or meet for the Government not to take some extra steps for such a crisis, and to retain for England the command of the seas, to protect her flag wherever it may float, and to maintain inviolate the Empire of the Queen in every part of the world.

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: It is very much to be regretted that the discussion of Naval questions so frequently lands us in hopeless controversy; but there is one observation in which I think all parties will agree, and it is this—that if we were in the lamentable position which has been represented by my noble Friend—which, however, personally I do not admit—and we were in that position in spite of the large additions we have made to the Naval Expenditure, the blame for that situation would rest not with ourselves, but with a long succession of previous Administrations. I have not risen to enter into an unprofitable comparison between our performances and those of other Administrations. My object is to indicate the various points in which the extremely unfavourable statements which have been made lately with reference to the condition of the Navy are inaccurate. Ships have been included as complete and ready for sea which are still in hand, and, in some cases, very far from completion. All foreign ships are regarded as being armed with the armament proposed for them; whereas we know that, in numerous cases, they are armed with guns very inferior in power to those for which the ships were built. Delays in completion are spoken of as exclusively characteristic of British Naval administration; whereas we know that the disappointments which have been experienced at the British Admiralty, both with regard to the increased time and money required to complete our formidable iron-clads, have been, at least, equally experienced in France and Italy. Comparisons are made of mere numbers, without reference to the fighting efficiency of the ships. Thickness of armour is compared, without reference to the area protected, although in the one case you may have a mere belt above the water line, and in the other complete protection. Lastly, differences of coal supply are ignored, although I find, in arguing with my Colleagues in favour of restricted dimensions, that coal endurance is a quality upon which they insist most strongly. As a broad principle, displacement is the fairest measure of the fighting power of contemporary ships. Displacement means weight—whether of armour, armament, machinery, fuel, or material used in the construction of the hull. The proportions assigned to each may vary according to the qualities insisted upon in the particular type; but we may assume for the able Constructors of the chief Maritime Powers of Europe equality of skill in the utilization of tonnage. If a comparison be made on the basis of displacement between the Navy of this country and the Navy of France, to which allusion has been more particularly made in the speech of the noble Lord, I venture to say that the result will be highly satisfactory to this country. I will confine myself to a comparison of ships actually ready for sea in the years 1882 and 1885 respectively, and built either of iron or steel, or of wood, launched subsequently to the year 1867. Older ships of wood are excluded, it having been laid down by the Committee on the French Estimates for 1880-1 that the life of wood-built iron-clads should be reckoned at 15, or, at the utmost, 16 years. Grouping together in the first class ships with armour of not less than nine inches, and with a displacement exceeding 8,500 tons, we had, in 1882, 10 ships aggregating 96,000 tons, while the French had three ships aggregating 2,000 tons. In 1885 we shall have 15 ships with 140,000 tons; the French five ships with 51,000 tons. Taking for the second class ships protected with armour exceeding eight inches, and a displacement under 8,500 tons, we had, in 1882, 13 ships of 80,000 tons; the French, seven ships of 56,000 tons. In 1885 we shall have 16 ships of 101,000 tons; the French, 13 ships of 93,000 tons. In the third class, consisting of ships with four-and-a-half to six inches of armour, and without limits as to displacement, we had, in 1882, 13 ships of 104,000 tons; the French, 12 of 50,000 tons. In 1885, we shall have 12 ships of 98,000 tons; the French, five of 24,000 tons. For coast defence we had, in 1882, eight ships of 28,000 tons; the French 14 of 37,000 tons. In 1885 we shall remain as at present, while the French will have increased to nine ships of 41,000 tons. In this comparison the three vessels of the *Cerberus* type for

Colonial defence are not included, nor the *Viper*, the *Vixen*, and the *Waterwitch;* while on the French side seven floating batteries and the *Onondaga* are omitted. I venture to think the Committee will be satisfied with the comparison I have made; and I would point out that while we are especially strong in ships of the first class, the advantages we possess in ships of the older type should not be disregarded. With improved machinery these ships could be made extremely useful for the protection of our commerce. While I have been able to place what, I hope, will be a satisfactory comparison before the Committee, it must be admitted that the French have made great efforts of late to strengthen their Navy. In the interval between 1876 and 1879, a large addition was made to the sum which they appropriated to shipbuilding. In the last three years, however, their expenditure has remained comparatively stationary, while our expenditure has increased from £3,123,000, in 1880-1, to £3,754,000 for the current year. By this increase of expenditure our armoured tonnage, including the *Mersey* and the *Severn*, has been increased from 10,863 tons to 13,206 tons; and the number of men employed on repairs from 5,000 to 6,500. Hon. Members opposite may say that we ought to have done more; but we have proceeded with deliberation, because we knew we were secure, and we are seeking, by every means in our power, to make a better application of the money already at our disposal, rather than propose to Parliament a further, and perhaps unnecessary, increase in the Estimates. I fear I am not justified in holding out hopes to the Committee that any sensible reduction can be made in the expenditure of this country on the maintenance and repair of our large seagoing Fleet; but I venture to hope that a material improvement is practicable in the application of the money devoted to shipbuilding. Powerful sea-going ships must always occupy the first place in the British Fleet; but I consider that it would be unwise—and that is the opinion of our professional advisers—to concentrate our resources unduly on vessels of that class. These large vessels should be supported by swift auxiliaries, protected as regards buoyancy, and armed with light or medium guns. Vessels of that class, while combining with the larger ships in battle, would be found highly effective for the protection of our commerce. This new and valuable type is represented in our present programme by the *Mersey* and the *Severn*. I venture to hope that two or three more ships of this class will be included in the programme of the ensuing year. They should take the place of the large corvettes, the *Calliope* and the *Calypso*, which are rapidly approaching completion. Torpedo vessels are scarcely inferior in importance to fast cruisers. A combined attack of numerous torpedo vessels would be formidable, and perhaps fatal to the largest iron-clads. They are being largely built for all the principal nations of Europe. The provision in our present Estimate for vessels of this class is confined within somewhat narrow limits; but we hope in the coming year the completion of the six gun vessels, which are included in the present Contract Vote, will set free a considerable sum which can be most usefully applied to the increased construction of torpedo vessels. Ships capable of cruising under canvas are, in my opinion, indispensable for the training of seamen. We have, thanks to the exertions of former Administrations, a very large reserve of vessels of this class; and the universal use of composite construction has added largely to the durability of our armoured cruisers. The relative fighting efficiency of the Navy may be raised without increasing the expenditure by superior skill on the part of our constructors. I regret to see that in some public utterances by Naval authorities the skill of our Naval architects is impugned; but I venture to say that a comparison between the British Fleet and Foreign Fleets redounds greatly to the credit of our Naval architects. No Navy contains so small a proportion of obsolete ships as our own. We may regret the deficiency of speed in some of our unarmoured vessels; but the new ships we are now building or completing are a remarkable and gratifying advance in the essential quality of speed. As a Fleet, they are unrivalled by anything which is in the course of construction for any Foreign Navy. The speed of 15½ knots an hour attained in the recent trial of the *Conqueror* was a gratifying incident in recent shipbuilding history; and all the later iron-clads will be capable of 16 knots an hour. In the *Mersey* we look for 17 knots, and in the five protected ships of the *Leander* class we look for 16 knots, or, with the use of forced draught, 17 knots. We have thus no less than 16 ships building which will have a speed of 16 knots, rising to 17 knots. In point of fighting capacity, no ships of equal tonnage now building for Foreign Powers are equal to the *Collingwood,* and later vessels of the same type. We are quite ready to improve; but, as at present advised, we see no necessity for departing from a type which had received the endorsement of two Boards of the Admiralty. If the type be satisfactory, it is obvious that by repeating it we are doing much to reduce the time occupied in construction, and also to economize the cost. Having thus indicated the means by which the fighting strength of the Navy may be increased without adding to the expenditure, I must leave the question of a further addition to the Votes to the consideration of the Government. The decision must obviously depend on proceedings elsewhere, which we can neither foretell nor control. If our expenditure has increased, and if it should be increased in the future, we have been following, and not leading, in a rivalry which we deplore. For the present Board of Admiralty I would contend that they have taken the measures which they have deemed necessary under the circumstances; and we ask for the confidence of Parliament in our future administration.

SIR JOHN HAY said, that, after the very elaborate and full speech of the hon. Gentleman (Sir Thomas Brassey), he should not venture to go over the same ground; but some of the hon. Gentleman's statements required some further elucidation. The hon. Gentleman had stated that in the year 1885, or, rather, in April, 1886, there would be 51 British ships ready for use—15 of the first class, 16 of the second class, 12 of the third class, and eight ships for coast defence; while the French would have 33—six of the first class, 13 of the second class, five of the third class, and nine for coast defence. He was sorry to contest any statement of the hon. Gentleman, who, of course, had more accurate information on this subject than he himself, or any other person in the country; but he was anxious for a little more explanation. In the French Estimates it was shown that the French Fleet would be made up to 35 in 1886, and not only to 33. That gave a difference of two ships; but as the hon. Gentleman, of course, did not give names, it was difficult to see how the difference arose. The English Fleet, however, so far as he could make out, would only amount, in 1886, to 43 ships; and he could not tell where the 51 to which the hon. Gentleman had alluded could come from. Forty-three ships were all we should have complete by that time, unless the *Defence* was included, and then there would be 44; but he had omitted the *Defence,* because he found no proposal for repairing her; and, according to a Return last year, her boilers were in a condition in which they could not be considered of value.

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: They are perfectly capable of being repaired.

SIR JOHN HAY said, that might be so; but there was no Estimate for their repair. Last year the pressure of her boilers was down to 15 lbs., and, as there was no Estimate, he assumed that they were not worth repairing. If the *Defence* was to be repaired, it was a pity there was no Estimate for new boilers and other matters. Did the hon. Gentleman include the *Cyclops* and her three sisters? [Sir THOMAS BRASSEY: Yes.] And the *Mersey* and *Severn?* [Sir THOMAS BRASSEY: No.] Would the hon. Gentleman state which were the eight vessels he had spoken of for coast defence?

SIR THOMAS BRASSEY: The *Glatton,* the four ships of the *Cyclops* type, the *Scorpion,* the *Wyvern,* and the *Viper.*

SIR JOHN HAY said, the Report on the *Cyclops* class stated that if they were in sea, broadside on, with 10½ seconds' interval, they would roll over, and, of course, they would become coffins for all on board. The *Cyclops* and her three sisters could not be considered seaworthy, and ought not to be included in this list; and, therefore, he thought the Committee would see that these eight ships ought not to be considered as belonging to the Iron-clad Navy of a first-class Power. They did not steam nine knots an-hour; their unseaworthy qualities were recognized as dangerous, and they should not be regarded as coast-defence vessels for a first-class Power. Neither were they to be compared with the French ships of that class, all of which where iron-clad, and were seaworthy, and which, with the guns with which they were mounted, would form a great addition to the French Navy. Deducting these eight ships, he was quite satisfied that on the 1st of January, 1886, while England would have 43 sea-going iron-clads, France would have 35. It might be said that was a due and proper proportion. He did not think it was. He did not think that 43 sea-going iron-clads were sufficient for this country. The old proportion of line-of-battle ships for this country was twice the number of France. It was always considered that it was necessary that we should be able to keep the sea with a force which should be equal or superior in Home waters to any combination in Europe, and that, at the same time, we should be able in the Pacific and the Indian Oceans to protect our Colonies and our trade. Eight of our ships could not leave the Channel. If they did go beyond the Channel they would be quite as dangerous to themselves as to their enemies; therefore, they were not fit to be considered for a moment as swelling the list of iron-clads from 43 to 51. With regard to the question of guns, he confessed that he viewed with some alarm the apathy which was displayed. A very valuable Return in regard to guns was laid on the Table by the War Office on the 20th of April, it having been moved for by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith). The Committee would remember that for the service of the Navy—he asked the attention of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour), who thoroughly understood the subject, and who would correct him if he was wrong—for the service of the Navy some 2,200 guns were required; he believed the number was rather larger, amounting to nearly 2,300. In addition, a certain number of spare guns were required; and the Secretary to the Admiralty had told the Committee, with great satisfaction, that a very large number of merchant steamers were of such a quality as to be fit to be used as cruisers in the event of war. When, however, the hon. Gentleman was asked whether the guns were prepared for those vessels, he was not able to answer, and he had not yet been able to give the information required. The Return which was moved for by his right hon. Friend the late First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. W. H. Smith) showed, however, what guns they had got. The number of guns "ready, delivered, and in store" amounted to 131—131 guns for the service of a Navy which required 2,245, and which also required for the 280 merchant ships which the hon. Gentleman alluded to 560 more guns, of which there was no trace. His noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox), in that excellent speech which they listened to in the earlier part of the evening, pointed out that the gun question was complicated by the great variety of the patterns. At any rate, one would think that it would be desirable that the guns and ammunition should be complete, so that whatever the pattern should be there should be an ample supply of each description at the base of Naval operations. Here he differed from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) and the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) as to the desirability of having a separate manufacture of guns under the charge of the Admiralty. He never thought it was a desirable thing that there should be two establishments in the country for the manufacture of guns.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he had never suggested two manufactories.

Sir JOHN HAY said, his noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox) made the remark, and his right hon. Friend did not correct it. He, therefore, assumed the remark was correct. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman was not of that opinion. It seemed to him that though it might be good that the gun carriage should be under the direction of the Admiralty, the manufacture of guns was a big question, which a Committee or a Commission ought to inquire into. He was of opinion that, looking to the fact of the enormous charge for the Army, and for the manufacture of guns both for the Army and Navy, the manufacture of guns ought to be a separate concern. In the panic during the Crimean War the Ordnance Office was abolished. He thought it was better that the Ordnance Corps—Artillery and Engineers—should be under the War Office; but the manufacturing department for both the great Services ought to be separate. The manufacturing department might buy guns from private traders, or manufacture them themselves, or do both; but, at all events, the Army and Navy should draw the guns from it. That was the old process; and it would be of the greatest advantage to the House if, instead of having thrown on the Table enormously swollen Army Estimates, they were to have separate Estimates in regard to the manufacture of guns, which manufacture could be conducted by the Master General of the Ordnance, or by some Minister responsible to the House for the expenditure upon guns and ammunition and other articles of that kind which were necessary for the Services. The reason why he should dislike to have the Army manufacturing guns for itself and for its fortifications, and the Navy manufacturing guns for itself, was that if, in a Naval action, they fell back upon Malta or Gibraltar for a fresh supply of ammunition and guns, the same guns which the fortifications had, and the same ammunition which the fort had, would be available for the ships, and they would not be required to keep a large separate supply for ships which at times might run short, and might lead to great complications and disaster. He was persuaded that until they went back to a separate Ordnance Department for manufacture, both for the Army and Navy, they would not have a satisfactory supply of guns and ammunition for either of the Services, neither would the House have that control over the manufacture of guns which it ought to have, and which it had previous to the abolition of the Ordnance Department. But, in the meantime, the Navy was without guns. The ships had certain guns, no doubt; but they were inferior to the guns of other Naval Powers. They were told that the ships which would be ready in a few years' time would not be armed in a satisfactory manner. He saw that of the 12-inch 43-ton guns "ready, delivered, and in store," there were none; of the 18-ton guns, one; of the 6-inch 80-cwt. guns, 14; of the 81-cwt. guns, 92; of the 4-inch, 22-cwt. guns, 19; of the 13-cwt. guns, five; making 131 guns. Such was the total number of guns returned by the War Office on the 20th of April, 1883, as "ready, delivered, and in store." It was possible he might have omitted to mention some guns; but, at any rate, 255 guns was the outside number, according to the Return he had previously spoken of. There were also 229 guns ordered. Such a condition of affairs was not satisfactory; and, looking to the condition of Europe, he could not believe the Committee would be satisfied they had either guns or iron-clads sufficient for the defence of the country.

SIR EDWARD J. REED said, he thought the noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox) had done good service in placing before the country, with great fulness, the views taken by himself and by many other hon. Gentlemen who had studied these questions thoroughly. At the same time, he felt bound to say that that was no place for the threshing out of the questions involved. It would be quite impossible to completely sift matters in a Committee of the Whole House; and he hoped the day would come when they would have Select Committees of the House appointed to deal with questions of this kind. To his mind, the Government would show greater judgment and discretion by granting a Committee to deal with moot points of this kind, rather than by making such a large concession as they were disposed to make on a recent occasion, when the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) brought his Motion regarding National Expenditure before the House. It appeared to him that the Prime Minister was ready to refer the framing of the Estimates, more or less, to a Grand Committee of the House, and for the Government to receive its guidance largely from such Committee. He (Sir Edward J. Reed) thought it would be highly impolitic for the country to hand its finances over to the charge of a Committee; but, at the same time, he considered that on questions of great public importance, which were limited in their scope and defined in their nature, there might be a Committee occasionally—a Committee which would thresh out the subject, and put the public mind at rest. He listened with great pleasure to the speech of his hon. Friend the Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Sir Thomas Brassey), because, as hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House would admit, he gave them encouragement to believe that that which was the object of all of them was likely to be more or less accomplished. He apprehended it was not the object even of hon. Gentlemen opposite, who did not profess to be always actuated by the same principles of economy as they on the Ministerial side did—he believed there was no hon. Gentleman on that side of the House who desired the Government to embark in any large or ill-considered expenditure. What they all had in view was to get a better expenditure of the money voted by Parliament. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty told them that it was the intention of the Admiralty, as far as possible, to check expenditure upon slow ships, and ships that were imperfect in many respects, and to concentrate their attention and efforts, as much as possible, upon fast ships. The hon. Gentleman told them it was the endeavour of the Admiralty to obtain in the ships a speed of 16 knots or more. If that could be supplemented by some satisfactory statement as to coal supply he believed the satisfaction of the Committee on the point would be complete. There was one point in the statement of his hon. Friend that struck him as a little remarkable. The hon. Gentleman said that the vessels of the *Mersey* and *Severn* type were representative of that class of vessels which it had been said should form an auxiliary fleet to the great line-of-battle iron-clad ships. Now, the *Mersey* and *Severn* cost £100,000 for their hull, and £65,000 for their machinery; and he thought that vessels costing £165,000 were rather too expensive to be regarded as auxiliaries to individual iron-clads, however important an auxiliary fleet might be. It had been publicly advocated for a long time past that there should be attached to the principal iron-clads vessels which should operate as defences about them against torpedoes; but surely they should expect smaller and cheaper vessels for that specific service than the *Mersey* and the *Severn*. So long as nothing contrary to that had arisen in the statement of his hon. Friend he could only regard the statement as satisfactory. He should like to say a word or two about some other ships which had been mentioned during the debate. The *Cyclops* class of vessels had been condemned; but he should prefer to take, for the purposes of illustration, vessels designed entirely outside the Admiralty. If the *Orion* and *Belleisle*, for instance, had been built for any Foreign Government, they would have been extolled as vessels possessing the wonderful advantage of a combination of great power, small size, and moderate expense, and also as examples of the great skill which the private shipbuilders of this country brought to bear upon iron-clads. The *Orion* and *Belleisle* were designed and constructed by Samuda Brothers; and he thought if the former Member for the Tower Hamlets could have been present during this discussion he would have been a little shocked to hear the harsh terms in which the *Orion* and *Belleisle* were spoken of. He (Sir Edward J. Reed) knew they were powerful vessels; and he could only say that if rolling was their defect the Admiralty knew well how to remedy it. He should also say that if the *Cyclops* class of vessels had been built for some other Government they would not have been subject to the criticism passed upon them. He was aware that in the case of the *Cyclops* his noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox) and others had the justification of a Committee; but Committees sitting on Designs of Ships—Committees in which there was no Naval architect with power to vote—were extremely likely to go to extreme lengths. The *Cyclops* class of vessels was immeasurably superior to a very large number of vessels which they used to hear extolled in the House of Commons and elsewhere in the days of the American War. He did think that that class of vessels was not deserving of all the censure which had been expressed with regard to it. With respect to the *Neptune*, twice over had he been credited with the design of that vessel. As a matter of fact, she was designed in his office, the object of the designers in coming there being to protect themselves with regard to calculations—to ensure themselves against running into miscalculations. The conception of the ship was not his, and the responsibility never could be his, because the building of the ship was entrusted to private builders, who were quite incompetent to perform the work. Later on, it was true, she was completed under his care. He should like to say that the argument of his noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox), in which the *Neptune* was referred to, was a perfectly sound one. It was true that, although successive Administrations came down to the House and told them, with the utmost confidence, that the Navy was never in a better condition, that they were quite satisfied with it, that those who criticized and complained of its position were altogether in the wrong, and were exaggerators; the very moment there was any risk of the Navy being called upon to do anything, they bought up every ship they could lay hands on, and in that way got into the Navy vessels with which they themselves were dissatisfied, and which their own officers condemned; that it was in this way public money was expended extravagantly, and with less wisdom than it ought to be. Although his hon. Friend the Civil Lord of the Admiralty had made a powerful speech, and made striking statements, the accuracy of which he (Sir Edward J. Reed) should be sorry to doubt, he had no hesitation in saying that if they ran any risk of entering on a European war the present Government would come to the House and ask for a special Vote of Parliament to enable them to buy iron-clads. The Government would lose a great opportunity if they failed to pay serious attention to the representations that had been made from both sides of the House. The Navy Question was one which did not prove very inviting to the House; it was generally discussed when very few Members were present; but it was, nevertheless, one in which the public were deeply interested. The concern of the people in the Navy was manifested on every occasion when necessity arose; and he considered it would be a weak thing for this Government, or for any Government, to leave anything undone which would give to the people complete confidence in the Naval Administration. In conclusion, he would repeat that he considered the speech of his hon. Friend (Sir Thomas Brassey) an extremely valuable one, holding out to them, as it did, the expectation, at least, that the Admiralty would do their utmost to curb useless and wasteful expenditure, and apply the money saved to useful purposes.

CAPTAIN PRICE said, that in a discussion on Navy Estimates there was such an enormous variety of subjects to be covered, that it was quite impossible for any Member, in a single speech, to go thoroughly into all the questions involved, although he was bound to say his noble Friend (Lord Henry Lennox), who opened the debate, had, as nearly as possible, covered the ground which lay open to them in a consideration of the Estimates under discussion. He (Captain Price) asked the attention of the Committee for a few minutes whilst he entered into a consideration of the fighting strength of the Navy — that was to say, the strength of their Iron-clad Fleet. His hon. Friend the Civil Lord of the Admiralty gave them just now a very fair comparison between the Fleet of this country and that of France. In all such comparisons, however, it was a very difficult thing to make a correct classification. Hon. Gentlemen always dealt with the kind of classification which they themselves took up; and he asked the attention of the Committee, and especially of his hon. Friend (Sir Thomas Brassey), to a classification which he would now endeavour to put before the Committee. It was a very simple one, and might be, perhaps, very popularly understood. Possibly, before introducing his classification, he might be permitted to refer to one remark of his hon. Friend of which he took a note. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty said that in all these matters of comparison they ought to consider, amongst other things, the area of protection in an iron-clad ship. In was all very well to talk about having so many iron-clads; but a most important element of consideration was the area to which the ship was protected by armour. If they were to go into that subject fully, he feared it would be found that the advantage lay with the new French ships which were building. All the French ships of the *Inflexible* type were more fully armoured than ours. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty also spoke about the coal-carrying capacity of our armoured ships. He (Captain Price) was not quite sure how the matter stood with regard to France; but the large armour-clad ships which were being built in Italy had considerably more coal-carrying capacity than our iron-clads had. [An hon. MEMBER: They are larger.] They were larger, he admitted, and we had got nothing to equal them. Some of the Italian ships were capable of steaming from the Mediterranean to South America and back without coaling. We had no ship in this country capable of doing anything like that. In the comparison he wished to make between the fighting strength of the Fleets of England and France he should divide the Iron-clad Fleet of both countries into three classes. He did not quite understand the classification his hon. Friend (Sir Thomas Brassey) made. He understood the hon. Gentleman to put into the first class all ships carrying armour of over nine inches. If he did that he must include ships of very small power indeed. The hon. Gentleman's classification also depended upon tonnage; but he (Captain Price) excluded that from his classification. He took the two most important elements of classification of the strength of iron-clads—namely, the thickness of the armour and the weight of the gun. If they did that they found this result—and, though he did not use the tonnage as a distinct element, it almost entirely lent itself to this classification—that in the English Fleet, in the first class, which he would take to mean vessels of not less than 18-inch armour and carrying guns of not less than 43 tons in weight, there were 10. He was alluding not only to the number of ships which were at present existing, or were ready for sea, but was taking all those which were contemplated at the moment; because he took it that discussion of the Navy Estimates was for the purpose of considering not only what ships they had ready now, but what were to be provided for in future. The Fleet of 1882 and the Fleet of 1885 had been referred to; but he thought it would be better if they went further into the future. He wished to take account of every ship which was at present contemplated in France and England, as well, of course, as those in existence at the present moment. If they took all these ships and looked through the Navy Estimates and at the Dockyards, they could not make out more than 10 iron-clads of the class he had mentioned as belonging to the English Navy. France, on the other hand, of the same class of ships—that was to say, carrying armour of not less than 18 inches, and guns of not less than 43 tons—possessed no fewer than 18, the names of which had been given by the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox). One ship on each side had less armour than 18 inches; but he had put them in the list on account of their armaments. The ships of the second class he had taken as those possessing armour of not less than nine inches, and guns going up from 18 tons to 38 tons weight. Of that class in England, built, building, and promised, they had 26, and in France they had 18. The total was, therefore, 36 to France and 36 to England. The third class he omitted altogether. In that class he put every iron-clad not mentioned in the first and second class, and it would be useless to go into that, as all sorts of questions would be continually cropping up as to whether such and such vessel ought not to be included, or whether such and such vessel ought not to be excluded. He ought first to mention how the case stood, so far as Italy was concerned. In that country there were these enormous ships he had spoken of. In the first class there were seven; in the second class five; and in the third class seven; making a total of 19. The sum total of all this was that on the completion of this programme, about which they were talking, and which was presented to them in the Navy Estimates, whether it took place in 1885, 1886, or 1887, they should be in possession of 51 armour-clads, 36 of which would be in the first and second class; France at a similar date would be in possession of 50 iron-clads, 36 of which would be in the first and second class; and Italy would possess 19, 12 of which would be in the first and second class. This showed that on the completion of the respective programmes France would have a number of iron-clads at least equal to our own, if not greater, and France and Italy combined would have a preponderance of 12 ships of the first and second class. What they had to consider that evening, and at all times, was, whether this was a safe state of things? Of course, in considering that, they had to consider whether any combination was possible between France and any other country. They always looked upon France as their principal opponent—he did not mean to say the most likely one—for they were not likely to meet her in anything but an amicable way, at any rate for some time; but they looked on her as the principal Power they might have to deal with. He was struck very much the other day by a letter he read from one of our senior Admirals—namely, Sir George Elliot—on this point. The Admiral had put the case so much better than he (Captain Price) could, that he should like to mention what he had said to the Committee. He had said—

> "Suppose we were at war with France, or with France combined with any other country, let us consider this—that our Fleet, roughly speaking, would be divided between the Mediterranean and the Home ports."

That was a proposition which no one would deny. He was not going to consider the number of iron-clads it might be necessary to have on Foreign Stations—in China, Australia, and in the Pacific. He left those places out of the question altogether; but supposing they had their whole fleet of iron-clads concentrated in European waters, where would they be? Why, they would be divided between the Mediterranean and the Home ports; but where would the French Fleet be? That would occupy a position midway between the Mediterranean and the Channel, consequently the whole of it could at any time be concentrated on the one-half of our Fleet in the Mediterranean, or the other half remaining at home to guard our coast. We could not get out of that—no amount of telegraphing, or anything of that kind, would enable us to escape such a strategical event as that. Many people said the only way to guard against such a difficulty as that was to have a Fleet of double the strength of the French Fleet, and such people he must answer by saying he did not think they were far wrong. It had been our policy in past times to do that, and it should be our policy now. If it was not, he should like to ask the Government what was their present policy with regard to the Naval strength of the country, because they had never been able to get at that yet. Was their Fleet to be equal to the combined Fleets of the world, or ought it to be equal to some combination of European Fleets, or simply to be nearly equal to the strongest Fleet in the world? He had noticed that in "another place" a noble Viscount (Viscount Sidmouth) had mentioned what he believed to be the Prime Minister's opinion on this point—namely, that their Fleet ought to be equal to the combined Navies of the world. The Earl of Northbrook contradicted that, and said the noble Viscount could not quote authority for such a statement. But he (Captain Price) was correct, he thought, in saying this much—that both the Prime Minister and all Ministers who had had anything to do with the administration of the Navy had, up to the present time, at all events, agreed that it was necessary for this country to be equal to most combinations of European Powers. He remembered one Minister—the present Home Secretary—not many years ago saying that the Fleet of this country was equal to the combined Fleets of the world put together. Of course, having said that, the right hon. and learned Gentleman must have been of opinion that their Navy ought to be as good as the combined Fleets of the world, or else a person in his position should come down to the House, and say—"I cannot agree to the Estimates—they ought to be considerably reduced." He held that if this question as to what the comparative strength of their Navy should be was inquired into and reported upon, it would, no doubt, settle the question for many years to come. It seemed to be impossible to get any statement from the Government on the subject; and when hon. Members made any comparison between their own Fleet and the Fleets of other countries, such comparisons were strongly deprecated. That had been the case over and over again. He had not heard comparisons deprecated so much that evening; but that was because the Government were taking it for granted that these comparisons must be made. They might take it for granted that they always would be made. The First Lord of the Admiralty (the Earl of Northbrook), in "another place," and the Secretary to the Admiralty in this House, he was bound to say, made such statements as were calculated to lull the people of this country into a sense of false security. He should like to call the attention of the Committee to one or two statements made by the First Lord the other day, which, he thought, would bear out the assertion he made, that what fell from the noble Earl was calculated to lull the people of the country into a sense of false security. The noble Earl might have been improperly reported, for they had only *The Times* and the other newspapers to tell them what he had said. Viscount Sidmouth had drawn a comparison between the ships building in this country and those building in France, and had said that in the French Naval Estimates there appeared 18 large and powerful iron-clads. The Earl of Northbrook, in answering Viscount Sidmouth, said there was a great error in the comparison, and that the figures for 1885 had been taken, 10 ships having been reckoned, neither of which, up to the present day, had been launched; whereas, of the total number of English ships taken into account, only two had not been launched. He (Captain Price) did not know whether that statement was wrongly reported or misprinted; but it was calculated to give the most erroneous impression of the state of things. The Earl of Northbrook said they had only two ships in the programme which had not been launched; but how did the matter stand? As a matter of fact, there were nine ships in the programme which had not been launched—nine out of 13 building in this country; and in France, according to Viscount Sidmouth, there were 10 out of 18 which were building and were not yet launched. The Earl of Northbrook's was a most misleading statement—namely, that they had only two ships building which were not yet launched. The Earl of Northbrook denied that there was any extraordinary endeavour being made to increase the Navy of France, and they had heard a good deal about that that night. The noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) had shown conclusively and clearly the extraordinary steps taken by the French Government at the present time to increase their Navy. He had alluded to the tonnage which had been built, and which was to be built during the present and forthcoming year. He told them of the number of men that France employed in her Dockyards, pointing out that she had 5,000 more than we had, the number she employed being 23,000, against our 18,000. He (Captain Price) was inclined to ask what these 5,000 men were doing? Were they sitting down doing nothing, and was all this money that France was voting year by year being thrown away, or being pocketed by Ministers, or what became of it? It was certain that France was making most extraordinary efforts to replace her obsolete ships and increase the force of her Navy. He would allude to one more statement by the Earl of Northbrook, which, if it was correctly reported, was most extraordinary — namely, with regard to the armaments of these Fleets. The noble Earl had said that, speaking roughly, 43-ton guns were the guns which were being put on the French ships now being completed for sea; whilst in our ships which were being completed—in such ships as the *Rodney*, for instance—63-ton guns were to be mounted. What was the impression conveyed by that? Why, that the French ships were being armed with 43-ton guns and our ships with 63-ton guns. Why, in the first place, there was no such thing as a 43-ton gun in France; and, in the second place, there was no 63-ton gun in the English Navy. They were told something about this last year. He remembered the Secretary to the Admiralty dealt grandly with the 63-ton guns, or the 60-ton guns, with which the Fleet of this country was to be armed. Why, at the moment the Secretary to the Admiralty spoke not only were there no 63-ton guns in existence, but they did not even exist on paper. The designs for the guns about which the hon. Member talked so much had not been completed, and the Surveyor General of the Ordnance would bear him out in what he was saying. The fact was that in the French Navy four of the 18 vessels of which he had spoken would be armed with 48-ton breech-loaders—indeed, they were so armed, and half of the remainder would be armed with 59-ton breech-loaders, and the remaining half with either a 72 or a 75-ton gun. Some doubts had been expressed as to whether these 72-ton guns that he was speaking of in the French Service had been supplied to the ships. He had had the advantage of being over at Cherbourg last year, and of going over the magnificent Dockyard there—a Dockyard which, he thought, compared very favourably with our yards. The French officer who conducted him over the yard gave him a great deal of valuable information. He (Captain Price) tried to get from him the number of these 72 guns actually completed; but the French officer said he could not state the exact number which had been made, although he had reason to suppose that several had been. He added that only a few weeks before —and it was then August of last year— eight of these guns had been in Cherbourg Dockyard, and had been forwarded from there to Toulon, in view of complications arising in Egypt. Therefore, unless the Admiralty had much superior information to that, he was correct in saying that whereas we had no 63-ton guns in existence, or certainly had them no more than half completed, the French Navy possessed guns of a much larger and more powerful kind. Hon. Members were constantly taunted with dealing in exaggeration; but he had shown, he thought, some exaggerations which had been made by so estimable a person as the First Lord of the Admiralty himself. He wanted to know—and he had never been able to understand—why it was that the Admiralty concealed from the House and from the public the real state of things? They were constantly talking about their great Naval strength. Public men, at dinners, meetings, and so forth, were constantly talking in this strain. Undoubtedly, they had an immensely powerful Navy; but they never talked about the relative strength of their Navy and the Navies of foreign countries, or of its efficiency, and these were the great points. The Admiralty knew very well what the opinion of Naval officers in this country was as to the state of their Navy—they knew very well the opinion of their own advisers. He should like to hear them deny that they had at the Admiralty information from their advisers to the effect that at the completion of the respective programmes of the two countries this country would be in possession of fewer iron-clads than France and Italy, or France and Russia combined. That was a distinct proposition, which he should very much like to hear replied to. He asserted that they had sufficient information at the Admiralty to enable them to give a distinct answer. He referred to the completion of the programmes, and hon. Members knew what he meant by that. He believed that before long their Navy would not be strong enough to cope with any combination of Navies of European countries. He did not know whether the Secretary to the Admiralty or the Government were in a position to guarantee that they should have no Naval war within the next five or six years. If they were not, they should be able to deny the proposition he had just laid down. There was a sentence which fell from the Secretary to the Admiralty last year which indicated that he did not feel quite easy in his mind on this particular point. He said that the general consideration governing the policy of the Admiralty was—

> "That it was not necessary for the safety of the country to ask for any special grant of money for iron shipbuilding, unless the French Admiralty, having completed its programme of 1872 and replaced its obsolete ships, should then go on building as fast as ever."—(3 *Hansard*, [268] 1063.)

When the French Government had completed their programme it would be too late for us to take the proper measures. We could not build iron-clad vessels in a year, or in two years; and we should find that when the French and British programmes were completed, and the French Admiralty went on building at the normal rate, increasing their Fleet as we did, it would be too late to make up for lost time, and to maintain that superiority which, undoubtedly, we ought to have. He was not one who desired to increase the Expenditure of the country unnecessarily. Undoubtedly, he always urged an increase of expenditure on the Naval Estimates, because he thought it was most urgently required. He believed their general Expenditure might be cut down in many respects. He thought they might save a little by refraining from teaching the children of the poorer classes how to solve equations, and how to translate Latin and Greek. He found in the Civil Service Estimates that they were to be called on shortly to spend £100,000 on a new site for the Admiralty Offices. Surely that was rather like beginning at the wrong end. What did they want new Admiralty Offices for before they had got a new Navy? The Government were acting like the little boy, who desired to have a pretty purse before he had any money to put in it. The present Admiralty Offices were amply sufficient for the transaction of the business of the present Navy; and if, in cases of this kind, the Government would save a little money, and give the country a few more iron-clads, they would add to their own reputation and to the efficiency of the Navy. He apologized to the Committee for detaining it so long, and thanked hon. Members for having listened to him so patiently. His only object—like that of the noble Lord who introduced the subject—was to provide, if possible, not only that they should have an efficient Navy in the immediate future, but at the time when they knew that France would have a very much superior Navy to that which she had at the present time. He knew very well that the Government, and those who presided over the Admiralty, were responsible for these matters. Hon. Members were told they ought to leave these matters in their hands. They were quite willing to do that. It would be satisfactory to them, and, no doubt, to the country, if, after a severe Naval reverse, in consequence of which they found the power of this country humbled, they could turn to those who had brought about that state of things, and say that they were, at all events, now reaping the reward which they so richly deserved.

MR. STEWART MACLIVER said, they had now been considering the efficiency of the Navy for some time, and he was one of those who thought that it was a Service on which no expense should be spared. Since the usual interchange of courtesies across the Table had taken place, since the guns had been disposed of, and the various ships debated, he might be allowed to invite attention to those who built the ships and those who sailed them. The increase of the Vote this year was moderate, amounting to £283,317, of which £113,804 went to Dockyard work, Devonport getting £23,069 more than last year, and 360 additional men out of the total increase of 1,772 to be provided for. As usual on these occasions, they had the grievances, real and imaginary, of different classes revived; and he could not refrain from complimenting the Civil Lord and the Secretary for the efforts they had made to understand those grievances by visiting the Dockyards and hearing from the workmen the statements they had to offer in their own behalf. This was a much better arrangement than had hitherto prevailed. Then the men could with difficulty get their claims heard, and were naturally dissatisfied. Of course, it could not be supposed that every complaint would be met and adjusted. Some were less reasonable than others; but to hear a complaint was generally found an easier way of adjusting differences. His hon. Friend the Secretary, whose able and exhaustive statement they had all admired, devoted an entire day to the case of the men of Devonport, and won their confidence by his frank and genial manner of dealing with them. The large and important body of shipwrights, who had strong claims upon the consideration of the authorities at Whitehall, were looking hopefully forward to some advantage from the interview with the hon. Gentleman. To this they were well entitled, after patiently waiting for nearly 20 years without any advance. So were the joiners, the riggers, and the writers of the various Dockyards. The position of the Naval Engineers he had on other occasions brought to their attention; and while he cheerfully admitted the readiness of the Department to meet the hardship of the 11 years' condition of pension, he yet thought the clause should be so modified as to allow engineers to count junior time and enable them to obtain rates of pay from which they were at present debarred. The total number of Chief Engineers was 220; but of these only a small proportion received 17*s.* per day. Referring to the engine-room artificers, those men, he said, had looked for some improvement in their position; but instead of that a great hardship had been inflicted upon them, as shown by the issue of a recent Circular. By a new Regulation two years of extra time was imposed upon those men without any corresponding advantage. The effect of this change was to produce distrust and alarm amongst the men, which it was desirable to remedy as soon as possible. He would give the Committee the experiences of those men, one of whose number had written him a letter in which, speaking of his own particular case, he said that having completed 10 years he was made to sign a new indenture. A month afterwards he was sent for and told that the indenture was null and void, and that he must now serve 12 years in order to qualify for a pension. This extra service would be found to inflict injury upon the men in a way which was not intended by the authorities when it was put into force. Its effect would be to defer the rise of pay to the men, while it would compel them to give two extra years of service before qualifying for a pension. That he would show was so in a very few sentences. The number of engine-room artificers who entered the Service from 1873 to 1876 was 98——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is discussing particular items which come under Votes 6 and 16. He is not discussing the general policy of the Estimates, which is the Question under Vote 2.

MR. STEWART MACLIVER said, he understood they might go into these cases under the Vote before the Committee. However, he would reserve what he had to say for Votes 6 and 16.

MR. W. H. SMITH: The noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox) has delivered a most interesting and most important speech, and one which, I am sure, the Committee has listened to with great interest. I am not able to follow the noble Lord to all the conclusions at which he has arrived; but I am sure my hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Campbell - Bannerman) will feel that the questions raised deserve the most serious consideration from Her Majesty's Government. In "another place" the First Lord of the Admiralty is reported to have said—

> "No Government of this country, and certainly it is not the intention of the present Government, will allow any nation to take a position of equality with England on the sea"

—that no other Government should possess a Navy equal to our own. But there was a much more important condition laid down by the present First Lord of the Treasury in 1878—namely, that our Navy should always be equal to any probable or possible combination that could be brought against it. The Secretary to the Admiralty, in introducing the Estimates, laid great stress on the fact that the Admiralty were conscious of their responsibility for maintaining the Fleet of England in a condition equal to the duties that devolved upon it, and he then proceeded to discuss the figures relating to our iron-clads. No doubt, a very agreeable impression may be produced by the statement of the fact that we have, at the present time, 51 iron-clads, as against 43 in the year 1855. But, Sir, while we put these numbers one against another, we must bear in mind that the Navies of other countries have been also enlarged, and that much greater duties fall upon the English Navy as compared with any other. The Committee and the country are aware that, at this moment, iron-clads have to be employed in the China and Australian Seas, in the Pacific, on the Coast of North America, and in the West Indies. Our Fleet is scattered in a manner in which the Fleet of no other Power can be scattered; and while it is discharging duties in three or four different seas, if, unfortunately, we should be engaged in a war, Foreign Powers might be able to concentrate their forces against our Navy. The responsibility of Her Majesty's Government in this matter is a very grave one, and we do right in pointing out and insisting upon that responsibility, and in assuring them that whatever assistance may be required, in order to maintain and keep the Navy in an efficient condition, this House and the country will always give. I feel certain of this, and that there will be no excuse for any Government not taking as much money as may be necessary to provide a thoroughly efficient Navy. I must again refer to the question of the guns, to which the noble Lord near me (Lord Henry Lennox) has alluded at some length, and to the delay which has resulted, on the part of the Admiralty, in completing the programme laid down for the equipment of ships. I do not say this offensively towards the present Board of Admiralty. I confess that when I had the honour to be First Lord of the Admiralty I fully realized the difficulty which the present system of obtaining guns places in the way of the administration in completing the programme laid down both as regards time and efficiency. When the present Government took Office they felt it was necessary to be vigorous in their administration of the Navy; and they promised, among other things, that the ships should be prepared for sea much more rapidly. In saying this I repeat what I have often said before, that I am not speaking from a Party point of view, but merely drawing attention to what, in my opinion, are the inevitable results of the system under which the work of the country is being carried on. Speaking on the 7th of June, 1880, the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) promised that by certain arrangements which he proposed to make the *Agamemnon* and the *Ajax* were to be completed respectively on the 1st of December, 1881, and the 1st of March, 1882; but I think I am right in saying that up to this moment the *Ajax* has not been to sea, and that the *Agamemnon* has only just been completed, the delay having, I believe, been due to the fitting of the ships. Sir, it is a serious thing that from a cause of this nature the good intentions of Her Majesty's Government should be frustrated as regards two ships, in the one case by a delay of 16 months, and in the other by a delay of 14 months at least, the *Ajax* not being even now ready for sea. Well, Sir, that is the case with regard to the *Agamemnon* and *Ajax*. And now I come to the statement of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (Mr. Trevelyan), then Secretary to the Admiralty, who, after repeating in March, 1881, that the *Ajax* and *Agamemnon* were to be completed at Chatham during "the coming year," went on to say that the *Shah* and the *Raleigh* were to be refitted with their new armament also in the course of "the coming year." But neither the *Shah* nor the *Raleigh* have been touched, and not a single new gun has been supplied to them. Again, in March, 1882, we were told that the *Ajax*, *Agamemnon*, and *Conqueror* "will be finished in the course of the year," and we had the assurance of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland that—

> "The *Conqueror*, within this calendar year, as we confidently hope, will be actually armed with the new 43-ton gun."

Well, Sir, that gun, I am told, is not in existence. But the *Conqueror* is not ready for it; nor will she be ready for it in the course of the year. Then, we were told, in 1882, that five ships were to carry the new 60-ton gun; but the ships have been building for more than 12 months, and I understand that the design of the gun, which ought to have been sent to the Constructor 12 months since, has not yet been sent in. The result of an omission of this kind is that a ship has to be cut to pieces in order to put in the necessary fittings for the guns; and that is a proceeding which involves great delay, additional expenditure, and great disappointment, and so you do not get the ships when you ought to get them. That was the case with the *Conqueror*, which was to be ready by the 31st of March, 1883; she has not got her guns. [MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: They are ready for her.] I am exceedingly glad to receive that assurance from my hon. Friend; but, at all events, we have been twice promised that the ship would be ready for sea by the 31st of March last at the latest. That period has passed—and I am afraid the next 31st of March will also have gone before the ship is ready for sea and to take her place in the Navy. We were also told that the *Rupert* would have her boilers renewed, and be armed with new 18-ton breech-loading guns—all that was to be accomplished during last year. No 18-ton gun is in existence, so far as the Navy is concerned—certainly, none have been delivered or are ready; and the *Rupert* has to be armed with the old gun, and is, therefore, so much less efficient than she would have been had the engagement entered into by the Admiralty been fulfilled, besides costing a large sum of money for refitting. My right hon. and gallant Friend (Sir John Hay) has spoken of the supply of guns by the Naval Authorities for the Navy. I do not quite agree with that; but I do advocate most strongly the complete reconstruction of the relations now existing between the Admiralty and the War Office, and should certainly desire some explanation of the delay which has occurred during the last three years in the supply of guns. Great delay has been caused to our ships from the present system; and I feel sure it will occur again unless some new system is adopted. The Return I have in my hand will show that, notwithstanding the amount provided for new guns in 1881, not a single gun was delivered; in 1881-2 the sum of £72,000 was provided, with the same result; and in 1882-3, when £207,000 was provided, only 77 guns were delivered to the Navy, of which none were of greater calibre than the 6-inch gun. These figures alone show the necessity for the most serious consideration on the part of Her Majesty's Government as to the supply of guns. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) was very sanguine, in March last year, when he promised that the *Hercules* should be armed with batteries of 18-ton breech-loading guns. He said—

> "She will carry a broadside of 18-ton breech-loading guns, and we shall have 174 guns of all sizes of the new type by the end of the next financial year"

—that is to say, the 31st of March last. But those expectations have not been realized. With regard to the 60-ton gun of which he speaks, I would ask my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty possess information which will enable them now to give the necessary orders for the hydraulic apparatus, and directions for the construction of magazines? I have some recollection of a ship in the case of which, for a long time after her guns were received, the question of ammunition was not settled, the result of which was that a great deal of expense and loss of time was incurred in altering the arrangements of the ship below, and in fitting machinery in order to provide the means necessary for fighting the ship. It was then found that, for want of space, she could not carry as many rounds for her guns as she ought to have carried. There is another point to which I desire to refer; and I wish it to be understood, with reference to the actual performances of the Department, that I am not addressing myself to the present Board of Admiralty as sinners in particular, but rather that I am asking for information, and I hope to find that the Board of Admiralty will find some mode of stating facts to the House which will not be so difficult to understand as the form now before us. When the hon. Gentleman made his speech to the House, I showed that the statement of the tonnage proposed to be built in 1882-3 differed from the statement in the present Estimates to the extent of something like 600 tons. In 1882-3, the Admiralty proposed to build 11,016 tons of armoured and 4,486 tons of unarmoured ships; but in the Estimates for 1883-4, they have corrected those figures to 10,615 tons of armoured and 4,201 of unarmoured ships; and you say you have built 11,448 tons of armoured and 4,792 tons of unarmoured ships, showing an increase in the former of 432 tons on the original Estimate, and 833 tons on the corrected Estimate. But, in page 204 of the Estimates, the Committee will perceive that the actual number of tons built are shown, and these exhibit together a total net deficiency of 1,283 tons on the work promised last year. If the deficiency in respect of the *Benbow* is taken into account, there will be a total deficiency, instead of an increase, of 1,568 tons. Sir, I have no doubt this is something which can be explained; but it is not explained by the figures which have been placed before the country, and I think it would be much more satisfactory if some method could be arrived at by which a clear view of the work done in our Dockyards could be communicated to Parliament. I do not call in question what has been done in the Dockyards; but I say that, by all appearances, so far from there being an increase, there has been less done by 11 per cent than was in the programme. Again, in the case of the corvettes, it is claimed that there has been more work done by 500 tons; whereas, in point of fact, there is a deficiency of 400 tons, if the figures put forward are correct. Then, Sir, it was stated, in 1882, that only 1,018 tons were necessary to complete the *Cordelia*; but 1,040 tons are reported as having been built. It seems to me clear that you have not increased the displacement, and I have no doubt that you have done some work twice over; but, if that is so, the proper way would be to write it off as an expense, and not make a claim for it as an addition to the strength of the Navy. There is one other question to which I wish seriously to draw the attention of the Admiralty—namely, the tendency to increased costliness of the Service. Vote 1, in 1881, was for 58,800 men, the amount being £2,721,000. In 1882-3, the men were reduced by 600, but the Vote remained the same. In 1883-4, the men are reduced again by 250, but the Vote still remains the same; so that you are increasing the cost of the Service man per man, and in order that you may not ask for more money you are diminishing the number of men. That is a matter for serious consideration. I know it is difficult, with the pressure put on the Admiralty from all sides, to increase the pay and remuneration; but it is a serious matter that we should have gone down in the *personnel* of our Navy from 58,800 to 57,250 in three years, while the cost remains the same, and for the same money we are getting 2½ per cent less efficiency. The time is getting late, and I will not occupy much more of it; but I venture to say there is one other matter to which, so far as the building of ships is concerned, the attention of the Admiralty might be directed. I cordially supported the appointment of Mr. Rendel to the Board, as I felt that the Board needed fresh strength in dealing with designs when once prepared, and requiring that they should be properly carried out as prepared, and without loss of time. I cannot help thinking that if an officer was made responsible, from the first, for the complete design for a ship, and was called upon to see it carried out, without any tinkering or changes in construction, we should see our ships fitted more quickly, and at much less cost than now. It is in the knowledge of all who are acquainted with the Admiralty construction that alterations are frequently made in ships, and they are due, generally speaking, to the fact that things have been forgotten, or not properly considered in the first instance, and it is nobody's fault. I think the Board of Admiralty should make all that some one officer's duty, so that a design for a ship of war should be as thorough and complete as the design for a house, or for a first class mercantile steamer would be. I know very well the conditions with which the Admiralty have to comply are complicated, and that they must march with the times, and make such changes from time to time as may be necessary; but I think designs should be considered completely by competent persons at the first, before the ship is laid down, or the design has left the Office of the Admiralty. It has been alleged that one of the reasons for the delay in the construction of the *Leander* is that the Admiralty have not fully decided upon the smaller arrangements which have to be carried out by the builders. I have no doubt that is true; but anyone who walks through a Dockyard will know that what I am insisting upon is not usually complied with. A great many things are left open for consideration and decision on a future day; but consideration and alteration do seriously interfere with the efficiency and rapidity of the work. There is one change which has been made in the Admiralty which I regret, so far as the Admiralty itself is concerned, and that is the withdrawal of Mr. Hamilton from the post of Secretary. I had the responsibility of bringing Mr. Hamilton to the Admiralty, and the appointment is one which I never regretted. I believe he was a most efficient servant in every sense of the word, and I cannot doubt he will prove to be a great loss to the Admiralty, however ably his Successor may discharge the duties. I have no doubt he is well placed in his more important duties—if they can be more important—and I can only congratulate the Government of Ireland in having obtained the services of so efficient an officer.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sure every Member of the Committee who was present when the noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox) spoke, listened with the greatest interest to his speech; and I only regret, with regard to that speech, that the House was so empty, and that, therefore, the greater number of Members who are now here had not the advantage of hearing the noble Lord's remarks. The noble Lord, in a most able and temperate manner, urged on the Committee the strong view he entertains that the present Administration at the Admiralty are not doing enough for the maintenance of the Navy. That, in one sentence, was the gist of his remarks. Although it is almost a commonplace, yet I wish to say, in the clearest and most unreserved terms, that the Government accept, as the basis of the naval policy, the principle that our Naval superiority must be upheld. That is a doctrine which may be asserted and acted upon in this country without, in the least degree, arousing jealousy on the part of any other nation, because it is a doctrine justified and required by circumstances in our position from which most other nations are free. Our scattered Colonial possessions; the vast amount of our maritime commerce; the preponderating share we have in the carrying trade of the world; the large extent to which we are dependent on foreign supplies—all these considerations, apart from the immediate defence of our coasts, require that we should have no rival on the sea. No Administration would deserve or receive the confidence of either side of this House, which neglected or did not fully realize this necessity; and, therefore, so far as the noble Lord and any other hon. Members who have addressed the Committee, have been urging on the attention of Parliament this necessity, I have nothing on the part of the Admiralty to express but agreement with them. But where we part company is when they say that our proposals are inadequate. Much has been said, and will be said, on this subject, expressive, I will not say of panic, because I have no desire to attribute so unreasonable a feeling to anyone, but of extreme anxiety on account of the active shipbuilding policy of France. Other nations have been mentioned; but, after all, it is upon a comparison with France that the great bulk of the arguments we have heard this evening have been founded. It is, of course, true that when we use the words "superiority" or "rivalry" a certain comparison is involved, and the calculation of our naval strength naturally rests upon an account taken of the naval strength of other Powers; but, for my part, I am not prepared to go into a detailed comparison between the ships of the two countries, partly because it is delicate ground to tread upon, and partly, also, because when we come to individual ships, or even classes of ships, we come to subjects which are really very much matter of conjecture. We have heard to-night one classification given by my hon. Friend (Sir Thomas Brassey), who is one of the great and acknowledged authorities on the subject, and who possesses a power of acquiring and communicating information on the subject which few people possess; and we have heard from the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price) another classification. We have heard the right hon. and gallant Admiral (Sir John Hay) find fault with my hon. Friend's classification in some respects; and, therefore, I think that is a mode of dealing with the subject which is rather to be avoided by anyone who is unable to speak with the great personal authority of my hon. Friend and Colleague. I also wish especially to avoid the use of the very doubtful word "obsolete." When we talk of one ship being obsolete, and of another not being obsolete, it appears to me that these phrases are often used in a double sense. An obsolete ship may mean a ship which is perfectly done and useless, or it may merely mean a ship of a type which is not to be reproduced; and, therefore, as there is ambiguity in the phrase, I am not enamoured of it. I, therefore, prefer to direct the attention of the Committee for a few moments, as so much has been said as to the condition of France and her naval preparations, to the broad facts which have led to the recent development of shipbuilding in that country. It is somewhat more than 10 years ago since the people of France awoke to the fact that their naval force had not been kept up to what they considered the proper level. The noble Lord spoke of France at that time having no Navy at all; but, as a matter of fact, it had a very substantial Navy, although it had been neglected for some years. To make up for this neglect, the people of France resolved, for some years to come, to devote large sums of money to restoring their Fleet to what they believed to be its proper position. That was a most patriotic and natural decision on their part, and they have steadily and gradually carried their purpose into effect. In order to show what was the state of things between the two countries then as compared with the present day, I must, of course, make a comparison; but I propose to make the comparison in bulk rather than in detail, in order to avoid dispute as to particular ships. I propose to show the relative position of the two countries in 1872 and what it is at the present time; and I think if the Committee will favour me with their attention they will see that the figures I quote show at once the reason of the great increase in French shipbuilding, and, at the same time, prove that we still maintain that material superiority which I am sure every Member of this Committee thinks we ought to possess. In 1872 the French Navy possessed, in available iron-clad ships, a total displacement of 155,070 tons, while we possessed a total displacement of 269,416 tons. But of these 155,070 tons of French ships only 23,150 tons were iron ships, while of our 269,416 tons 191,056 tons were iron ships. The rest in each case were wooden ships. At that time there were building in France nine armoured vessels—I am talking of armoured vessels only—one of iron, and eight of wood; while we had altogether abandoned wooden ships, and were constructing eight vessels of iron. The Committee will, therefore, see that 11 years ago France, while possessing a formidable number of wooden iron-clads, had fallen altogether behind in the construction of iron-armoured ships. Now, an armoured ship, whose framework is of wood, may be an efficient engine of war, but it soon deteriorates, and has a much shorter life than a ship of iron. Indeed, the French authorities themselves have decided, and their opinion is published in the Report of the Commission of 1880, that the extreme limit for the normal existence of a wooden iron-clad is only 16 years. Passing from that time to the present day, how do we stand now? Taking, as before, the whole bulk or mass of iron-clad tonnage, without regard to individual vessels, no doubt many of which are very poor and inefficient, I find that in 1883 France has in available ships 71,500 tons of iron or steel vessels, and 170,560 tons of wooden vessels, while we have 331,910 tons of steel and iron vessels, and only 14,000 tons of wooden ships. It is thus evident that we have a great preponderance in the more enduring material; but this difference will be to some extent reduced by the tonnage now in the course of construction in the two countries respectively, which, consisting entirely of iron or steel ships, is 150,000 tons for France, and about 100,000 tons for England. These figures may have varying values attributed to them. The deduction to be drawn will depend on the estimate we set upon many of the French wooden ships on the one hand, and on our earlier iron-clads on the other; but the figures show, at all events, the reason why the French have been making these great strides in adding to their Navy. The reason is that they are engaged in the process of exchanging their wooden ships for iron ships; they, in fact, speak of it themselves as the "transformation" of their Navy. The noble Lord said France was aiming at pre-eminence over us; but, for my part, I do not believe that at all. I believe the object of France is most reasonable and patriotic, and one which we can regard without any alarm. She finds that the great bulk of her Fleet is composed of wooden ships of short lives, some of which are already, probably, in a material sense defunct, although they may not be absolutely condemned; and she wishes to substitute for them the more modern style of steel ships, which are more enduring, and more permanent and effective. I cannot see in these figures, showing, as they do, this gradual conversion from wooden ships to iron ships of longer existence, any ground for extreme alarm; while, at the same time, I do think that as France is at this moment adding so largely to her Fleet the newest kind of iron-clad ships of a formidable nature, we have been fully justified in making the material additions which the present Administration has made in the last three or four years to the naval strength of this country. That is all I have to say with regard to this rivalry comparison between England and France. The French Government and the French people look upon us with no particular individual jealousy, and have no desire to outstrip us; and we, on the other hand, may very well sympathize with the great patriotic efforts they have been making to establish their Navy on a proper footing. But we, as I say, have been making additions gradually and steadily to the amount of armoured iron-clad ships, for which we have asked money from Parliament. Others, no doubt, who are great authorities, and whose opinions we shall always wish to take into account, have urged us to take another course. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir John Hay) takes a very different view of the French Navy; and he has, in a letter to *The Times*, gone so far as to recommend that we should immediately, "as a commencement"—to use his own words—begin the construction of no less than 11 first class iron-clads at the various private Yards throughout the country. That is to say, according to my right hon. and gallant Friend, we are to embark in the expenditure of £5,000,000 or £5,500,000 on one particular type of vessels, or, at any rate, vessels of one particular size. [SIR JOHN HAY: Only for one year.] Well, they were to be begun as a commencement. If we are to make great strides of that kind in expenditure, I am not by any means sure that that is the direction in which we should exert ourselves. There are many other things which we might do. There are fast small torpedo vessels, or protected vessels of the *Severn* class, which might be most useful auxiliaries to the iron-clads; and if we indulge in any such expenditure as the right hon. and gallant Gentleman recommends, I think part of it might be devoted to the construction of such vessels. Let me repeat the figures I quoted in introducing the Estimates, showing the progress which has taken place in armoured shipbuilding in recent years. These figures were called in question by the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox); but I told him at the time that I did not know where the figures he contrasted with them were taken from. I have taken these figures from the Expense Accounts, and, including the tons built in the Dockyards and by contract, I find they stand thus—In 1878-9 there were actually built 8,430 tons; in 1879-80, 7,427 tons; in 1880-1, 9,235 tons; in 1881-2, 10,748 tons; in 1882-3, 11,466 tons; and this year, 1883-4, we propose to build 12,281 tons. But with regard to the alarm with which certain hon. Gentlemen view the immediate future—because it is in 1884-5 that the French programme is to be completed—I am bound to say that, so far as the present Administration is concerned, nothing that they could have done would have been of any avail with regard to that event. No ship which the present Administration could have laid down since they came into Office could have been ready in 1885; so that, I think, I am justified in supposing that my right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith), who perfectly well knew what the French programme for 1885 was—and the programme was a good deal beyond the actual performance—and who was in Office at the time when it was possible to lay down ships in anticipation of it, but who did not do so—I think I am perfectly justified in saying that he takes very much the same view as I do of this question. I have said that we have built in past years a certain number of tons, and I have spoken of our intention this year again to build a certain number of tons; and, so far from being astonished, I am not at all surprised—it is what I expected—that the noble Lord and other hon. Members have taken exception to this calculation. The fact is, that to those who study this subject, the question, "What is a ton?" is almost as difficult to answer as the celebrated question, "What is a pound?" Everybody knows what the displacement of a vessel is, and therefore, for my part, I am always more comfortable, in dealing with this question of tonnage, when I speak of a vessel's displacement, because in it you have a completed result turned out for a purpose; but if hon. Members want to know what is meant by a ton in the Navy Estimates, as contrasted with a ton of displacement, I must ask them to turn to page 190, at the foot of which they will find a luminous note, which I hope will give them some useful information. The note runs—

> "The tonnage given in this abstract is the weight of hull complete. A ship's state of advancement in building is measured in the following manner:—Each man is assumed to add to the ship for every day's work an equal amount of tonnage, whether at the commencement or the completion. In other words, for every pound spent in labour there will be a certain fraction of tonnage added to the ship. This fraction is arrived at by dividing the weight of hull in tons by the total cost of labour in pounds."

That is a statement of the way tonnage is made up, which, I confess, it may be somewhat difficult for hon. Members to follow. The fact is, that in calculating the progress of a ship regard must be had to two things—namely, the weight of the hull—not the total displacement—on the one hand, and the ultimate cost of the ship on the other hand. It is by calculating the proportion between these things that we can arrive at what a unit of tonnage is. The noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) alleged as a fact that during several years a great many tons had been lost in the shipbuilding of the Navy; and I have seen articles in newspapers almost implying that some ingenious and light-handed gentleman had run away with thousands of tons of iron ships. The plain fact is, that we form the expectatian of building a certain definite number of tons in the course of a year—and by tons I mean a certain proportion of the ultimate cost of the vessel—but it is often found that, with a certain amount of labour expended on it, a ship does not progress so far as we had hoped it would, and that, in fact, a "ton" has proved in this case a more costly unit than we expected. At the end of the year, when we thought we had built 1,000 tons, we had only built, perhaps, 700 "tons," and, accordingly, we have had to begin the following year as if our original estimate had been for only 700 tons, because only that proportion of the ultimate cost of the ship has been achieved, although the labour and money actually expended has not fallen behind our original estimate. Again, in the Expenses Account a further calculation, based upon the further progress of the ship, may again increase the value of a ton; and, in fact, if we did not make these corrections in the value of the unit, we might go on until in a vessel of 5,000 tons we apparently built 6,000 or 7,000 tons. To those who hear of it for the first time this may appear a rather ridiculous mode of computation. There is no doubt that a ton, as we speak of it, is an artificial unit altogether. It may, perhaps, be thought that it would be desirable to get rid of the question of "tons" altogether, and to base our calculations and Estimates simply on the ultimate cost of the hull of the ship. I would, however, observe that the system of calculating by the tons' weight built, computed on the principle I have described, has existed in the Admiralty for many years, and therefore has the advantage of forming a perfectly fair mode of comparison with past years. Again, if we took the fraction of the ultimate cost, as is done by our neighbours across the Channel, I am afraid we should still not escape from the awkwardness of the position, because as the cost increases so the value of the unit is increased; and just as we have apparently to build more "tons" than the ship contains, so if we go back over the French Estimates, which are based on "hundredths," we shall find that their ships are often made up of more than 100 hundredths. This is the explanation that I think it right to give in answer to some very strong remarks made by the noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox) as to the apparent loss of tonnage during a course of years. Complaint has been made by my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) as to the retardation of ships. I have just said that the French sometimes find themselves in the same difficulty as ourselves—that they find they have had to build more than a ship before they get it finished. When one suffers from a misfortune, perhaps the thing that gives one the greatest solace is to find that other people suffer in the same way; and we can derive this kind of comfort from the fact that the French complain of the very evils of which my right hon. Friend opposite has so justly complained to-night. So far from advancing or exceeding their programme, they are falling behind every year in spite of all their efforts. In fact, on a recent occasion, so disheartening in this respect were the statements made in the French Chamber by the Minister representing the Marine Department, that one of the Deputies exclaimed—"*On a fait machine en arrière!*"—he complained that progress had actually been made backwards. My right hon. Friend has asked me about some ships which he mentioned, and inquired what is the cause of their delay. I wish to set myself right in one respect. The allegation has been attributed to me that some of our ships have been delayed for the guns. I never meant to convey that impression. I never meant to say that ships were delayed in consequence of waiting for the manufacture of guns. What they have been waiting for is the design of the guns—a much more important matter. If we know what the size and weight, and what are termed the ballistics, of the gun are to be, we can go on building the ship up to the last moment. The non-reception of the actual gun is a matter which would cause comparatively small delay. What causes delay in building the ship is that the guns which are ultimately to be put in it are not even designed. Under such circumstances it is quite impossible to know up to what size to build, and what amount of magazine accommodation must be provided. That was so in the case of the *Ajax* and *Agamemnon*, for instance. I will not go through all the circumstances which have caused delay in the case of those vessels; but, in 1878, the possible use of a newer type of 38-ton gun stopped work on the turrets and citadel deck. It was finally decided to adopt iron armour for the citadel, and to keep the 38-ton muzzle-loader; but, after experiments, the powder charge was raised. It was further decided to carry an auxiliary armament of 6-inch guns. The settlement of the pattern of the guns occupied considerably more than 12 months, and, in addition to this, the novel torpedo arrangements occupied some time in working out. I think I have said enough to show how the delay arose; but I do not wish to imply that there has been undue delay in the manufacture of guns. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) knows that we are engaged in the great work of re-arming the Navy, or preparing for the arming of the Navy with breech-loading guns. Not much progress in that direction had been made when the present Government came into power, and I do not think it can be said that we lost much time in setting to work after we took Office. A short experience convinced the Secretary of State for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty that it was desirable to have an Ordnance Committee to make sure of the work we were doing. That caused a certain amount of delay; but, as a result of its inquiries, we are more confident in what we are undertaking, and we are gradually feeling our way towards a satisfactory solution of the many problems referred to that Committee. With regard to guns for particular ships, I am glad to tell my right hon. Friend that the *Conqueror's* guns are ready—that is to say, two 43-ton guns are ready for delivery, and others will be ready in a short time. The *Rupert* has retained her old gun, and of 18-ton guns there are seven which are fast nearing completion. The 63-ton gun, it is expected, will be ready for the *Admiral* when they are completed. I am glad to say we now know the particulars of the 63-ton gun, and, therefore, we can proceed with perfect confidence with the ships in which it is to be placed. I must again say that when we hear of delay in regard to guns, and when we hear of the guns which the French have as being so much better than ours, we derive a sort of grim satisfaction from reading, as I have done, in a very recent work of high authority, that the French complain exactly as we do, and are constantly asking—"When will the guns be ready?" In speaking of guns, I am disappointed to find that neither the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox), nor the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith), nor the gallant Admiral (Sir John Hay) gives us any credit for our decision to place two 100-ton guns in one of the new ships. We have been frequently told of the French 100-ton guns, although their construction has been abandoned; and we have been asked why we did not provide guns of this size. I think that now the Government have made up their mind to have them, it might have been taken into account in this discussion.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he had understood they were not yet made.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN. The gun will be the Elswick 100-ton gun, such as was used recently at Spezia, but of slightly improved design. The noble Lord made some observations, in which, to a certain extent, I agree, in deprecation of the custom, if it could be said to have formed itself into a custom, of the Government, in cases of emergency, going into the market and buying any ships that could be found, without much regard being had to their quality. The noble Lord also blamed the Government of Mr. Gladstone in 1870 for rushing into the building of certain vessels for coast defence which have been denounced as unseaworthy. The construction of those ships, however, was not a leap in the dark, because similar vessels had already been tried and found successful for the purpose for which they were intended. We are now engaged in placing on the *Hecate* a superstructure to remedy the defects that have been pointed out. That work is being done by contract, and it is expected it will be finished in the course of the summer. The cost will not, I hope, very much exceed £10,000, instead of £20,000, the sum mentioned by the noble Lord, and the same course will be followed with the other three vessels if the improvement on the *Hecate* justifies it. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Devonport (Captain Price) made considerable allusion to a speech made by the Earl of Northbrook in "another place." I am perfectly certain that everything my noble Friend stated would be taken from accurate and authentic sources. It is true we have eight ships in the course of construction, and I do not know how many ships Lord Northbrook spoke of. In regard to the men in the Dockyards, Lord Northbrook stated in his speech that it was quite true that the French had a larger number of men in their Dockyards than we had in ours; but the noble Earl's contention, and the contention of many who had studied the labour question, was, that the English labourer did more work in the end than the French labourer, and that, therefore, it was quite possible that the difference in the numbers might not represent anything like an equal difference in the output of work. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) spoke of the growth of the expenditure under many of the Votes. The Government are doing all they can, and they flatter themselves that this year they have been successful, in keeping down the expenditure under many of the Votes. With regard to Vote 1, to which the right hon. Gentleman particularly alluded, it is the case that although the numbers have been reduced, the expenditure has increased, or, at any rate, remained the same. This arises, I believe, from two causes—first of all, from the increases of pay and advantages which are necessarily given to the different men of the Service; and also from the greater tendency there was to introduce a large number of a more expensive kind of men into the Service. This year, for example, there is an increase in the cost, although a decrease in the number, of petty officers and seamen generally, and it is explained in this way—that greater provision has had to be made for chief and other engine-room artificers, for skilled artificers in iron-clad ships, and for the petty officers employed in the gunnery and torpedo service. My hon. Friend the Member for Plymouth (Mr. Macliver), who was interrupted in his observations, alluded to my promise last year to see some of the workmen who had represented their grievance to the Board of Admiralty. My hon. Friend (Sir Thomas Brassey) and myself have visited the principal Dockyards, and we have, with great satisfaction and pleasure to ourselves, had interviews with the workmen. We were greatly struck with the pleasant and kindly and reasonable tone of those whom we met, and we will take good care that all the recommendations they made shall not be lost sight of.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Jenkins.*)

Mr. A. F. EGERTON said, he had no wish to prolong the debate; but, before the Motion to report Progress was put, he desired some explanation of Vote 2.

Mr. GORST rose to Order. He wished to know whether, by the Rule which was supported by both the Front Benches, an hon. Member, speaking on a Motion to report Progress, must not confine himself strictly to the Motion to report Progress?

The CHAIRMAN said, there was no doubt that by a strict interpretation of the Rule that was so. He merely understood the hon. Member to ask a question.

Mr. GORST: That is out of Order.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he was afraid they must not discuss anything relating to the Vote. The Committee had now been engaged in this discussion for some time, and he thought it would be willing, if necessary, to sit up some time longer in order to complete the matter. It would be extremely inconvenient to report Progress.

Mr. GORST said, the noble Marquess was probably not aware that although the Committee had been engaged for some time in an extremely interesting discussion, it had not at all discussed the Vote before the Committee. He was quite certain that no one who had listened to the speeches which had been made that evening would have the slightest idea that they were debating the Vote for the Victualling and Clothing of the Seamen and Marines of the Royal Navy; they had been talking about the ships, and they had never mentioned the Seamen or Marines. Why he thought they ought to report Progress was that some opportunity ought to be given to hon. Members, who wished to do so, to discuss questions affecting the Seamen and Marines of the Royal Navy. When Vote 1—the Vote on which questions affecting Seamen and Marines ought properly to be raised—was brought on, it was impossible to discuss it at length, because the Government found it necessary to get the Vote in order to carry on the Administration. They were obliged, in order to assist the Government, to abstain from discussion; but it was understood that the questions which they were unable to raise upon the Vote for the pay of the Seamen and Marines should be raised upon the Vote for Clothing and Victuals. It seemed to him that the discussion about guns might very property have been raised upon Vote 6 or Vote 10; certainly, it appeared to his untutored mind out of place on Vote 2. It was because the Committee had not discussed the Vote at all that he should support the Motion to report Progress.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he agreed with his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Gorst) that the discussion, which had been most interesting so far, might, with great propriety, have been taken on Vote 6. He should be borne out by the Committee when he said it had always been understood, and he hoped it would be, that under Vote 6 there was an opportunity afforded to the Committee to review the general Naval Policy of the Government. This year, in order to promote the convenience of the Government, it was arranged that upon Vote 2 there should be an opportunity afforded to the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) to deliver the speech which had proved so interesting to them all. They had not discussed Vote 2, and if they had had an opportunity he should have been prepared to show that there was a very large increase of expenditure on the Vote which deserved the careful consideration of the Committee. If the Government said they were obliged to have this Vote that night, he should not resist them; but if they were to discuss Votes in Committee of Supply, they must not be asked to take a Vote on trust at 1 o'clock in the morning. He had been sitting on a Grand Committee all day; and he must remind the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) that it was understood, when the New Rules were adopted, that there would be an earlier reporting of

Progress. He should regret if they were not allowed to go into the merits of the Vote in such a way as might, perhaps, lead to some useful examination of its various items.

Captain PRICE said, that in consequence of the New Rules, the noble Lord (Lord Henry Lennox) had no opportunity of making a Motion on going into Committee, as used to be the custom in years gone by. This was a good illustration of the awkwardness of the Rules, that they were bound on this question of Navy Estimates to endeavour, as far as they could, to cover the whole ground in one Vote. It would be much better, if these Rules were still to remain in force, that such questions as had been raised by his noble Friend should in future be raised on Vote 10, so that they could have Vote 6 for the discussion of Dockyard matters, which always occupied some time. The general discussion on naval affairs should be taken on Votes 1 and 2.

Mr. GOURLEY said, he hoped the Government would agree to report Progress. The Members who had spoken had been, either in the past or present, officially connected with the Navy, or connected with it indirectly. Only one Member who was unconnected with the Navy—a Member who was interested in the Dockyards—had risen to address the Committee on the important matter raised by the noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox), and as to Vote 2, no one had had an opportunity of addressing the House on it at all. He thought it was unreasonable of the Government to ask them to go on at that hour, because there were several hon. Members outside the official and ex-official Benches who wished to speak. The official and ex-official Members had had it all their own way that night, and the outside Members had not had the slightest opportunity of expressing their opinions. It was all very well for the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith) to smile at this, because, as an ex-Minister, he had the eye of the Speaker and the Chairman. The right hon. Gentleman had changed his opinions on the subject of guns, or his opinions had advanced so rapidly since he had become ex-First Lord of the Admiralty——

The CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Member must confine himself to the question before the Committee.

Mr. GOURLEY said, that if he was out of Order, of course he must submit to the ruling of the Chairman. All he was going to say was that they heard very little about breech-loading guns from the right hon. Gentleman when he was First Lord of the Admiralty, and had power to deal with the question. He hoped the Government would respond to the appeal made by the hon. Member for Penrhyn, and agree to Progress being reported.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it seemed to him a little unfair, on the part of the Government, to ask them to agree to the Vote, seeing that although they had been in Committee some hours they had not discussed the Vote. He should be inclined, under other circumstances, to oppose the granting of this Vote without full discussion on it. There was this reason why the House should have further time for discussing it, and that was that under it there had been most monstrous frauds committed by Admiralty officials. The discovery of these frauds showed that the Admiralty system of supervision was so futile and useless that some very stringent regulations were called for. Ample explanation ought to be required at the hands of the Admiralty officials. An adequate explanation of these frauds, and of the way in which the Admiralty accounts had been audited, could not be given at that hour of the morning; therefore, on these and other grounds, he thought the Government had no right to complain of the treatment they were receiving. It would not be unfair, he considered, for the Committee to agree to report Progress.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that if it were the desire of the Committee to discuss the *personnel* of the Navy on this Vote, the Government would not oppose the Motion to report Progress. If they agreed to the proposal for reporting Progress, it would be on the understanding that the general discussion was closed, and that when the debate was resumed it would be upon either the *personnel* of the Navy or matters directly affecting the Vote. He had understood the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Gourley) to say that he wished to address the Committee further on the subject which had been under discussion that evening. If that was so, he hoped the hon. Member would go on with his observations, and that he would be followed by others until the question was closed.

MR. JENKINS said, he was anxious to speak on the general question, and as he had understood that others also desired to do so, he had moved to report Progress. If it was understood that they would be able to speak on the general policy of the shipbuilding on Vote 61, he should be glad.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that on that Vote the general subject of shipbuilding could be discussed, but not the *personnel* of the Navy.

MR. JENKINS said, he should be glad to withdraw his Motion. ["No, no!"]

MR. BIGGAR objected to the Motion being withdrawn. He held it was most unreasonable at 1 o'clock in the morning to pass a Vote for £1,000,000 sterling for a purpose which had never been discussed in the most remote degree.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (UNREFORMED) BILL.—[BILL 156.]

(*Sir Charles Dilke, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Hibbert.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause (Saving for Over,) — (*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time, and *added.*

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, an hon. and learned Member (Mr. Inderwick) had a saving clause applying to Winchelsea, on the Paper. He Mr. Guest) would ask the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) if he would not consider the desirability of adding a Saving Clause in the case of the borough of Corfe Castle, after the Winchelsea Clause? It would be satisfactory to the people of the borough if this were done. Corfe Castle was in the First Schedule.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, this point would be dealt with later on.

Clause 3 (Future abolition of Corporations, except as provided by new charter or by scheme under 40 & 41 Vict. c. 69).

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 38, after the word "managed," to insert the words "dealt with, leased, alienated."—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he could not agree to the insertion of the words, as they would give power to make away with property altogether. It was undesirable to put these words in the Bill, as the clauses by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), which had been accepted, gave ample power to deal with property so far as the House would wish it to be dealt with.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. TATTON EGERTON said, he had an Amendment to Schedule 2, to leave out the name of the Altrincham Corporation from the list of those to whom the Act was to apply. He had, however, consulted with the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) on the subject, and, as a result, he would not proceed with the Amendment.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said, he had an Amendment, to leave out Clause 16, and insert a New Clause in its place. The clause he wished to strike out was as follows:—

> "This Act shall not be deemed to apply to the lords, bailiff, and jurats of Romney Marsh, but only to the Corporation of Romney Marsh mentioned in the First Schedule of this Act."

Amendment proposed,

In page 11, leave out Clause 16, and insert the following Clause:—"Whereas it appears from the Report of the Commissioners of 1876 that doubt exists as to whether the Corporations mentioned in Part II. of the First Schedule to this Act, as existing or reputed to exist in Romney Marsh, are Municipal Corporations, and it is expedient to make such provision respecting the same, as hereinafter contained. Be it therefore Enacted as follows:—

The reputed Corporation of the bailiff, jurats, and commonalty of Romney Marsh, and the reputed Corporation of the lords, bailiff, and jurats of Romney Marsh, shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, continue to exist, and to elect officers, and to hold the property vested in them, but any such Corporation shall not have or exercise any municipal rights or powers, and all property vested in such Corporation shall continue to be applicable for the purposes to which it is at present by law applicable or otherwise for the benefit of the inhabitants of the said places."—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE was understood to say that no objection would be taken to the Amendment, after other Amendments which came before it were disposed of.

MR. INDERWICK said, he wished to move the insertion of a New Clause.

Amendment proposed,

In page 10, after Clause 13, to insert the following Clause:—

(Saving as to Winchelsea.)

"In the event of a charter not being granted to Winchelsea, the property of the Corporation of Winchelsea shall continue to be held, managed, and enjoyed as heretofore, in like manner as if a scheme of the Charity Commissioners, in pursuance of this Act, had provided for such holding, management, and enjoyment, and for that purpose the Corporation of Winchelsea shall continue undissolved in like manner as if it were constituted by the said scheme, and, notwithstanding anything in this Act, Winchelsea shall continue to be entitled an ancient town of the Cinque Ports."—(*Mr. Inderwick.*)

Clause *brought up*, and read the first and second time, and *added.*

Clause (Corporation of Romney Marsh,—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time, and *added.*

Clause (Saving Havering-atte-Bower,) —(*Colonel Makins,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time, and *added.*

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he should like now to ask whether Corfe Castle could not be put in the same position as Winchelsea? Corfe Castle had the same privileges as Winchelsea, and it ought to be allowed to keep its Charter, if not the jurisdiction and privileges granted by that Charter. He did not know whether the right hon. Baronet could not see his way to granting his request.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not think he could see his way to the exemption of Corfe Castle from the provisions of the Bill. The licensing jurisdiction in Corfe was in the hands of a body who were really self-elected, and it formed a great difficulty in the way of dealing with the licensing question intelligently throughout the country if they had bodies of this kind self-elected. In the case of Wareham, which the hon. Member also represented, the same state of things existed; but that was a larger place, and the inhabitants might desire to see a Corporation in it. Corfe Castle was a very small place, and it would not be possible there, he feared, to keep up a separate jurisdiction of this kind. The privileges of the Cinque Ports were different to those of Corfe Castle. Corfe Castle, no doubt, had certain maritime privileges; but, if he remembered rightly, a gentleman who was a large landowner in the neighbourhood nominated the Mayor, and the Mayor and Deputy Mayor acted as magistrates.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, they could do with Corfe Castle what they had done with Winchelsea in the matter of licensing.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Winchelsea has given up its licensing powers.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, that was so, and he asked that Corfe Castle should give up its licensing powers also, and be treated in other respects similarly to Winchelsea. Let it hold the old privileges granted to it in its Charter. It seemed to him that whilst it was in the postion of the Cinque Ports, Corfe Castle should have the same privileges as Winchelsea. If he might, at this stage, allude to Wareham, the inhabitants of that place had always been anxious to come under the Municipal Corporations Act; but what they felt was, that if they did they would have to have a new Corporation, which would cost them a certain sum of money. Would the right hon. Baronet assure the House that all these places would not be obliged to have a new Corporation if they did not desire it? They were not anxious to have new Charters; but if they were to be compelled to have them, would they not be given to them free of expense? There had been no complaint in Wareham against the way in which municipal business had been carried on. The Commissioners of 1876 reported that there was no complaint made of the Corporation. He hoped to hear that Corfe Castle would be treated in the same way as Winchelsea, and that if a new Charter was given to Wareham it would be given free of cost.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. Member to move an Amendment?

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Then there is no Question before the House.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST: Then I would move to leave out Wareham from the First Schedule.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member second the Motion?

An hon. MEMBER formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 15, line 8, to leave out the words "Wareham, the mayor, capital burgesses, and assistants of the borough of Wareham."—(*Mr. Montague Guest.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member stated that there was no complaint made as to the borough of Wareham. There had been considerable difficulty in the matter of licensing; but it was not necessary to discuss that, as the hon. Member was willing to give up the licensing jurisdiction. It would be much easier to come to a conclusion now that the licensing question had disappeared. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would carefully consider the matter with the hon. Member; and if the hon. Member could induce him to agree with him he would do what he could to meet his wishes when the Bill got into the House of Lords. To strike out these words from the Schedule, however, would not carry out the hon. Member's views.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he should not persist in his Amendment.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS wished the right hon. Baronet to tell them, on the Schedules, what boroughs would get new Charters.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wareham. Did I understand him to say that he would withdraw it?

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST: Yes, in consideration of what the right hon. Baronet has said I will withdraw the Amendment. Will he assure me there is some hope or probability that the new Charter will be granted to Wareham free of cost?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had not offered that, but he would consider the point. The cost of the inquiry was not charged on the borough, but the cost that the hon. Member alluded to was the actual cost of the Charter.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said, he wished to refer to two answers the right hon. Baronet had given the other evening, one having reference to the places he proposed to grant new Charters to, and the other—on which probably he (Mr. Akers-Douglas) had misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman—relating to the granting of Chartars free of charge. From what he had since gathered, the right hon. Gentleman, he thought, had meant that the legal inquiry would be granted free of cost. Surely it would be hard on those places in the First Schedule which were to be allowed to retain their Corporations if their Charters were taken away from them by this Bill, and they were then told they must pay 100 guineas apiece for fresh ones. If it was necessary to take away municipal powers from these Corporations, fresh powers should be granted by the Bill, thus saving the fees that the Corporations would otherwise be called on to pay. Perhaps powers of the kind to which he referred could not be inserted at this stage. The right hon. Baronet might give them his views on the subject; and if it could not be done now, it might be possible later on to alter the measure in this way.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there was no Question before the House on which he could speak. He did not wish to evade the point, however, and would, therefore, ask if on any formal Question he could enter into the subject raised?

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS said, that to give the right hon. Baronet an opportunity of replying, he would move to strike out New Romney from the Schedule.

Amendment proposed, in page 14, line 34, to leave out the words "New Romney."—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'New Romney' stand part of the Bill."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: That comes before Wareham, the Amendment with regard to which has been withdrawn.

MR. SIDNEY HERBERT said, the right hon. Baronet had already stated that the cost of the inquiry would not fall on the boroughs in many of these places. The right hon. Baronet would remember that on the concomitant Bill—the Money Bill—he had asked a question on this subject, and had been informed that there would be no objection to relieving the boroughs from this cost. It now appeared that there were two objections to the measure as it stood. The first was one he had not raised before, not wishing to detain the House—namely, that it would cost the country, even if it did not cost the boroughs, a certain amount of money. Any investigation that took place under the Bill would have to be paid for by the taxpayer, according to the statement of the right hon. Baronet; but a new question had now been raised as to the cost of the Charter being allowed to every borough which would have to undergo the inquiry and obtain a new Charter. There had been no direct answer given to the question which had been asked on the latter subject. It seemed hard that a great many of these boroughs—many of whom were averse to the Bill, and from a great many of whom they had heard nothing as to their opinions in regard to the Bill—should be called upon to hear an investigation, then have their old Charter changed for a new one, and be obliged to pay a fee of 100 guineas for it. It seemed to him unfair to do that; and he would ask hon. Members to remember that even if this fee was not to be paid by the Corporations themselves, a special Money Bill had been passed by the side of the present measure, which would have the effect of imposing it in the form of an extra tax on the British taxpayer.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, his hon. Friend who had just spoken was of opinion that he had not heard personally the views of the Corporations with regard to this Bill; but, as a matter of fact, he had heard very little else for some months. He could assure his hon. Friend that the costs of inquiry would be very small—they would not be so heavy as in the case of those places which desired Corporations for the first time. There would be an inquiry for fixing the number of Councillors, the boundaries, and the number of wards, the times of election and retirement, &c. There would also be an inquiry to prevent any conflict with the existing sanitary and school board authorities; and in all these respects it was desirable that a local inquiry should be held.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL remarked, that the right hon. Baronet proposed to destroy all Charters; going back for his purpose to the time of William the Conqueror, and putting the boroughs to the expense of obtaining new Charters, although the old ones would do. If that were really the intention of the Bill, he apprehended there would be some difficulty in "another place."

MR. SIDNEY HERBERT asked if the case of one of these Corporations could be met by a special Bill being brought in?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that would be the case, no doubt; but he thought it would not be hard to discover a better means of settlement.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he thought that the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 should be followed in the present case; because, instead of providing for the abolition of the Charters of the Corporations, and then conferring upon them a fresh Charter at considerable expense, it simply altered their constitution. He was at a loss to understand why that could not be done; and he thought it would be a very hard proceeding to abolish the Charters, unless they could insure that the Corporations could get fresh ones free of expense. The Corporations concerned had no property, and they did not want new Charters. They had licensing powers, and it was to these rights that he believed the right hon. Baronet objected. He hoped some assurance would be given that the Charters would be obtainable free of cost.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he was unable to add to the statements he had already made; but he trusted that from those his hon. Friend would be able clearly to understand the position of the Corporations with respect to costs.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill to be read the third time *Tomorrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter
before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 8th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister * (56).

Report—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (Limerick Waterworks) * (3); Pluralities Acts Amendment * (42).

SUNDAY OPENING OF NATIONAL MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES.

RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN, in rising to call the attention of the House to the question of the opening of Museums and Galleries on Sundays, and to move—

> "That, seeing the success which has attended the action of Her Majesty's Government in opening on Sundays the national museums and galleries in the suburban districts of London and in the city of Dublin, and whereas this House was last Session informed by Her Majesty's Government that no opposition to Sunday opening, so far as it had already gone, had come before them, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived for extending the policy of Sunday opening to all museums and galleries supported by national funds,"

said, that the subject was one which had been several times before their Lordships, and that, therefore, there was no necessity for him to enter into details with regard to it. If he did not enter at length into the question, he wished the House clearly to understand that he did not do so from any doubt as to the strength of the arguments which could be used in support of the proposition he had to lay before their Lordships. He merely took his present course because he saw no object in troubling the House with a twice-told tale. No doubt, the arguments used two years ago were fresh in their Lordships' minds; and he hoped that those arguments, although not then successful, had since germinated and would bear good fruit on the present occasion. He would confine himself to arguing three principal points — first, whether a large number of the working men of the Metropolis were anxious that a change in the law on this subject should be brought about; secondly, whether such a change in the law would give any large classes an opportunity of utilizing in a proper manner their Sunday leisure; and, thirdly, whether there would be very serious objection raised in any district against the opening of the Museums on Sunday in their neighbourhood. With regard to the two Amendments to his Motion which stood upon the Paper, he might say that he accepted the first—that of the noble Lord (Lord Stanley of Alderley) which proposed that the Museums should not be opened on Sunday until 2 o'clock in the afternoon—with great pleasure, as it undoubtedly supplied an omission in his Resolution, because he had not the slightest desire to interfere with the hours of religious service on Sunday. On the contrary, he believed that the adoption of his Resolution would increase the attendance at places of worship by elevating the general moral tone of the people. But the Amendment of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) he looked upon with very different feelings. In the first place, it was not an Amendment to his (the Earl of Dunraven's) Resolution at all, and he did not know whether it could be moved as such. The noble Earl did not propose to introduce, or add, or interpolate any words, but brought forward an altogether different proposition. He should have infinitely preferred that the noble Earl had met him with a distinct negative. Did the noble Earl think that the opening of Museums on week nights could be regarded in any sense as a substitute for the proposal contained in the Resolution? The working classes, and those for whom he asked this boon, were removed, many of them, great distances from Public Galleries and Museums, and after their return from their daily labour were much too tired both in mind and body to avail themselves of the so-called privilege offered them by the noble Earl and his Friends. He had received a great many letters bearing on this point, and in all of them the same remark was made. Practically speaking, to open Museums on week-day nights would, to his mind, be of no use at all. No one could expect a working man, after he had got home, washed and dressed himself, and had his supper, to leave his wife and family in order to visit a Museum two or three miles away. There was another reason, besides, why the proposal of the noble Earl should not be adopted, and that was that the authorities of the British Museum and other National Institutions would infinitely prefer to have such places opened on a Sunday afternoon instead of on week-day nights, and that mainly on account of their *employés*. As they all knew, a large number of working men were anxious for a change, such as he now suggested; and, in speaking of working men, he did not confine himself merely to the artizan classes. He included shop assistants, lawyers' clerks, and people of a similar class, who were employed during the entire day. No doubt, there were many people of the working classes who did not at all care for the proposed boon, who knew little about Museums, and cared just as little; and he had no doubt that many Petitions had been signed by persons of that stamp against the opening of Museums on Sundays. But he was confident that there was a large and growing number of the artizan classes who were exceedingly anxious that this boon should be conferred upon them. Within the last few days he had received resolutions in favour of his proposal from large numbers of working men's clubs and associations. Again, the opposition to the movement, in the House of Commons, although still very large, was diminishing, and public opinion, it might therefore be assumed, had undergone a considerable change in the same direction. It was true that there was a large majority in the House of Commons last Session against the Motion by Mr. Howard; but that was, to a great extent, due to a very vigorous speech delivered by Mr. Broadhurst, who spoke with all the authority of the working men on a subject of interest to the working men. But Mr. Broadhurst's authority to represent the working classes upon the point had been immediately challenged at a meeting of Metropolitan working men called to consider this question. The delegates present represented 46,000 people in round numbers, and associations containing 45,482 members sent delegates instructed to vote for Sunday opening, while 536 members sent delegates instructed to vote against it. The resolution passed was to this effect—

> "That we declare that those we represent strongly desire to see extended to London the policy of Sunday opening, which has proved such an unmixed good to our fellow-citizens and working men in Birmingham, Manchester, and other provincial towns."

That meeting was a very remarkable one, attended, as it was, by delegates sent to record the deliberately formed opinions of the majority of the members of the various trade organizations, and distinguished, as it was, by the very high tone adopted by the speakers, and by the strength and fervour of their views. He thought a meeting of that kind deserved to be taken into consideration, and he trusted their Lordships would give it the weight and consideration it deserved. In the name of common sense, why should not the artizans of London have the same benefits as those of Manchester and Birmingham? What was the difference between the character and circumstances of the two? The only difference was that, whereas in the Provincial towns the Institutions were in the hands of the municipal bodies, and the working men could make their opinions more rapidly felt, in the Metropolis the question of their being opened or closed depended on the action of Parliament, and the opinion of the working men on Parliament could not make itself so rapidly or easily felt. In this respect Parliament lagged behind the municipal bodies in having a true view of what was wanted for the welfare of the working man. From a view of all the circumstances of the case, he confidently maintained that the policy of Sunday opening had proved an unmixed blessing in those places where it had been adopted. None could know so well as the working classes themselves what was beneficial to them; and the deliberately formed opinion of the vast majority of the working men of London that Sunday opening had proved beneficial in Birmingham and Manchester was an assertion that ought not to be lightly contradicted or gainsaid. If the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) would carry his objection to its logical conclusions, he would bring in a Bill to close Kew Gardens, Hampton Court, and other places of that kind, that were open in the suburbs, and to close the Museums that were open in the Provincial towns, and then their Lordships would see what was the real and true strength of public opinion upon this question. Nor was this a new experiment. It was an experiment which had been tried in all Protestant countries on the Continent. It had been tried in America, and in our Colonies, and the result was pronounced to be good. It had been tried in a great many of our Provincial towns, and, so far as he could judge, the result was good there also. The Chief Constable of Birmingham, speaking of the Art Galleries there, said—

> "These places have been opened since 1872 with the greatest success. In my opinion, no such satisfactory results could have been achieved among the poorer classes of the town in weaning them from the public-houses. They are visited by thousands, and more orderly, quiet, and decently-dressed crowds are not to be seen anywhere."

Again, the Mayor of Manchester, and the

chief librarian of the chief public library in the same city, bore similar testimony as to the good results ensuing from the opening of the public libraries and the annual picture exhibition, the chief librarian, indeed, adding that the success of the experiment so fully justified their expectations as to silence all opposition. He submitted that opinions of that kind ought to have some weight in their Lordships' House. The next point he wished to mention was whether the working men would avail themselves of this privilege or not. He was aware it was often claimed that they cared nothing about it, and that where Institutions were open they did not go to visit them. That allegation was not, however, at all borne out by all the testimony of competent observers in the places where Museums and Art Galleries were open. On 11 Sundays of one year 62,000 people visited the Gallery of the Royal Institution at Manchester; the Birmingham Art Gallery was visited by 29,000 people on the Sundays of one year; between 10,000 and 11,000 had availed themselves of the kindness of the noble Duke (the Duke of Westminster), who opened the Gallery of Grosvenor House during the Sundays of two months; the Botanic Gardens at Dublin were visited by 156,000 people in one year; and those at Kew by over 411,000 people. He could multiply facts of that kind; but he thought he had sufficiently shown that there was a strong desire that Sunday opening should be extended to the Metropolis, that it was found where the privilege was accorded that the working classes had most greedily availed themselves of it, and that their being opened had caused no scandal, nor even occasion of complaint. In other words, he had shown that wherever the experiment had been tried it had proved successful. He was quite aware of the strong opposition to the change he proposed; but he ventured to say that that opposition was founded to a great extent on false assumptions and mis-statements which, although no doubt involuntary, were more or less misleading. Two or three days ago he received a leaflet from the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association, commenting on the delegate meeting to which he had alluded, and stating that the names of the delegates were counted twice over. That was not the case. A certain number of the members of those associations were affiliated to the London Trades' Council, and so were counted twice over; but the number was comparatively small, and not at all sufficient to warrant the statement that the numbers were counted twice over. He had not been able to quote the exact figures, and it had been impossible for him to find out the exact majority or minority that voted for sending the delegates to those various bodies. A letter appeared in *The Times* the other day, in which it was stated that the enormous number of the working class organizations—no less than 2,335, representing 480,725 members—had sent to the same Society against the opening of Museums on Sundays. It had been impossible here again to find out whether that statement was correct or not. As a matter of fact, he believed it to be full of mistakes. He wrote to the Association for the pamphlet which he was told contained all the information required; and the reply he received was that the pamphlet had not yet been issued, although it had been sent to the newspapers. In those circumstances, the House ought not to attach any importance to those statements. He had just received a letter from a working man, one of the delegates of the meeting of the London Trades' Congress, which contained more than 15,000 members, who stated that he was morally certain that there was not the number of trade organizations mentioned in the letter to *The Times* in the whole Metropolitan district, and that, even if there were, nothing like such a number as that given expressed the opinion it was stated they had done. He wished to point out also the way in which this information was received. The Society was asked months ago to ascertain opinions in the matter among the working classes, and they gave the result only the day before that on which this Motion was to be made. The issue was not placed fairly before the Societies. The question was not whether the Museums should be opened on week-day afternoons or not at all, but whether they should be opened on Sunday afternoons or week-day nights, and that was not put to the working men. A great deal too much was assumed also in the extraordinary way in which the question was put to them. It was stated in the resolution, for instance, that "it was undesirable that Parliament should further promote the employment of Sunday labour ; " but he contended that the employment of Sunday labour by the opening of Museums in the way he wished would be absolutely *nil*, or, at any rate, so infinitesimally small that to place the matter in that way before the public was to put it on an entirely false issue. The various organizations were written to, and the person who was asked to state whether he was in favour of Sunday opening was a requested to state whether he did so as private individual or as secretary speaking for the society ; but he (the Earl of Dunraven) had no means of testing the accuracy or representative character of the signatures. He had received one letter inclosing a copy of a resolution passed by a branch of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, and that resolution was a protest against the secretary having signed the document on behalf of the branch in opposition to the opening of the Museums as proposed, knowing, as he must have done, that the great majority of the branch were in favour of it. Doubtless there were other cases of the same kind, and if time were given for investigation he had no doubt that the figures which had been given representing the number of working men opposed to this movement would be brought down to very small proportions. In other respects the statements made against the movement were hasty and unreliable. A little while ago it was stated that the opening of the Art Gallery at Birmingham on Sundays had proved a complete failure, and that the attendance had fallen off. It was true the attendance fell off ; but there was nothing remarkable in the fact, bearing in mind that that Gallery was burnt down. Manchester had also been referred to in proof of the failure of the people to appreciate the opening of Museums on Sundays ; but in that city there was no Museum at all. Therefore, he asked their Lordships to form no opinion on the subject from the statements made by those societies. Numerous Petitions had been presented for and against this proposal, and he fancied that the majority of them were against it ; but he would ask their Lordships to consider whether it was right to balance Petitions for and against a proposal of this kind. It was easy to get up Petitions against it, for all those who had no feeling on the matter were willing to sign them ; but persons would not sign their names to any Petition in support of the proposal unless they were strongly in favour of it. It was not fair to balance Petitions for and against Sunday opening equally against each other, as though it were a question whether people should or should not be obliged to visit Museums. If his Petition were granted, no reluctant person need avail himself of the privilege. There was no compulsion in the proposal he was making. If people did not want to go to the Museums on Sundays they could stay away. All he asked was that those who were not satisfied with the Day of Rest as it now was should have an opportunity of spending a portion of it in that way which they believed to be most conducive to their own improvement and happiness. That was the opinion of thousands of the working people of this country. Their Lordships had always been solicitous of the interests of the people, and as an evidence of this he might point to the Bill which their Lordships recently passed to prevent the payment of wages in public-houses. He (the Earl of Dunraven) did not believe that this kind of legislation would make the working men temperate. Intemperance among the other classes was not removed by legislation ; it died out by men becoming more civilized. If Parliament would only give the artizans and workmen of England a chance of improvement and of healthy and reasonable recreation, if it would only remove the obstacles—of which this was one—which stood in their way, the result would be the same. The main argument against this proposal used to be that it would lead to a desecration of the Sabbath ; but this appeared to have been given up, and it was now said that if this proposal was adopted we should be in danger of losing Sunday as a day of rest. But he would ask their Lordships seriously to reflect whether that objection rested upon any solid ground. He believed that the objection was entirely groundless, for the working classes had not the smallest desire to work on the Sunday, and they would not now-a-days be made to do what they did not want. The whole course of legislation and the whole tendency and direction of the action of working men in recent years had been towards shorter hours and less labour. Would not common sense suggest that if more work was to be done in the week the first effect would be to do away with the Saturday half-holiday rather than to interfere with the Sunday? He had the greatest respect for the feelings which induced the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) to oppose him on that ground; but was not the noble Earl reasoning on facts which, though they might have existed 40 or 50 years ago, had no existence now? The argument of interference with the Sunday as a day of rest was, however, no longer the main objection, and the ground of opposition had been shifted to a certain extent. But at the bottom of all the opposition out-of-doors lay a strong Puritanical religious feeling—a feeling which he looked upon with the greatest respect, but which he believed had upon this subject been excited and aroused on false issues, and which did not represent the true and natural feeling of the people. He had received a circular the other day, which he certainly considered the most extraordinary document that he had ever seen in his life. He believed that he could challenge every statement in that circular, not by any abstruse reasoning, but by the merest common sense. The circular in question was sent by the Lord's Day Observance Society, and in it it was said, speaking of these Museums and Galleries, that—

> "To open them on the Lord's Day by authority would be an encouragement of things in direct rivalry to the public worship of Almighty God."

That was the most astounding assertion almost ever put into print. It asserted that the contemplation of the works of God, as collected in Museums of natural history, and of the noblest works of man in the shape of works of art, literature, and the like, was in direct rivalry with the worship of Almighty God. He thought that was a most monstrous assertion, and one which he did not suppose would be accepted by the right rev. Prelates. Then he found in another paragraph that the Committee urged that no such demand existed as would justify the assertion that the people wished for such openings; and in another paragraph he found that London would be deluged with the multitudes flocking to those Museums. He would like to know which of those statements was true, as they did not agree very well together. But the last paragraph was, perhaps, the most astounding of all. There it said that in Paris, Berlin, Florence, and other capitals the result had been the almost unbroken toil of the great majority of working men, and that in those capitals the state of morality was so much darker that illegitimacy, infanticide, suicide, and murder, existed in a much greater degree than in London, in proportion to the population. As a matter of fact, that was not true; but the astounding part of that assertion was that they were actually asked to believe that the contemplation of natural history specimens and good pictures, and the perusal of good literature, produced suicide, immorality, and murder. He did not mean to say that there were not pictures which might be capable of creating homicidal tendency as against the authors of them, or even pictures which might lead persons looking at them to think that suicide was preferable to a prolonged contemplation of them; but what he had read was a solemn statement to their Lordships and not an art criticism, and they were asked to believe that that was one of the results of opening Museums on Sundays. He merely mentioned those arguments because they were the arguments which were used out-of-doors, though he did not believe they would have any weight with their Lordships; and he asked them not to attach too much value to Petitions and opposition called into action by such extraordinary arguments as those. There was one other point to which he would refer, and that was the question of extra labour. That would be infinitesimally small. As a matter of fact, we had long since come to the conclusion that a certain amount of labour was allowable on Sundays, if it led to good results. If Parliament were to pass a Bill to suppress one out of the many newspapers which appeared on Monday morning, they would put an end to much more Sunday labour than would be incurred by the opening of Museums. Professor Dyer, of Kew Gardens, had said that the Gardens and Museums were generally thronged with visitors on Sundays, and that all that the attendants had to do was to give a little extra cleaning on Monday morning. Since he had come into the House, he had received a letter which suggested that if there was any difficulty about the labour on Sundays, a sufficient number of attendants could be obtained from religious communities which kept their Sabbath on a Saturday. There was nothing he would more deeply regret than to see Sunday labour largely increased, or to see the reverence for the Sunday abated or lessened one atom; and he believed that we ran a risk of seeing it lessened if the alteration he suggested was not made. The danger was in the Sabbath ceasing to be useful to us or a great benefit to the people. If this were the case, he feared they would see the reverence for the day greatly diminishing. Sunday was a day of great irksomeness to thousands of excellent people, and its irksomeness was chiefly experienced by men and women who were the most intelligent and who had most influence over their class. He greatly regretted also that anything like a shock should be given to religious feeling, but he did not believe that any such shock would be given by opening the Museums on Sunday. He should be very sorry to think that the religious sentiments of this country rested on such a very flimsy foundation. He merely asked their Lordships, in conclusion, to believe that the extra labour required would be infinitesimal; and he asked whether it was just to the taxpayers that they should be practically debarred from having any enjoyment or use out of the buildings for which they paid, and whether it was fair that the working men of London should labour under a great disadvantage, as compared with those in our other great Provincial cities? The Motion asked for nothing but justice to the working classes—justice which the Amendment to be moved by the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) would not grant. This was a boon greatly desired and most earnestly implored by many thousands of the most intelligent men and women, not only among working men and artizans, but among many other classes whose whole time was taken up in labour. He did not want to coerce anyone against his conscience, but only liberty for everyone to do as he pleased. There was no danger of their losing Sunday as a day of rest, but he would ask whether it was right, kind, or considerate to lay insuperable obstacles in the way of their fellow-countrymen who were anxious to raise themselves, and who could not do so until those obstacles were removed? They only desired to do that without harming anyone; and by so doing he thought an enormous improvement would be soon manifested in the whole tone of the national character, and an undoubted benefit would be conferred on all classes. The noble Earl concluded with the Motion which stood in his name.

VISCOUNT POWERSCOURT, in seconding the Motion, said, he thought it hardly necessary, after the able speech of the noble Earl, to say more than a few words on the question. There appeared to him to be two arguments commonly used against the Motion—the first, that it increased Sunday labour; the second was what he might call the thin end of the wedge. He was sorry to understand that many persons took the view that because Museums were opened, shops, theatres, and other places of amusement would be opened also. He could say that the working people certainly asked nothing of the kind. With regard to the question of Sunday labour, it must be obvious that a certain amount of labour was approved of at present. Much labour was expended on newspapers, much in the traffic of the streets and upon the railways in excursion and other trains. He was much struck by a remark of Mr. Powell with reference to excursion traffic when he said that he did not see why excursion trains should not take the country people into town to see the Museums there as well as the townspeople into the country. The working classes had made it clear that it was impossible for them, after the toil of the day, to visit those Institutions on weekday evenings. Various fishing villages were sending representatives to the Fisheries Exhibition. These poor people had only six days to remain there, and if the Museums were open to them on Sunday it would be a great boon to them and give them a chance they would never probably have again. He could testify to the number of visitors to the National Gallery of Dublin, of which he was a Governor. It amounted on the average to 700 every Sunday, and there was no doubt whatever that the privilege was highly appreciated. The fact indirectly was evidence in favour of the contention that, in refusing to permit the reading of books, the admiration of the highest products of human ingenuity, or the study of the wonders of nature, we were illegitimately depriving large masses of our countrymen of privileges to which they were entitled. The late Dean Stanley, who was President of the Society which desired to promote the opening of Museums and similar places on Sunday, made some remarkable observations on this subject. He said—

> "The observation of Sunday more than any other religious question touches the hearts and consciences of the country. The object of the Sunday Society is to maintain the value and importance of the English Sunday to the English people, and, on the other hand, to do the best they can for them."

Believing that it would tend to promote the proper observance of Sunday, he had much pleasure in seconding the Motion.

Moved to resolve,

> "That, seeing the success which has attended the action of Her Majesty's Government in opening on Sundays the national museums and galleries in the suburban districts of London and in the city of Dublin, and whereas this House was last Session informed by Her Majesty's Government that no opposition to Sunday opening, so far as it had already gone, had come before them, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived for extending the policy of Sunday opening after Two o'clock to all museums and galleries supported by national funds."—(*The Earl of Dunraven.*)

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, he was certain that it was by an oversight that the words of his Amendment had been left out——

The LORD CHANCELLOR rose to Order. The Amendment of the noble Lord had not yet been reached.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY, in moving, as an Amendment—

> "That inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried out,"

said, that the noble Earl (the Earl of Dunraven) had begun his speech by complaining that he had behaved somewhat unfairly and disrespectfully to the noble Earl. The noble Earl must have forgotten what occurred in 1880, when, on a Motion expressed in precisely the same terms, he had moved an Amendment in the same form as that now standing upon the Paper. No objection of the kind was then raised, but the Amendment was carried. Under these circumstances, he failed to see how he had neglected to treat the noble Earl with the courtesy which he certainly deserved. He must say, however, that he could not agree either to the Motion or the statement of fact with which it commenced. The Motion began by stating that—

> "Seeing the success which has attended the action of Her Majesty's Government in opening on Sundays the National Museums and Galleries in the suburban districts of London."

That stated too much. The experiment had only been tried at Kew, Greenwich, and Hampton Court—very small suburban collections. Whenever it had been tried for long in Provincial towns it had failed. The great argument in favour of the movement was that it would tend to decrease intemperance; and he would take one case alone—the case of Birmingham—as an example. In Birmingham, where the Public Library and Art Gallery had been open on Sundays for several years, the system had certainly not succeeded in moderating the habit of drinking; on the contrary, that city had seen an increase of drunkenness and intemperance. In 1875 the number of persons proceeded against for drunkenness was 2,507; in 1878 it had increased to 2,851. The number of convictions for drunkenness in 1875 was 1,859, and in 1878 the number was 2,380—an increase of 521 cases. He must assert that the success claimed by the noble Earl would really go for nothing, unless he could prove that there had been a saving of hundreds and thousands of persons from drinking habits, and that those who frequented the Galleries and Museums were persons enticed from gin-palaces and pot-houses. It was stated that no opposition had been laid before the Government. Everyone knew perfectly well, however, that opposition had been shown by the public. The feeling of the House of Commons was shown in the last Session when Mr. Broadhurst resisted Mr. Howard's Motion for opening Museums on Sundays, and defeated it by 208 to 83, gaining a majority of 125. And the feeling of the country on the subject was not less plainly exhibited when Mr. Broadhurst presented to the House of Commons on Friday, May 4, Petitions signed by persons representing 100,740 individuals, and on Monday, the 7th, Petitions from 3,450 *employés* in different firms. In the House of Lords, Petitions in favour of the noble Earl's Motion, if any, were next to nothing. Six, he believed, was the sum total; but there were many against it. To mention only two—one from the Wesleyan Conference, representing the whole body of the Wesleyans, and others signed by nearly 70,000 persons, one alone having 49,503 signatures. He was not prepared to say, if the noble Lord's Motion was carried, and the Museums and Art Galleries were opened on Sunday, that hundreds, and even thousands of people would not flock to them; probably the British Museum and similar places would be crowded; but it would not be with gin-drinkers, but with sightseers, who could as well make their visit on some other day—comfortable people, who found time a bore, and rejoiced to make the Seventh Day resemble the other six. But there was another side to the question, and that was the amount of additional labour imposed on many classes of the community. The noble Lord had dwelt only on the small amount of labour which would be imposed on the guardians of these Institutions. But a noble Duke opposite had said last year in regard to that matter, that it was not possible to employ supplementary people for places like the British Museum; they must have people who were cognizant of the details and history of the collections. But he would put that consideration aside. And then let them look at the additional labour which would be thrown on others. Let them consult the omnibus men; they would tell you that they now worked 16 hours in the day, and that they only got one Sunday a-month off, for which they themselves had to pay. If this Motion were agreed to, their labour would be quadrupled, and they would probably lose that Sunday which they now had per month to themselves. Let them go to the cabmen. They spoke of the proposal with positive alarm. Then there were the railway officials to be considered, and the dangers to the public arising from the overworking of those officials. Again, it was well known that wherever large bodies of Englishmen congregated, liquor was sure to be in demand. Did they suppose that the large crowds of people who were expected to visit these places on Sunday would not require to have refreshments? Many of them would call themselves *bonâ fide* travellers; and, certainly, drinking habits would be encouraged to a much greater extent than they were at present. He had the testimony of a late secretary to the Sunday League. He deposed, before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1868, when resisting the closing of public-houses on the Lord's Day, that the people—he instanced himself, among others—must have refreshments when they went to hear the Sunday bands in Battersea Park. The result, then, would be that great additional labour would be thrown on the assistants in the public-houses. Take the experience of a Bank Holiday last year at the Alexandra Palace, when crowds of people assembled to gaze upon the works of art and beauties of nature there. He would read the figures which had been given by the lessees as to the amount of drink consumed on that day. That would give their Lordships an idea of the amount that would be consumed on a Sunday if these Museums were opened. The amount consumed on Bank Holiday in June, 1880, was 150 barrels of ale and 23,000 bottles of spirits, wine, ale, and stout; and 400 additional waiters had to be employed. This was the populace feasting on the enjoyment of the Fine Arts! The feeling which animated the great mass of the working people who were opposed to the opening of Museums on Sunday was that it was a step in the direction of opening theatres and workshops on the first day of the week—the making a "Continental Sunday" of that day. There was also an apprehension among working men that, in a short time, it would eventuate in a demand by employers that they should receive seven days' work for six days' wages. The noble Earl had said that these people could protect themselves. No doubt they could in times of prosperity; but let an adverse time come of abundant supply of labour and little or no demand for it, they must accept the conditions of the employer and work on the Seventh Day if he chose to enforce it. He maintained that the large mass of the workpeople were decidedly opposed to the change. It was perfectly true that 62 societies of working men in London were in favour of the noble Earl's proposal; but the noble Earl forgot to tell them that the 222 remaining societies were all against it. He would explain to their Lordships the course he had taken in regard to this matter. Last year, after Mr. Broadhurst took the line of opposing the proposal in the House of Commons, and his Amendment was carried by a majority of 125, he consulted several gentlemen of experience in the matter, and sent out circulars in order to ascertain the opinion of the working classes generally on the question. Circulars were accordingly sent out to 2,335 Trade Unions and Working Mens' Associations, Clubs, and Institutes in London and the Provinces, and answers were received from every one of them, signed either by the Chairman or by the Secretaries of the different Associations, Clubs, and Institutes. The question submitted to them was—"Will you accept Mr. Broadhurst's Amendment; or would you rather have the Museums open on Sundays?" The answers sent gave the title of each Association or Institute, the name of the secretary, the number of persons belonging to the Institution; while another column contained various observations; and all those Associations spoke in the strongest language in favour of Mr. Broadhurst's Amendment, and objected to the other proposal without a moment's hesitation. The result was that 480,725 adult men—the choicest men among the working classes of England—all protested in the most decided manner against the proposition of the noble Earl. Was it not manifest, from this statement, that they were forcing that imaginary boon on an unwilling and reluctant people? Now, he himself proposed substantially the same Amendment as that of Mr. Broadhurst. The noble Earl said that it was a vain and foolish Amendment; that, if carried, it would be of no use, and that it would do nobody any good. Well, to that he had to say, in the first place, that it satisfied all those 480,725 working men; and, secondly, where it had been practically applied, it had been accepted. In 1872, the late Sir Charles Reed, the Member for Hackney, presented to the House of Commons two Petitions signed by 84,000 persons praying that the Bethnal Green Museum, which had just then been instituted, might not be opened on the Lord's Day. The Bethnal Green Museum was under the jurisdiction of the South Kensington authorities. Now, about that time or the year following, the South Kensington authorities opened the Bethnal Green Museum on the week-day evenings, shutting it up on the Lord's Day; and what had been the result? The noble Earl said that on the week-day evenings no working man or woman would go there; they would be tired and weary, and would rather remain at home. But what was the fact? In about nine years, during the time that that Museum had been opened on week-day evenings, so far from nobody going there, between the hours of 7 and 10 there had been no fewer than 3,200,000 visits paid to the place, a very large proportion of the visitors being working men and women. Well, if those men and women who protested against that Institution being opened on Sunday, and declared that they would not go there on that day because it would be against their conscience to do so, had in nine years paid 3,200,000 visits to it on week evenings, was it not fair to suppose that if similar Institutions to that at Bethnal Green were opened elsewhere on week evenings the working classes would attend them in like numbers? A certain proportion of our working people might be Agnostics, and a still larger proportion might be indifferent to religion; but there was another and a not inconsiderable body of them who were deeply religious, many of them being found in churches and chapels, while a great many were not found in either. Those were men under true religious convictions; and, regarding the matter from the highest point of view, they held the sanctity of the Lord's Day to be so great that they would submit to anything rather than that it should be depreciated. It was a remarkable fact that there should be such a consensus of opinion among working men that the opening of the Museums on Sunday would lead to great social mischief, and that the Lord's Day must and should be respected as a Charter, as a day of rest for all classes of the people. Were not those sentiments to be regarded? And did they not show that there was in the hearts of the people that love for social order which was one of the best securities for the body politic? Those people desired to conform to the religious habits and traditions of their forefathers; and ought not their Lordships to rejoice in that fact, and to do everything in their power to foster such feelings? He trusted that the response of their Lordships to that appeal would not be one that would discourage those sentiments; he trusted —nay, more, he believed—that their decision that night would show that the action of their Lordships was in full and joyous conformity with the wishes and, he might say, with the prayers of a large and most respectable body of their fellow-countrymen. The noble Earl concluded by moving the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment *moved*,

To leave out all the words after ("That") and insert ("inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March, 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried out.")—(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

EARL COWPER, said, it was with great regret that he felt himself differing from the views of his noble Relative who had just spoken. He thought he might take it for granted that nobody would venture to say that in those Galleries and Museums there was anything that was likely to deteriorate the working men, or that the Institutions were bad in themselves. He had heard some people—not very religious people—say that the effect of listening to a long sermon was to make them eat a better lunch. But he did not think there was any good reason to suppose that attending Museums or Picture Galleries would necessarily lead people to drink. He did not believe there was any more connection between the consumption of drink on Sundays and the opening of Public Collections than there was between Sunday opening and the murders committed in Dublin. It was, however, objected that the opening of those places on Sunday would lead to something else which they would not be able to stop. It was said that if the Museums were once opened they would go on gradually opening the theatres, music-halls, and similar places. Now there was hardly any change, however good, that was not advocated by some people who might also advocate some other things which were objectionable; but surely that was no argument whatever against adopting a thing which was good. But was there anything in the proposal of the noble Earl (the Earl of Dunraven) necessarily leading to the opening of other places? There was, he thought, a broad distinction between a public place, supported by public money, belonging to the public, and to which access was free, and allowing places to be opened where money was recived for admission. There was a difference, for instance, between opening Kensington Gardens or Battersea Park and opening the gardens at Cremorne. There was, however, another objection to the Motion, which was more intelligible. That was the division of opinion on the subject among the working men themselves. But there was a division of opinion; for if there were Petitions against the Motion, there were also Petitions in its favour. But it was difficult to get at the real opinions of the working classes, and Petitions were no gauge of real convictions. Those who objected to the Motion made it a matter of conscience, and were consequently much more active in getting up and signing Petitions than those who held, it might be an indolent opinion, that it would be a good thing to open Public Galleries and Museums on Sunday. It was said that the National Gallery and the British Museum required a high degree of cultivation for their enjoyment. No doubt that was so—but it was all the more important to give as many opportunities as possible of improving the taste of the working people. He felt, as much as anyone, the importance of a day of rest, and of giving the sanction of religion to that day. But he could not but think that the observance of Sunday which consisted simply in hearing sermons and compulsory abstinence from all enjoyment did more harm than good. In his opinion, the Sabbath was better spent partly in worship and partly in wholesome recreation which did not involve labour. Certainly those who inflicted gloomy Sundays upon their households were not entitled to enforce their views upon those who did not agree with them. His noble Friend who introduced the question had referred to the labour aspect, which was, no doubt, an important aspect of it. But they all had their dinners cooked on Sundays, and employed their servants in other ways; and he thought it rather Pharasaical to refer to the labour imposed on a few for the sake of the many who would be benefited by the opening of Picture Galleries and Museums—as to the drivers of cabs and omnibuses. It would not be an increase, but only a fresh distribution, of labour, because, after all, working men were not in the habit of staying at home now on Sundays. He would certainly record his vote in favour of the Motion of the noble Earl.

EARL CAIRNS said, that two or three topics had been introduced into the question with some amount of exaggeration. First, there was what might be called the public-house argument. It seemed to be thought that there was something in that proposal which would have the effect of emptying public-houses, and so promoting the cause of sobriety among the people. This was a very plausible argument at first sight; but, upon examination, it would not be found of much weight. He was one of those who doubted whether the persons who frequented public-houses would be found in the British Museum or the National Gallery. He had not much personal knowledge on the subject, but he had been assured by those who thoroughly knew the working men, and their habits, and that was the view which they expressed. That question, too, was in some measure settled by the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Westminster), who had opened his splendid Gallery to the public on Sundays, and who had stated that it was certainly not working men who availed themselves of the opportunity afforded. Public-houses were closed from 3 to 6—precisely the time at which working men would visit the Picture Gallery or Museum—and they were re-opened at 6. Thus the time during which the Picture Gallery was open would be the time when the public-house was closed; and there would be no rivalry between the Picture Gallery and the tavern, and the former would have no means of withdrawing customers from the latter. But when 6 o'clock came round—as looking at pictures was exhaustive work—the visitors to the Galleries would betake themselves to the public-house. In fact, he had been informed that the publicans were in favour of the noble Earl's Motion, and that the public-houses in the immediate neighbourhood of the Public Exhibitions which it was proposed to open expected a large increase of custom. Another argument was that the places already open were much frequented, and that their opening had been very beneficial. He supposed Kew Gardens and Hampton Court were referred to. But there was no analogy between such places and Picture Galleries and Museums. He could imagine nothing more wholesome or desirable than that people should betake themselves to Kew Gardens or Hyde Park or Battersea Park on Sundays to enjoy the fresh air and flowers. What was the test proposed of the desirability of the change? It was always assumed that the number of persons who would avail themselves of increased opportunities was a conclusive argument in favour of the proposal. No doubt, if those places were opened, a large number of persons would visit them; but the argument did not go far enough. The whole question of the Continental Sunday was involved. If theatres or music-halls or opera-houses were opened, no doubt a large number of persons would visit them. It was assumed that the opening of Museums and theatres in foreign countries conduced to sobriety; but if that were so, which he doubted, the argument proved too much, for no one proposed that theatres and concerts-rooms should open on Sundays. Such a change was not wanted. He would read to their Lordships an extract from a letter written by a German gentleman of eminence as to the state of things on Sunday in his country. He said—

> "We Germans are, to a great extent, far removed from such a celebration of Sunday. The day of rest and of most elevated joy is too often robbed of its honour. The forenoon of Sunday is given up to work and the afternoon to pleasure. That which can elevate man is often despised, but that which degrades him is sought after. On Sunday the policeman reap their most abundant harvest; on Sunday children occasion the greatest anxiety; on Sunday evening, above all other days, does the wife anticipate the return of her husband with a foreboding heart. Drunkenness and riotousness celebrate their greatest triumph on Sunday; and most of the misdemeanours are committed on that day, or are intimately connected with the misuse of it. We turn, therefore, to our countrymen with the urgent request that they would, in their various spheres, endeavour to procure for the Sunday a more honourable observance in our land. If the Sunday acquires a different character, the national life will rest on a securer basis."

He trusted, therefore, that their Lordships would not suppose for a moment that by relaxing the Sunday rule in Germany the morals of the people had been improved. There was only one other matter connected with this question to which he should desire to refer, and that was with regard to the difficulty, pointed out by the noble Earl who spoke last, of drawing a line. If they did all that this Motion proposed that they should do, where were they to stop? The noble Earl said that he saw no difficulty whatever in drawing a line; but he confessed that he waited most anxiously to hear from him where they were to draw it. The noble Earl said that they ought to open those Establishments which were paid for out of the public taxation. But, in that case, what was the principle upon which he intended to proceed? Surely it could not make much difference in point of principle whether the working man paid for the maintenance of an establishment by means of taxes or whether he paid for it at the door. Somebody came and said—"Here is an Exhibition exactly similar to your National Exhibition, which you say will elevate the minds of the people, but we charge 6*d*. at the door." Would the fact that the 6*d*. was charged at the door be a valid ground for preventing such a private Exhibition from being opened? It was quite impossible to listen to an argument resting upon so flimsy and unsubstantial a suggestion. It might be said that those Exhibitions educated and elevated the mind; but there were many people who believed that the drama educated and elevated the mind, yet it was scarcely proposed to open the theatres in this country on a Sunday. There were others who thought that the performance of music educated and elevated the mind, yet it was not proposed to open the opera-house on a Sunday. This showed how impossible it was to draw the line at that which educated and elevated the mind. After all, the real question was, in whose interest was this proposal made? It was put forward by a Society composed of professors, philosophers, and artists of great eminence, for whom we had a great respect. They did not make the proposal on their own behalf, but on behalf of the working men. But was it the fact that the working men themselves desired that this proposal should be carried into effect? He did not say that there might not be a small number of working men who did desire that these Establishments should be opened on Sunday; but he did say that the overwhelming mass of the working men was opposed to the proposal. Apply every test on the point that they liked, and they would get the same answer. The first great test of the feeling of the working men on this subject was to be found in their Representative Assembly—the House of Commons. What had been the view which had been taken of this question by the House of Commons ever since the passing of the last Reform Bill, when the representation of the country was so widely extended? Since that time there had been three divisions taken on this question, and on every one of them there was an overwhelming majority against the proposal to open the Museums on Sunday. The noble Earl who sat upon the Cross Benches (the Earl of Dunraven) said that the majorities in the House of Commons against the proposal were continually diminishing, and that that fact showed that a change was coming over public opinion in reference to this question. He observed, however, that the minority in the other House had only increased from 83 to 87 on the occasion of the last division, which did not show a very decided increase of public opinion in favour of the proposal. Who took the lead in the other House in opposition to the proposal? Why, it was a working man, who said that—

> "He voted against it in the interest of labour, with which he had been connected all his life, and on the ground that the seventh day should be kept distinct and as fully relieved from all associations of labour as it was possible. He also opposed the Motion on the ground that there was no sufficient demand in the country to warrant the Resolution submitted to them. He further opposed it on the ground that the Motion could have no effect except loosening the ties which bound them together in defence of an absolute right of having one day in seven free from all labour."—(3 *Hansard*, [269] 1168.)

In his opinion, that was a very sensible ground of objection to the proposal; and he was satisfied that Mr. Broadhurst's view of the matter was shared by the majority of the working men of this country. There was not a borough in England which was so completely composed of working men as was the Tower Hamlets, and when this question was discussed at the last School Board election for that borough, Mr. Lucraft, who was thoroughly acquainted with the desires of the working men, when asked whether he would vote for the opening of the Museums on Sunday, said—

> "As to opening of Museums on Sunday, he looked at it purely from a workmen's point of view, and he should not like to work seven days instead of six. He therefore could not vote for opening Museums on Sunday."

That announcement was received with cheers. Last year the two Representatives of that borough voted against the proposal. Then, it was said that the Provincial towns were in favour of the proposal. Mr. Mundella, however, had pointed to the fact that out of the 154 Municipalities in England who had Museums, only four had opened theirs on Sunday, and these Municipalities were controlled, as the noble Earl (the Earl of Dunraven) had said, by the votes of the working men. In Nottingham, where a splendid Museum of Art had been built at the cost of the ratepayers, the question of opening it on Sunday became a test question at a municipal election; the candidates in favour of opening were defeated, and Mr. Mundella had been informed that the return of the successful candidates was effected by the votes of the working men. As for Manchester, pictures were exhibited at the Royal Institution, which was in the hands, not of the municipal authorities, but of private trustees, who, acting on their own responsibility, opened the building six Sundays in the winter for two hours in the afternoon, to which there was great opposition in the town itself. It was proved to demonstration that the working men, by their action in the Provinces, objected to this Motion. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) who sat behind him told them he was responsible for the way in which the returns of the various trade organizations stating their opinion on this question were obtained. He did not think the noble Earl who sat on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Dunraven) could be aware of what the Society, of which he was the mouthpiece, did with regard to the mode adopted of obtaining the opinion of these societies on the subject of Mr. Broadhurst's Resolution. The Sunday Society, as soon as they heard there was going to be an appeal to the working class organization throughout the country, published an advertisement in *The Times* and *The Daily News* in January last, in which, after declaring their conviction that the response to the appeal would be to demonstrate the practical unanimity of the working class organizations in support of the objects of the Sunday Society, they actually offered to the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association to bear the whole cost of publishing the returns. The Sunday Society were so convinced that the appeal would turn out in their favour that they would bear the whole cost. It was to be hoped they would fulfil their promise. Well, the result was that 480,725 members of the trade unions and other trade organizations were in favour of Mr. Broadhurst's proposal. And what had they to weigh against that? A deputation went to the noble Earl the Secretary of State yesterday, and they put into his hands a document claiming that they had in favour of opening 45,482 working men, as against the number he had stated. But, then, they very candidly said that the total was somewhat in excess of the number of individuals, seeing some members of trade societies were also members of clubs, and, moreover, many of the trade societies were represented on the Trades' Council. Many of the names were counted twice over, even among the 45,000 just mentioned. Indeed, the Society had made a calculation, and counted between 15,000 and 25,000 duplicate names. But was not this most conclusive evidence of what the working men of the country thought? He submitted it was, and, therefore, he said that the first great question being what the working men wished, their Lordships had every guide and proof that they did not wish for this proposal to be carried; but, on the contrary, that it should not be carried. He held and believed, as many of their Lordships held and believed, that Sunday was a Divine institution, and one of the greatest blessings which Divine Providence ever gave to mankind. There were many persons who looked at the Sunday in its phyiscal bearing, and there were others, working men especially, who looked at it from a labour point of view; but all these ends could and must be accomplished by the aid of the action of Parliament and by legislation. They had legislation in regard to trading, labour, and so on, on Sunday. They might depend upon it they never could maintain legislation upon this subject unless they maintained the sanctity of Sunday as a Divine institution. It was quite impossible on a matter of this kind to justify or maintain legislation in the long run, unless legislation was backed by the feeling in the country that they were legislating in defence of that which was a Divine institution. He objected to the movement which was being made by the Sunday Society—it was a singular name by which they called themselves—because it was calculated to destroy this feeling with regard to the Divine institution of Sunday. He was sure the noble Earl had no such intention; but what was the view put forward by the Society? He had in his hand an address delivered under the auspices and on behalf of the Sunday Society, by one of its vice-presidents, a man for whom he had the greatest respect as a man of science. What was the teaching with regard to the Sunday put forward in his address? This was the teaching—

> "Turning over the leaves of the Pentateuch where God's alleged dealings with the Israelites are recorded, it strikes me with amazement that such writings should be considered binding upon us. The overmastering strength of habit, the power of early education—possibly a defiance of the claims of reason involved in the very constitution of the mental organization—were never more forcibly illustrated than by the fact that learned men are still to be found willing to devote their time and endowments to these writings, under the assumption that they are not human, but Divine. As an ancient book claiming the same origin as other books, the Old Testament is without a rival, but its unnatural exaltation provokes recoil and rejection."

It was impossible for the public to disconnect language and doctrine of this kind from a Motion composed by the very Society whose views were given out in the address from which he had quoted, and, therefore, he dreaded, and the country dreaded, countenance given by their Lordships to a Motion of this kind.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he did not wish by rising then to necessarily close the debate, nor did he speak as representing the views which the Government took on this matter; but he wished to make a few observations, not at all in the way of a formal speech, in explanation of the vote he should give on the subject, for he intended to vote, as he had voted before, in favour of the Resolution. A noble Lord who spoke behind him said nobody thought it was wrong to go to Museums or Picture Galleries on Sundays; but he was not at all sure that that was a right or sound assumption. There were not a few noble Lords, and a considerable proportion of people in the country, who conscientiously thought it was wrong to go to Museums on Sundays. He did not, however, intend to argue at all upon the high religious and moral aspects of the question. Mention had been made of the difference between opening the British Museum and National Gallery and descending to the opening of theatres and other places; but it appeared to him to be infinitely more difficult to draw the line between opening Hampton Court and Kew Gardens and the British Museum and National Gallery. He could not help feeling that some of the arguments that had been used were apart from the question. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) had complained of the hardships of omnibus and cab-drivers; but that referred, not so much to the opening or shutting of Museums on the Sunday, as to the stopping of all traffic by road, rail, or river on the Sunday, and by that means securing the immense advantage from his point of view of preventing the public, who must use these means of locomotion, from getting to Kew or Hampton Court, or to the other Gardens in the suburbs. What he (Earl Granville) had felt and always said—and he entirely agreed with the two noble Earls opposite—was that this was one of those social questions in which they must be guided very much by the opinion of those who were principally concerned. The noble and learned Lord who had just sat down had gone very minutely into the evidence of public opinion as far as he was concerned. He made an allusion to what had passed at Bethnal Green Museum. He (Earl Granville) should like to know what the opinion of the Rector of Bethnal Green was. He (Earl Granville) thought that that bore very importantly upon this question. With regard to the indication of public opinion, the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns) first mentioned what had taken place in the House of Commons, and complained that the noble Lord had said that there had been a change of feeling in that House in that respect. He (Earl Granville) could not help thinking that the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns) was mistaken in this matter. What were the actual facts? In the first division on the question in the House of Commons the majority against the opening of Museums on Sundays was 328, in the second 203, in the third 142, and last year the number was 125; and these figures, in his opinion, justified the assertion that there had been a change in the opinion of the House of Commons on the subject. But he went a little further. He thought a very much stronger indication than this diminution arose from the fact that one of those who voted in the majority last year was the Prime Minister of this country, who, of course, exercised great weight in a matter of this sort, and the fact of his vote made the decrease in the majority still more remarkable. On the other hand, Mr. Forster and Mr. Chamberlain, who were well conversant with the opinions of the working classes, voted in the minority in favour of the Motion. The noble and learned Earl then went to the opinion of the labouring classes of the country, and his strongest point of all was what Mr. Broadhurst had done in the settlement of this matter. Mr. Broadhurst represented a borough in which he (Earl Granville) had the greatest interest. He was a man whom he knew very well, and he could conceive no more trustworthy man, or one less likely to deceive, or who had a greater acquaintance with the class which he represented or to which he belonged; but, in stating Mr. Broadhurst's opinion, neither of the noble Earls happened to mention that Mr. Burt, who was equally representative of the class, was the person who seconded the Motion of Mr. George Howard on that occasion? Then the noble Earl opposite seemed very indignant, and, from the hints thrown out, seemed to think that the opinion of the working classes had not been quite fairly taken; but he said nothing to impair the manner in which that opinion was taken. He said that they should have been asked, in the first instance, whether they approved of Mr. Broadhurst's Amendment; and, secondly, whether they were in favour or not of opening Museums on Sundays? He must say that he thought the noble Earl quite right. Nothing could be a fairer way of putting the question; but that did not happen to have been the way the question was put. The way the question was put was this—

> "The Committee of Management of the Society approves of the Amendment proposed by Mr. Broadhurst in Parliament for opposing the increase of Sunday labour."

Was that the way to make an appeal for a fair expression of opinion? It was not a question as to whether they were in favour of the opening or shutting of the Museums, but "Will you have an increase of Sunday labour?" That was begging the whole question. Nobody could doubt what the answer of the great masses of the working classes would be to the question. He was very much inclined to believe the opinion that great masses of the working men of this country were opposed to the opening of the Museums on Sunday. But this Resolution did not affect the whole country. It affected the Metropolis of the country, and therefore it was really very important to ascertain, as far as possible, the feeling and opinion of the working men of the Metropolis on the subject. With reference to the figures that had been quoted to the House, representing the number of working men opposed to and in favour of the movement, he could not help feeling that the case of the 40,000 working men stated to be in favour of it—and their case was not a wit stronger than that of the small shopkeeper, and especially the ill-paid, and hard working clerk—was deserving of some consideration. It had been said that workmen could spend several hours in the evenings of week-days at the Museums, &c., but this was denied by the men. He put to the deputation of working men, which waited upon him yesterday, a question specially on this point—"Can you make out to me that it would not be as easy to attend on week-day evenings as on Sundays?" And they gave him the time when they left their homes, their hours of labour, the time it took to get back and clean themselves, and they said—"Is it possible that we should be in a state of mind or body to start fresh to go to Museums?" Nobody wished to force those to go to Museums who had moral or religious objections to do so, but the hardship was in preventing those who wished to elevate their minds. One member of the deputation said it was a hard case that after the Government of the country had given them the means of education in early life, they should now deprive them, by refusing to open the British Museum and National Gallery on Sundays, of the opportunity of elevating their minds as men, and of thus giving the last touch to their education. He granted that a man who was in the habit of getting drunk in a public-house on Sundays was not likely to be induced by such measures as these to make a sudden turn towards intellectual diversion; but he believed that working men who had received some education—such education, indeed, as their class never before had the means of acquiring—would, if they had the opportunity to choose, go to places where they could amuse themselves and elevate their minds rather than to the public-house, and it might be exactly the turning point whether for the rest of their lives they would go to the public-house or abstain from it. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) had said that going to Museums would encourage men to drink as much as going to public-houses. But there appeared to be this difference. He (Earl Granville) could conceive the objection to a man leaving his wife and family in a small room on a rainy day and going away to the public-house to spend his time; but it appeared to him that there was a great difference between that case and that of a man who, after taking his wife and family to a Picture Gallery or a Museum, at the end of the time sought some refreshment for the sustenance of his mind and body. He desired to say, in conclusion, that he did not wish to influence in the slightest degree any noble Lord on that side of the House; but, for his own part, he confessed that he had heard nothing in the debate that evening to induce him to give a different vote from that which he had given on the subject on previous occasions.

On question, whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the motion?

Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 91; Not-Contents 67: Majority 24.

CONTENTS.

Sutherland, D.
Westminster, D.

Bristol, M.
Lansdowne, M.

Ashburnham, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cowper, E.
Derby, E.
Durham, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Innes, E. (*D. Roxburghe.*)
Kimberley, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Milltown, E.
Morley, E.
Onslow, E.
Pembroke and Montgomery, E.
Sydney, E.
Wilton, E.

Powerscourt, V.

Alington, L.
Auckland, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Brabourne, L.
Bramwell, L.
Carlingford, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Coleridge, L.
Conyers, L.
Derwent, L.
Dorchester, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*) [*Teller.*]
Gerard, L.
Greville, L.
Hare, L. (*E. Listowel.*)
Harris, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hawke, L.
Hopetoun, L. (*E. Hopetoun.*)
Hothfield, L.
Inchiquin, L.
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare.*)
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*) [*Teller.*]
Kintore, E. (*E. Kintore.*)
Leconfield, L.
Lovat, L.
Manners, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Monson, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)
Romilly, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Skene, L. (*E. Fife.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*)
Sudeley, L.
Truro, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford*)
Wolseley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Archp.
Selborne, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Marlborough, D.
Norfolk, D.
Richmond, D.
Somerset, D.

Aberborn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Hertford, M.
Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Cairns, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Effingham, E.
Feversham, E.
Harewood, E.
Manvers, E.
Powis, E.
Redesdale, E.
Shaftesbury, E. [*Teller.*]
Waldegrave, E.

Bridport, V.
Cranbrook, V.
Gordon, V. (*E. Aberdeen.*)
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Melville, V.
Sherbrooke, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.

Bangor, L. Bp.
Bath and Wells, L. Bp.
Carlisle, L. Bp.
Chichester, L. Bp.
Durham, L. Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, L. Bp.
Hereford, L. Bp.
Lincoln, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Rochester, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.
St. Asaph, L. Bp.
Winchester, L. Bp.

Amherst, L. (*V. Holmesdale.*)
Ashford, L. (*V. Bury.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Byron, L.
Carrington, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)

Clanbrassill, L. (*E. Roden.*)
Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Congleton, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crewe, L.
Denman, L.
de Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dinevor, L.
Douglas, L. (*E. Home.*)
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Ebury, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Forester, L.
Harlech, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort.*)
Ker, L. (*M. Lothian.*)
Kinnaird, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Mount-Temple, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Penryhn, L.
Penzance, L.
Poltimore, L.
Polwarth, L.
Robartes, L.
Rossmore, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Scarsdale, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Silchester, E. (*E. Longford.*)
Tollemache, L.
Wimborne, L.
Winmarleigh, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *negative.*

Moved to resolve,

"That inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried out."—(*The Earl of Carnarvon.*)

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, that he thought in a very few words he could show his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) that there were very strong reasons why his Amendment should not be agreed to. He would speak merely with reference to the British Museum, and, in passing, he might say that he was not sure that the class of persons whom his noble Friend expected to attend would be the class who attended it. But the very large addition of labour which would be imposed on the officials and functionaries of the Museums was something very much beyond what the House had at that moment in contemplation, and would amount to no less than £15,000 a-year; and if that expense were large, the amount of labour thrown on the staff would be equally large, and required very great consideration indeed before the House agreed to a proposal of that sort. There was another point; the throwing open the Museums meant a change in many very important details, some of which might sound small when taken by themselves, but which, when taken in the aggregate, meant a very great deal. The question of lighting was a very serious one. First of all, it was admitted that it would be dangerous and improper to light the British Museum with gas, and as to the electric light, it was very far from being perfected. As a matter of fact, it had suddenly gone out within the last 12 months in the one department where it was used, and left the place in total darkness. In the Reading Room, with a limited, selected, and very orderly assemblage, such a contingency was unimportant; but if it were to occur in the other parts and the galleries of the Museum, with a crowd of people collected in them, it was impossible to say what the result of five or ten minutes' darkness might be. There was another point which again he must press, and which was important. The cleaning of the British Museum was a serious matter. At this moment, the difficulties, as the noble Duke opposite had said, were considerable, and if they had, on three additional evenings in the week, the entrance of a large crowd of persons, the difficulty would be very much greater. On wet evenings the Museum would be often used as a shelter and a lounge, and the amount of dirt which would be brought in on those occasions would be very considerable. It would thus become necessary to close a large portion of the Museum during the mornings to enable the necessary cleaning to be done; for the cleaning of statuary was a rather slow and nice operation. Sculpture could not be wiped with a cloth; but the dust must be blown away, and occasionally the marble must be washed. For all these reasons, and for others with which he would not trouble the House, he strongly urged his noble Friend to consent to give the House some little time for consideration. He believed the proposal in the Amendment of his noble Friend was not practicable without at least a large outlay and a good deal of consideration. At all events, in order that time might be given to consider the question of expense and other matters, he moved the adjournment of the debate.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*The Earl of Carnarvon.*)

VISCOUNT HARDINGE, as a Trustee of the National Gallery, desired to corroborate the statement of the noble Earl as to the difficulties, and even dangers, that would arise if this proposal were agreed to. The Trustees had often had the subject under their consideration; but in view of the danger which would arise if the building were lighted with gas, and the present undeveloped state of the electric light, they had come to the conclusion that it was impossible at present to do as proposed. He quite concurred with the noble Earl in all he had said, and thought that, amongst other drawbacks, the dust that would be collected by large bodies of working men and others congregating there on a wet evening might be very injurious.

EARL CAIRNS observed, that he did not think the noble Earl intended to bind the country to any immediate action in this matter, and it would undoubtedly be useful if further time were given to consider it. He would therefore propose, as an Amendment to the Amendment of the noble Earl, to leave out the words "the time has arrived when this recommendation," and insert the words "this recommendation, in so far as it is found consistent with the safety and the welfare of the institution." That would leave the question entirely open.

EARL GRANVILLE: I am not surprised that the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns) has not entirely acquiesced in the Motion of the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon). It is one of the most remarkable suggestions I have heard made in this House. The whole debate has turned on the wishes of the working classes. The Amendment was moved with all the authority and eloquence of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury). If that Amendment was objected to, it was surely the duty of those Members of the Opposition who were pursuing this after policy to have spoken before the Amendment was put. The majority of the Members of the House have retired, thinking the matter is disposed of; and now, without a word of warning, this Amendment has been sprung upon us. I can only say that what has been done will have a most extraordinary effect upon the country?

EARL CAIRNS: The Amendment is not put yet. It is only being put now.

EARL GRANVILLE: The division was taken clearly on the merits of the Amendment.

EARL CAIRNS: I beg your Lordship's pardon. That is quite a mistake. The vote was simply on the original Resolution.

EARL GRANVILLE: I object to the proposal being now made after many of their Lordships have retired.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: By far the greater number of those who took part in the division voted on the question of Sunday observance. There is no mistake about the motive which brought down the crowded Benches this evening. Now it is proposed that the debate should be adjourned, and the noble Earl complains that no Notice has been given of the intention to adjourn the debate to consider the much smaller question which has now arisen. No statesman in either House has ever heard of Notice given of any such intention. What is now required is information from the authorities of the British Museum and the National Gallery, who have not yet been heard. I should be willing to adopt the Amendment, deprived of its dangerous and stringent character by the Amendment of my noble and learned Friend (Earl Cairns), because there are many questions of a technical and administrative character that are worthy of careful consideration before the proposal can be carried out. At the same time, I think the Motion for the adjournment of the debate is very reasonable.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he would suggest that as their Lordships had not discussed this question of opening Museums on week-day evenings at all, it should be brought forward on a separate Motion. The condition of affairs was much altered since former years. He was also of opinion that at a time when the nation was trying to protect buildings from the enemies of social order, it would be well if the direction in the Amendment of the noble Earl was delayed in being carried out.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, he did not see the necessity for the adjournment, though he was not unwilling to accede to a Motion of that character. His present Amendment was identical in terms with one he proposed in 1881, when it was carried without any question being raised.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he objected to the proposal of the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) being put before their Lordships as an alternative for the original Motion. He hoped no one would be deceived by the transparent proposition that Sunday opening of Museums and Art Galleries was not necessary because abundant accommodation could be provided on week-days. No such question was before the House, and the working people, so far as their Lordships were concerned, must go without Sunday opening.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH said, he did not think the majority of the working classes were in favour of Sunday opening, and the information before the House gave a contradiction to what had fallen from the noble Earl (Earl Kimberley) who had just sat down, who was, moreover, not justified in what had been stated by him in reference to their Lordships' House, the statistics being distinctly at variance with what had been stated by the noble Earl.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he must deny that he had sprung any mine upon the supporters of the original Motion. He had not only mentioned to the Lord Chancellor, before the debate began, that he intended to raise this question, but he had consulted the noble and learned Lord as to the particular course which it was desirable to take.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I can bear out what the noble and learned Lord has said as to his having mentioned his desire to have an opportunity of giving expression to his opinion in the sense stated. I was not, however, aware that it was the opinion of anyone except himself. Having myself voted with the majority, I must say that I did so in the full belief that that which was recommended was practicable and ought to be done, and I continue of that opinion.

EARL CAIRNS said, that if his noble Friend withdrew the Motion for Adjournment, he would move the words he had suggested.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he should not oppose that course; but he thought what had taken place had been very extraordinary.

LORD DENMAN said, that the noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) had not, either previously or now, dictated any special mode of carrying out the Resolutions of their Lordships' House. It was obvious that there must be different hours in summer and winter.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON asked leave to withdraw his Motion?

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Moved, as an amendment to the foregoing Resolution, to leave out ("the time has arrived when") and in the last line after ("should") to insert ("if and so far as may be found consistent with the safety and general welfare of those institutions" (The Earl Cairns); after further short debate, the said amendment, on question, *agreed to:*

Resolved, That inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that this recommendation should, if and so far as may be found consistent with the safety and general welfare of those institutions, be carried out.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS—"BRADLAUGH v. CLARKE"—QUESTION.

LORD DENMAN, in pursuance of a Notice, asked the Lord Chancellor, Why the names of all the Peers who sat on the Appeal of Bradlaugh v. Clarke, on 5th and 6th March and on 9th of April, is not on the rota of Peers kept in the Princes' Chamber?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, in answer to the Question of the noble Lord, I have to state that the Paper which is put up in the Princes' Chamber, and which the noble Lord describes as the "rota of Peers," has been for many years past simply a record of attendance of those Peers who have filled judicial office, and are commonly called Law Lords. The noble Lord is well aware that since the case of O'Connell there has been a general consent in the House that it is better that the judicial proceedings should be conducted exclusively by those who have filled judicial office, or who, in respect to their information as trained lawyers, are regarded as Law Lords. The consequence of this is, that this list is exclusively the list of attendances of Lords that are so called; and that such a record should be kept is most proper, more especially since the year 1876, when, by the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, it was required that there should be at least three Law Lords who had filled certain judicial offices present for the purpose of determining appeals. Having answered the Question of the noble Lord, I may, perhaps, be excused for adding, with reference to some animadversions of which I myself appear to have been made the subject "elsewhere," that, until the question raised by that appeal—"Bradlaugh *v.* Clarke"—came before your Lordships' House, I never had occasion to consider, and never did consider, it; nor had I, until I heard the arguments in the ordinary course of my judicial duty, formed any opinion upon it. It has been supposed, because I was Attorney General in 1866, that I must have been personally responsible for the preparation of the Oaths Bill of that year. The fact is not so. That Bill was not in my charge; I had nothing to do with the preparation of it. It was under the charge of, and introduced into the House of Commons by, the then Home Secretary, Sir George Grey; and the only other name upon the back of it was that of the then Chancellor of the Exchequer. No controversy whatever arose in the House of Commons as to any of its provisions, except the matter of the Oath itself.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to alter and amend the law as to marriage with a deceased wife's sister—Was *presented* by The Earl of DALHOUSIE; read 1^{a}. (No. 56.)

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 8*th May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—*Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice and Legal Procedure*, Mr. Heneage *discharged*, Mr. Dundas *added.*

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—*Third Reading*—London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers), and *passed.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee*—National Debt *.

Ordered—First Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 2) (Killarney) * [172]; Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (Saint George-in-the-East) * [173]; Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 2) (Limehouse) * [174]; Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 3) (Lambeth) * [175]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) (Cheltenham, &c.) * [176]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) (Black-Torrington, &c.) * [177]; Board of Works (Ireland) * [178] * Charitable Trusts * [179]; Trust Funds (Scotland) * [180].

Second Reading—Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cummersdale, &c.) * [163]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) * [158].

Third Reading—Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) [156], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (ADDITIONAL POWERS) BILL

(*by Order*).

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

SIR CHARLES FORSTER, in moving that the Bill be now read the third time, said, he found that his hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had given Notice of an Amendment, to provide that the Bill should be re-committed. He (Sir Charles Forster) was quite aware that his hon. Friend, in taking that course, was quite within his strict Parliamentary right; but the course was one which was very unusual and inconvenient. No doubt, there had been a precedent, in the case of the Birmingham Sewerage Bill, in the year 1872; but, in this case, the Amendment was substantially the same as that which was moved by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. J. Hollond), and rejected on the stage of the Report. Unless the House was prepared to undergo considerable loss of time in discussing Private Bills over and over again, this was not a course which the House ought to approve or to act upon. This was a Bill which his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Somersetshire (Mr. R. H. Paget), who acted as Chairman of the Select Committee, told them, on the last occasion, had received the unanimous approval of the Committee; and yet the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) now proposed an Amendment almost identical with the one which was disposed of last week. In venturing to make these few remarks, he (Sir Charles

Forster) did so, because he wished to enter his protest against a course by which the system of Private Bill legislation, which had been so useful in the past, was likely to be seriously impaired in the future. He begged to move that the Bill be read a third time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, he would admit that it was his duty to show to the House some reason why he asked them to re-hear this case; and, certainly, his hon. Friend the Member for Walsall (Sir Charles Forster), who had just sat down, had given him no cause of complaint when he warned the House to be very careful how they unnecessarily called in question the decisions of Private Bill Committees. But there was more than one reason why this Bill should be re-heard on the third reading. In the first place, the Amendment which his hon. Friend opposite the Member for Brighton (Mr. J. Hollond) moved on the Report was not the same Amendment which he was now asking the House to accept. Quite the contrary. Had his hon. Friend's Amendment been carried, a great hardship would undoubtedly have been inflicted on the London and North-Western Railway Company; and the fact that such was the case, no doubt, influenced a large number of hon. Gentlemen concerned in railway undertakings in voting against his hon. Friend in the division. In the second place, not only was the issue he was now raising of a much more limited kind than the issue raised by his hon. Friend opposite, but the division which took place on that occasion was one of the very narrowest description. In rather a full House, the Amendment was only rejected by a very small majority. There was a reason, even stronger than either of those he had given, which made it important that the House should reconsider this question; because a new circumstance had come to light since the Private Bill Committee considered the matter, and since the House itself dealt with it, which had a most important bearing on the due consideration of the case. The House would see precisely what this new fact was, when he recapitulated, in a few words, how the case stood. The London and North-Western Railway Company came to the Committee for power to buy a small part of a disused burial ground. They could not ask the Trustees, to whom the burial ground belonged, to sell, until they were ready to sell, because, under the Act of Parliament which constituted the Trustees, they had no power to sell. The Trustees said—"We will not sell you the small portion of ground which is absolutely necessary for the enlargement of your Station; but we insist upon your taking three-fourths of the whole of the ground which belongs to us." The Committee made a compromise between the original proposal of the Railway Company and the demand of the Trustees, and they gave one-half of this burial ground to the Railway Company. It would be observed that the Committee struck a balance between the two parties—the Railway Company on the one hand, and the Trustees on the other; but would it be believed that when the Trustees insisted, or, rather, tried to induce the Railway Company to take three-fourths of the land, they were acting in strict contradiction to the wishes of the people they ought to have represented. The House was aware that this burial ground did not belong to the parish in which it was situated. It belonged to the parish of St. James, Westminster, and the Trustees were appointed by the Vestry of St. James, Westminster, who represented the ratepayers; and it was the fact—unknown to the Committee, and unknown to the House, which gave its decision last week—that the Vestry of St. James were indignant with the action taken by the Trustees, who nominally represented them, and were extremely anxious that the burial ground should be preserved, as by his Amendment it would be, as a recreation ground for the people of St. Pancras. The Vestry of St. James, who represented the ratepayers of St. James, were not desirous that the ashes of their forefathers should be turned into a marketable commodity, as the Trustees appeared anxious to provide. They were prepared to hand over such part as the London and North-Western Railway required for their new Station; but they were not prepared to see this burial ground, which had belonged to the parish from time immemorial, desecrated by being turned to some purely commercial use. The case, therefore, in favour of the Bill stood thus—if the Amendment were carried, the London and North-Western Railway Company would get all they required; while the other parties, the Trustees, were going altogether outside their duties, and did not represent the people they ought to represent. He now came to the other side of the question. Let them look at what they were going to do, if they took away this burial ground from the uses to which it might be put as a recreation ground, and turned it into stables. He could not help thinking that the House of Commons had shown itself, in many respects, slack in preserving these open spaces, notwithstanding the fact that the necessity for them, as open spaces, was a growing necessity. Whatever view they might take of the industrial developments now going on in England; however proud they might be of the increase of wealth it indicated, they could not shut their eyes to the necessary and attendant evils of it. Year by year the population of the country was diminishing, and the population of the towns was increasing. Year by year a larger portion of the population were being driven to lodge in squalid houses, with imperfect ventilation and defective accommodation. People spoke of those who advocated the retention of open spaces, as he was now doing, as if they were actuated by sentimental considerations only. They gave it a bad name, and then they voted against it. Now, he contended that the retention of open spaces was no more a sentimental object than a good drainage system, or good lodging and good accommodation. The well-being and health of the people, bodily and intellectually, were as much bound up in the keeping of these open spaces, and increasing them to the utmost of their power, as any of those vast schemes of drainage and ventilation in which the House was constantly concerning itself. Did hon. Members reflect upon the fact that a vast proportion of the population, in the whole course of their lives, from one year's end to the other, never saw a bit of turf, or a tree, or a flower? Those to whom residence in town was an agreeable incident were unable to understand either the pleasure that was given by parks and recreation grounds, or the absolute necessity they were to the poorer people who inhabited the large towns in this country. A gentleman had written to him (Mr. A. J. Balfour) from St. George's in the East, a large and poor parish in the East End of London, where they had turned the burial ground into the sort of recreation ground he proposed in this case, which proposal he hoped the House would assent to so far as this Marylebone burial ground was concerned. The writer said that the old burial ground had proved a source of pleasure to thousands of children and others who were able to obtain fresh air and enjoy their first glimpse of a tree, or a shrub, or a flower from what they saw planted there. They who belonged to the parish, and had relatives buried there, thought there was no desecration even in the frequent football playing of the descendants of the dead on or around their graves, and they looked upon trees and flowers as a pleasing substitute for dingy gravestones. If the Amendment which he (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had put on the Paper, and now recommended to the attention of the House, were carried, they would, on the one hand, give to the Railway Company, which was the complaining party on this occasion, everything they absolutely required for their station purposes; and, on the other hand, they would confer a boon of great present value, and of increasing future value, upon the district around St. Pancras, especially as it became more and more thickly populated. He earnestly hoped that the House of Commons, by giving a decided vote on the question, would, in future, prevent claims being made by any Corporation, however powerful, to spots which should be preserved intact for ever for the benefit of the labouring population in the great manufacturing towns. He hoped the House would understand that it was not in a captious or obstructive spirit that he brought forward this Amendment. There was a great question at issue; and he hoped the House would show, by their vote on the present occasion, that the interests of the people of St. Pancras had their attention. He begged to move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be re-committed; and, in the event of that Amendment being carried, he proposed to move—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee to modify the provisions of the Bill in such a manner that the powers of purchase relating to the disused burial ground in the parish of St.

Pancras be confined to such portions of the burial ground as may be necessary for the enlargement of Euston Station, and that such purchase be conditional on the laying out of the remaining portion of the burial ground as a suitable place of public recreation."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to insert the word "re-committed,"—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now read the third time,' stand part of the Question."

Mr. R. H. PAGET said, he need scarcely assure the House that he was in sympathy with the remarks of the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) with regard to the necessity of retaining open spaces, and the great value they were for the education and refinement of the people. But he would venture to ask the House to look at the question as one which had been already determined. [*Cries of* "No!"] Hon. Members might decline to accept that statement; but every argument which had been used in the present debate was also heard on the last occasion, and everything they could say in favour of the scheme had again to be said. Therefore, practically, the re-hearing of the case which the hon. Gentleman demanded was a re-hearing by the same tribunal of precisely the same case which they had already heard and decided. He wished to disclaim, for himself and for those who had served on the Committee, any kind of personal feeling whatever in the matter. They had the whole case fully argued before them; they had before them the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Vestry of St. Pancras, who urged the open spaces' view of the question. All the evidence was heard and cross-examined upon; the Committee deliberated, and after discussion, but without a division, they came to the conclusion which they thought the interests of all parties concerned best demanded. The House, although, undoubtedly, it had the right of determining eventually whether the decision of a Committee should be accepted or not, was not a good tribunal for going into minute questions. When a particular tribunal had been appointed to inquire into the merits of a Private Bill; when it had heard all the evidence; when it had had the whole case put clearly and thoroughly before it; and when it had, after due deliberation, come to the conclusion which it thought best, it was neither fair towards a Railway Company, or to a Private Bill Committee themselves, that the details, with which the Committee had been made familiar in evidence, should be raked up in an insufficient and irregular manner in the House. He would also venture to point out that, in this case, as in other cases, it was open to those who wished to reverse the decision of the Committee, to do so in the usual and regular way before the House of Lords; and he could not see any reason why this particular case should be singled out to be dealt with in this exceptional way. It would be a matter of extreme inconvenience if decisions arrived at by Committees upstairs unanimously were to be made matters of discussion in the House, especially after they had already undergone one discussion, in which the whole case had been heard, determined, and voted upon in a full House. It was most inconvenient, under such circumstances, to rake up all these matters again upon the third reading of the Bill, with a view of reversing the judgment of the Committee. He trusted that the House would maintain the decision it arrived at the other day, and would send the Bill up to the House of Lords.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE said, that when he saw this Notice on the Paper, and saw that it was practically raising the same question a second time which had already been discussed and settled, he thought he would endeavour to make himself, as far as he could, master of all the circumstances of the case, and that he would ascertain the way in which this burial ground was affected by the Bill. The inquiries he had made, irrespective of the Company itself, had induced him to hope that the excellent advice given by the Chairman of the Select Committee (Mr. R. H. Paget), and by his hon. Friend the Member for Walsall (Sir Charles Forster), would have been accepted, and that the House would not be asked practically to undo the decision they had already arrived at. Now, what were the facts of the case? This burial ground comprised about 16,600 square yards. The Select Committee was presided over by his hon. Friend opposite the Member for Mid Somersetshire, and hon. Gentlemen of all shades of politics looked upon that hon. Gentleman as one of the most able and experienced Chairmen who could be appointed. The House had heard the hon. Gentleman's remarks in regard to the Bill, and the very good defence he had made of the decision come to by the Committee. The Committee had fully considered the question, and they were of opinion that the wants of the Railway Company would be sufficiently provided for by dividing the burial ground between the Railway Company and the public, leaving that portion not taken by the Company under conditions by which it could be appropriated as a recreation ground for the people of St. Pancras. What the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) now did was to ask the House not to give the Railway Company one-half, but only to give them one-third; and the whole question upon which the hon. Member asked for a decision of the House a second time was a question of 2,200 square yards of land, or very little more than a quarter of an acre. Upon such a paltry issue, the House were asked to reverse the decision of their own Committee. The question originally was not a very large one, and he thought he could show that there was no necessity for it to have been brought before the House at all. With regard to the graveyard, for a period of 30 years it had never been used as a burial place at all; it had not been kept in good order; there were very few tombstones in it; and that portion which the London and North-Western Railway Company desired to take was singularly devoid of tombstones or any other sepulchral decorations of any kind. That portion which it was intended to devote to purposes of recreation did contain tombstones; but, on examining them, he could find no more recent date than 1834, or nearly 50 years ago. A good deal had been said about the feelings of the people of the district. He believed that this burial ground was for some time a parochial churchyard. Of course, he had no wish that the graves of paupers should be more desecrated than those of persons who were better off. Far otherwise. He recollected the time when it was found necessary to take possession of the burial ground of the Society of Friends, in the neighbourhood of Bunhill Fields. He himself went down to see the graveyard, when the bones of persons which had been interred there were removed, and he was struck by the careful manner in which the remains were dealt with. The human remains were gathered into cases and conveyed away under the superintendence of an able officer, who saw everything done decently, and in proper order. In regard to this being an open space, there was, perhaps, no part of London so well off for open spaces. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members said "Oh;" but Regent's Park was not far from this spot. Any man could walk the distance in six minutes, and to Primrose Hill in 17 minutes. [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and* "No!"] Let hon. Members who discredited that fact measure the distance upon the map, and they would find that he was right when he said that any man, walking at the rate of three miles an hour, would do the distance in 17 minutes. Within 200 or 300 yards there were Euston Square, Torrington Square, Campbell Square, and various other squares; and, in point of fact, there was not a place in London in which open spaces were less required than the place they were now speaking of. Independently of that fact, for 30 years the public had had no access to this ground; and now, if the decision of the Committee and of the House of Commons was ratified, one-half of it would be devoted to practical and useful purposes of recreation. Certain hon. Gentlemen raised a great outcry against taking this burial ground because it was an open space. But where had those hon. Gentlemen been during the last 30 years, seeing that the ground had been allowed to remain entirely neglected, although there was an excellent building erected in the immediate neighbourhood of it—the London Temperance Hospital; and he believed the Trustees of that Hospital made no objection whatever to the Bill now before the House. At the present moment there was no thoroughfare whatever through this ground; but the plan provided by the Select Committee did secure a thoroughfare from Hampstead Road, which, at present, the public did not enjoy. But what pressed most upon his mind was that he believed this ground was required for the accommodation of the increasing traffic upon the London and North-Western Railway. It formed part of a large scheme which had been prepared for the enlargement of Euston Square Station, in order to ease the traffic. Anyone who knew the Euston and Camden Stations knew that the line between those points was a narrow one, hemmed in between high walls, and that it was necessary, in order to relieve the traffic coming into and leaving London, that the space near Euston Square should be largely added to. He thought his hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had established no case for calling upon the House to undo the decision of their Select Committee; and he, therefore, hoped the Amendment would be rejected.

Mr. FAWCETT said, that, as a Metropolitan Member, and as one who had long taken an interest in the preservation of open spaces, he trusted the House would allow him to make a very few observations upon this question. He entirely disagreed with his hon. Friend who had just spoken (Sir Joseph Pease) when he said that his hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had made out no case for bringing the matter again under the consideration of the House. Now, it seemed to him (Mr. Fawcett) quite impossible to imagine a stronger case. Hon. Members who were fortunate enough to hear the hon. Member's short and, at the same time, very temperate speech, must have been convinced of the singular strength of his case. Of course, the most difficult case they had to meet was the one put forward by the hon. Member for Mid Somersetshire (Mr. R. H. Paget), who represented the Select Committee to whom the Bill had been referred. No one would doubt for a moment that the hon. Member and the other hon. Members of the Committee were as desirous of doing their duty, and of doing what they thought to be best for the interests of the public, as any other hon. Member of that House; but he (Mr. Fawcett) thought the doctrine of never reviewing the decision of a Committee might be pushed to a very objectionable extreme. He had no wish to pass censure upon the Committee; but the very fact that, after the Bill had been referred to a Select Committee, it must be read a third time in the House distinctly showed that the House considered it of importance that they themselves should retain in their own hands the power of reviewing the decision of their Committee; and it seemed to him that this was exactly the case in which it was fitting for the House to interpose. He fully admitted that, as a rule, the only questions struggled over in conflict before a Select Committee were questions between one Railway Company and another, or between some private Corporation and a Railway Company; and in such cases it was possible that all private interests were safeguarded before the Committee. But this was a case involving not simply private interests, but public interests, of which that House was naturally the guardian. Again, it had been said—"Why do you not let the matter stand over, and leave it for the House of Lords to settle?" But what would be the natural remark which the House of Lords would make in such a case? They would say—"The House of Commons, containing many Metropolitan Members, whose duty it is to look after the interests of the Metropolis, have not felt themselves called upon to oppose the third reading of the Bill. They must, therefore, have considered that there was not a strong case for opposition; and how can we be expected to do that which they refuse to do themselves?" Again, it had been urged that this was precisely the same case as that which was decided by the House by a small majority on the last occasion; but, with all respect to his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Somersetshire, he (Mr. Fawcett) contended that it was not the same case at all. What was determined on the last occasion was this. No less than 167 Members of the House thought the case, from a public point of view, so strong that the Railway Company ought not to have any of the land that they asked for. But what was the case presented now? The Railway Company originally asked for one-third of the burial ground; and not one-third, but one-half, was now allotted to them. What the House had to determine was, whether the Railway Company ought to be allowed to obtain more ground, which would otherwise be devoted to purposes of public enjoyment, than they originally asked for, and what they thought was sufficient for their wants. His hon. Friend the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) said that this, after all, was a small and trumpery question, because it only concerned 2,200 square yards of land. Now, he (Mr. Fawcett) thought that if it was a question of 2,200 yards of land, in the midst of his own constituents—and he believed that St. Pancras was not less densely populated than the district he represented—it was by no means a small or a trumpery question. His hon. Friend little knew the needs and wants of the people of London. He little knew how vitally important it was—and each year it was becoming more important—that every foot of open ground should be preserved. He (Mr. Fawcett) had no hesitation in saying—and he expressed the opinion after consulting those who were likely to know—that if the House was not careful in preserving every yard and foot of what remained in the shape of open spaces in the Metropolis, it would be impossible to maintain the health, and vigour, and welfare of the people of London. Therefore, without wishing to detain the House, he thought he had said enough to show that, though at first sight this might appear to be a small question, it was one which concerned the health and well-being of the people, and was one which the House had pre-eminently the right to decide. With some confidence, he thought he might anticipate what their decision would be.

Mr. FIRTH said, the present position of the question was remarkable, inasmuch as the people interested in this land did not propose to acquire it for themselves. It had already been pointed out by his hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) that the inhabitants of the parish of St. Pancras were themselves opposed to the course which the Trustees had taken in the matter; and he (Mr. Firth) thought that that fact, which had come to the knowledge of the House since the matter was discussed before, was a point of very considerable importance. How did the case now stand? He found that the Railway Company only asked originally for a small portion of the land, and that very portion his hon. Friend proposed by his Amendment to give them. He (Mr. Firth) regretted that the House could not see its way to preventing the Railway Company from taking any of this open space at all; but the complications of the case were such that there had hardly been any sort of proper representation of the public interests before the Select Committee. He believed that the parish of St. Pancras was anxious to preserve this open space for the benefit and recreation of the people. St. Pancras had a population of 250,000. The burial ground, however, did not belong to the parish of St. Pancras at all, but to another parish some distance away. There was an Act passed in 1881, under which the burial ground might have been transferred to the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Vestry of St. Pancras; but, as a matter of fact, it had not been so transferred. The parish of St. Pancras expressed its willingness to take it over if it were transferred; and if it had been taken over it would have been very greatly for the benefit of the people living there. It was suggested by the hon. Baronet the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) that the inhabitants of the district did not require open spaces of this kind; but, as had been well said by the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General, every inch of open ground was wanted for the benefit of the people of London. If hon. Members would go eastward of this ground they would find many thousands of people to whom open spaces of this kind would be a great boon and relief; and no one could imagine the extent of that boon and relief unless he had gone into the dwellings of the poor and had endeavoured to realize the condition in which they lived. Hon. Members like the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) took up and contested questions of this kind for them; but he was afraid that such Gentlemen too often laboured in vain in defence of the interests of the poor. He trusted the House would see its way to support the proposition now made. Attention had been called to the fact that 55 Railway Directors were in favour of this ground being taken from the people of the Metropolis. He presumed that every Member of the House could become a Railway Director if he thought fit; but he refused to believe that occupying that important position signified the hardening of the human heart. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] His hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) said "Oh!" and probably his hon. Friend had had a wide experience as to the hardening of the human heart; but his hon. Friend's experience differed from his (Mr. Firth's). It was a remarkable thing that Railway Companies found the most convenient places for driving a railway through were either open spaces devoted to the benefit of the poor, or ground covered by the habitations of the poor. That fact would be found amply illustrated by the condition of things which occurred in this case; and he thought it would be found that no authority appeared before the Committee which was qualified to defend the interests of the poor. It was to be hoped that the Government were about to give them some such authority in the Metropolis; but until they did so he hoped the House would see their way to support Resolutions such as that which had been proposed by the hon. Member for Hertford, and which, if adopted, would do something for the benefit of the poor.

SIR ARTHUR OTWAY said, he would only make a few observations in regard to the Bill, because they had already had a full discussion, not only to-day, but on a previous occasion. He did not think the House would act wisely if they adopted the Motion of the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour); and they ought to reflect upon the consequences which the adoption of the Motion might have upon the proceedings of the House hereafter. He must say he thought it somewhat hard that hon. Members, like the hon. and learned Member for Chelsea (Mr. Firth), who had just sat down, should suppose that anyone who did not agree with him on a question like this must necessarily be opposed to the interests of the poor. Now, he begged to say, for one, that he had had more opportunities of giving evidence of his feeling in regard to open spaces in the interests of the poor than the hon. and learned Member himself; but, setting aside altogether the question of open spaces, he would confine himself to the question presented to the House. He thought it would be a very inconvenient course if the House were to determine to refuse to accept the decisions of Select Committees specially appointed to inquire into the merits of Private Bills. He had studied the proceedings of this Committee, and he held in his hand a report of the Evidence taken by the Committee; and he found that all the matters to which hon. Gentlemen had referred had been examined into by the tribunal presided over by the hon. Member for Mid Somersetshire (Mr. R. H. Paget). Among other things, there had been a Report from the Home Office, in which no objection was taken to the proposals of the Railway Company in regard to the burial ground. That Report was laid before the Committee, and considered by them; and they introduced provisions into the Bill in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Report. That being the case, and the question having been fully discussed on a former occasion, and having been fully examined into by the Committee presided over by an hon. Gentleman quite as competent as any hon. Member of the House to be the Chairman of a Committee, he (Sir Arthur Otway) thought the House would do well to adopt the decision of the Committee. His hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said the proposition now made was not exactly the same as that presented to the House last week. No; it was not exactly the same; but it was exceedingly like it. In regard to what had fallen from his right hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), he wished to point out that this was not a case of reviewing one decision of the House, but of reviewing two decisions. They reviewed the decision of the Committee last week, and the House then decided by a majority to support it. If it became the habit of the House, after a Select Committee had been appointed to examine into a Bill, to review the decision of that Committee, and, on a further stage of a Bill, to review the discussion, they would take a course which would not only be highly inconvenient, but would strike a serious blow at the usefulness of Select Committees. If the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Hertford went to a division, he should feel bound to go into the Lobby against him.

MR. BRYCE said, he would detain the House only for one moment from the division. He was very desirous of showing what the true facts of the case were. There was no desire, on their part, to accuse those hon. Members who differed from them of being neglectful of the interests of the poor. He knew that the House was perfectly alive to that matter, and that they only desired to do that which was necessary for the public interests. In reference to the remarks of the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway), he (Mr. Bryce) asked the House to consider what the Amendment was. The proposal of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. J. Hollond) last week was that the decision of the Committee should be reversed, by prohibiting the London and North-Western Railway Company from taking any portion of this ground. [*Cries of* "No!"] Yes; that was so; and it was from that point that the question was argued. A compromise was suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), who proposed that a Motion similar to that now made by the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) should be adopted; but that compromise was not accepted. His hon. Friend the Member for Hertford's Motion gave now exactly what the Railway Company originally asked for; and his hon. Friend agreed to the request of the Railway Company that it should be allowed to take whatever was absolutely necessary for the purpose of enlarging Euston Square Station. His hon. Friend proposed to move, in the event of the Bill being re-committed—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee to modify the provisions of the Bill in such a manner that the powers of the purchase relating to the disused burial ground in the parish of St. Pancras be confined to such portions of the burial ground as may be necessary for the enlargement of Euston Station, and that such purchase be conditional on the laying out of the remaining portion of the burial ground as a suitable place of public recreation;"

so that, in point of fact, the Motion of his hon. Friend, if accepted, would give the Railway Company all they argued for last week. Those who supported the Amendment were not so unreasonable as to say that the development of a great station like Euston Square should be checked, even if it involved the taking of part of an open space; but what they said was—"Do not take more than is necessary; spare the open spaces wherever they can be spared." It was the course pursued by the Trustees of the parish of St. James, who desired to make a gain out of this burial ground, that they objected to, more than that of the Railway Company. What the Trustees asked was, that they should be empowered to sell to the Railway Company a large portion of this open space, which, on the showing of the Railway Company themselves, was not required for the enlargement of their Station, but which, no doubt, they said they could find use for if they got it. No doubt they would house their omnibuses and stable their horses upon it; but they could house their omnibuses and stable their horses just as well somewhere else within 300 yards of the Station. He thought, therefore, that the adoption of the Amendment would be greatly for the advantage of the poor of the district, who needed some sort of recreation ground in the neighbourhood.

Mr. PLUNKET said, he was sorry to interpose between the House and a division; but it was really not the fault of the Railway Company that the matter was again brought forward, The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), who had just sat down, would forgive him for saying that he had entirely mistaken the way in which the case came before the House. It was quite true that the form in which the Motion was originally put on the Paper by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. J. Hollond) was such as the hon. Member (Mr. Bryce) had stated; but it was purposely altered before it was put from the Chair. Indeed, he (Mr. Plunket) was interrupted in his speech, because he was arguing it as if it were still in the form in which it had stood on the Paper.

Mr. J. HOLLOND said, he wished to explain that the statement of the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Plunket) was not quite accurate. The question placed before the House was simply the re-committal of the Bill, for the purpose of enabling him to move an Instruction such as had been described by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce). If that Instruction had been moved, which provided that no part of this open space should be encroached upon, it would then have been competent for any hon. Member to move an Amendment in the same sense as the Amendment of he hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour). The Instruction which he (Mr. Hollond) intended to have moved, if the re-committal had been carried, was that which had substantially been described by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), and it differed altogether from that of the hon. Member for Hertford.

Mr. PLUNKET said, he could not say what the hon. Member (Mr. J. Hollond) might have moved under other circumstances; but the hon. Member distinctly declined to move the Amendment he had on the Paper. [Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: No.] He said yes. He was speaking in that sense on the last occasion, when the same right hon. Gentleman who interrupted him now interrupted him then. On the last occasion he had misunderstood what the Motion before the House was; and the right hon. Gentleman interrupted him, very properly, in order to explain what it was that the House was going to vote upon. There was a distinct Instruction to the Committee, on re-consideration, not to give any land to the Railway Company; and the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works was that the Committee might consider what amount of the land was necessary for the enlargement of the Station. He should like to call the attention of the House to the statement which had been made by the hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall (Sir Charles Forster), when the third reading of the Bill was moved, because many hon. Members had entered the House since the hon. Gentleman spoke. The hon. Gentleman had appealed to the House not to depart from its ordinary practice, on the ground that the adoption of such a course would make the conduct of Private Business impossible. He (Mr. Plunket) wished the House to reflect that they had been appealed to, not only by the hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall, who moved the third reading of the Bill in his official capacity, but also by the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway), who supported the appeal on similar grounds. The Chairman of Ways and Means asked the House not to interfere with its ordinary practice in this case. He (Mr. Plunket) did not deny, if there really was a special case of some overpowering public importance, that the House might then override the decision of its Committee; but he entirely denied that such a case had been made out in the present instance. On what grounds were they asked to review the finding of the Committee which sat on the Bill? There were two grounds—first, to avoid the desecration of the bodies interred in this disused graveyard; and, secondly, to preserve the open spaces of the Metropolis. No better motive could be put forward, and there were certainly none which would be more sure to get up an agitation. As to the desecration of the dead bodies interred in the graveyard, he must say that the argument was inconsistent; because the proposal was, to a certain extent, that these dead bodies should be interfered with for the purpose of giving to the parish a recreation ground. As that proposal was acceded to both by the promoters and the opponents of the Bill, there could be really no question in regard to the desecration of dead bodies. He found, however, that there was no desecration whatever. The application of disused graveyards for public purposes was a perfectly understood matter; and rules were framed, under the authority of the Home Office, to enable any proposed removals to be properly carried out. In the present case, every one of the rules and requirements of the Home Office had been fully complied with, so as to secure, in the event of the removal of any dead bodies being necessary, that it should be decently carried out. He did not suppose there would have been any objection of the kind if it had been proposed to hand over the graveyard for the purpose of forming a pleasure ground; and it was only because the requirements of the Railway Company were concerned in the matter, that this course had been taken. The second objection was that the ground ought to be preserved as an open space in the interests of the public health. Now, he thought it was as clear as anything could possibly be that, if ever there was a case in which there was no want of open spaces, it was the case of the particular locality of which they were now talking. His hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour), who proposed the Amendment, in an eloquent and effective speech, had referred to a letter from some person living at St. George's in the East, describing how the children there had made their first acquaintance with fresh air and green trees and flowers in the open space provided by the turning of the churchyard there into a recreation ground. Nothing could be more touching, and if this ground were lying in St. George's in the East, or in some other overcrowded part of London, there would be great force in the argument; but, in point of fact, it happened to be in a district which was among the best provided with open spaces in the Metropolis, and the squares were exceptionally numerous. [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and* "No!"] Hon. Members said "Oh!" and "No!" but what was the fact? Within a very short distance, there were Mornington Crescent, Oakley Square, Torrington Square, Euston Square, and various other open spaces.

MR. O'KELLY asked if the right hon. and learned Gentleman would allow him to inquire how many of these squares were open to the public?

MR. PLUNKET said, he was unable to say; but he was dealing now with the question of open spaces, and he need scarcely point out that every one of these places were open spaces, and that they were open spaces of the best kind, carefully kept for the advantage and improvement of the Metropolis. Further than that, this burial ground was within half-a-mile of Regent's Park; and, therefore, the House ought not to be misled, because it was impossible to find a district in London that was better provided with open spaces. He would ask the House to consider what was the alternative. He held in his hand a Paper which had been circulated among hon. Members that morning, entitled "Reasons in support of the Motion of the hon. Member for Hertford." What was it they proposed to do? It was stated in that Paper that the object was to keep these places as open spaces; but the House could not have the smallest idea of what kind of an open space it was proposed to maintain, if it was to be kept up in its present condition. It was one of the most miserable, dingy, and gloomy instances of a disused graveyard which could be possibly conceived. The Railway Company proposed to take over a portion of the graveyard, and the Select Committee provided that they should pay for the whole of it, and that the portion not given to the Railway Company should be converted into an open space properly maintained for the enjoyment of the neighbourhood; and it was also provided that there should be free access to it in the future, which there never had been in the past. He had just one word more to say. The House was told that a great many things had changed since the last time the matter was before the House. They were told by an hon. Member that the people of the parish of St. James, Westminster, had been in a perfect state of fever about this business, that their indignation knew no bounds, and that a meeting had been held for the purpose of protesting against the conduct of the Trustees. Now, he had received information, upon the authority of a gentleman who was present at the meeting, and who was prepared, if necessary, to give evidence on oath, as to the facts, should the question be raised before a Committee of the other House. The meeting, which was advertised, was, in point of fact, a very small meeting. It was attended, to a great extent, by persons who were not parishioners; and when the motion was put in opposition to the scheme of the Railway Company, only 18 hands out of the whole number of persons present were held up in favour of the motion. His right hon. Friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Fawcett), who always spoke with such authority in that House, said that it was impossible for persons interested in the matter to be fully heard before the Committee. [Mr. FAWCETT dissented.] Well, perhaps it was not his right hon. Friend who said it; but it certainly had been said in the course of the debate. It was, however, an entire misrepresentation. The fact was that the Vestry of St. Pancras was heard by counsel before the Committee. The Metropolitan Board of Works were certainly heard by counsel; and the Committee had before them the hon. and learned Member for Gateshead (Mr. W. H. James), who took so great an interest in the matter. Everything the House had heard advanced that day would, no doubt, be found in the Report of the proceedings of the Committee, having been fully discussed, examined, and cross-examined upon, and argued by counsel before the Committee. Nevertheless, the Committee decided unanimously in favour of the Bill which the House were now asked to read a third time; and he contended that they could not possibly have a stronger case, if they desired to raise an issue as to whether they were or were not prepared to sustain the decision of their Select Committees. One word more. This ground was really wanted for the purposes of the Railway Company, not only for the enlargement of their Euston Square Station, which the necessities of the traffic imperatively required, but in order to make provision for the Parcels Post and for other purposes. If this ground were given to the

Railway Company, the House might rely upon it, with confidence, that it was absolutely required by the necessities of the Company.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had no intention of taking part in the discussion that day, as he had already explained his views on a previous occasion; but, as some misapprehension had arisen as to what took place last week, he wished to say a word in the way of explanation. His hon. Friend the Member for Brighton (Mr. J. Holland), on the last occasion, moved that the Bill be re-committed, and he was prepared to follow on with a Motion which would have had the effect of preventing the Railway Company from taking any part of this land in question. In the course of the discussion which took place, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) ventured to suggest a compromise; whereupon the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Plunket) immediately got up and said the House had no right to make that compromise, as it was inconsistent with the Motion before the House. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) pointed out that the immediate Motion before the House was the re-committal of the Bill, and that it was quite inconsistent with that proposal to amend the Instruction. Now, he believed that a large majority of those who heard the discussion were in favour of a compromise; and if the vote of the House had been determined by those who had listened to the debate, he had no doubt the decision would have been in favour of the Amendment. But, unfortunately, a large number of hon. Members dropped into the House for the division who had not heard the discussion, but were merely summoned by the invitation of the Railway Company. Those hon. Members outvoted hon. Members who had been present during the discussion; and, consequently, there was a small majority in favour of the Bill of the London and North Western Railway Company. He did not complain of their action; they were quite within their right; but what he did say was that the matter was really determined by a majority of persons who were interested in the question. The only question now before the House was the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour), who proposed to give the Railway Company all that they really wanted and all that they asked for. Those who were in favour of the Amendment maintained two principles; one, that a disused burial ground of this kind should not be used for building purposes unless the interests of the public demanded it. He was quite ready to admit that the Railway Company had proved a case which showed the necessity of their making use of a small portion of the ground, and that it was demanded by them for the public convenience; but he did not think the public convenience required that any part of it should be laid out in stables. The second principle was that this disused burial ground ought not to be converted into building purposes, and that the dead bodies interred in it ought not to be disturbed without some strong public ground or reason being shown. His hon. Friend the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) had referred to a similar case—namely, the conversion of the burial ground at Bunhill Fields connected with the Society of Friends. Now, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had had something to do with that case. He had tried to prevent the ground from being interfered with; and he was sorry that he was unable to do so. He went down to the spot, and saw what took place, when large masses of bones were removed and carted away elsewhere. He should not soon forget the scene he witnessed. It occasioned a considerable amount of scandal, and he very much regretted what took place. All he could say was, that the principle he contended for was that these things should not take place unless a very overwhelming case could be shown that it was for the public advantage. As, in this case, the Railway Company would get all they wanted, he thought the remainder ought to be devoted to the wants of the public.

Mr. STANTON said, he begged to differ altogether from the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Shaw Lefevre). This was not what the Railway Company had asked for. In the first instance, the Railway Company asked for more than the Committee thought fit to give them. The Committee, in the exercise of their discretion, made a compromise, and gave the Railway Company what they thought they were entitled to. He wished, therefore, to state to the House that this was not all the Railway Company asked for; and if the Company did not get the land the Committee decided to give them, they would, undoubtedly, be put to very serious inconvenience. It must be remembered that London was increasing every year; and so much excitement was now being got up in favour of the retention of open spaces, that there was a possibility of the Railway Company finding themselves hemmed in on all sides, with very few places indeed to which they could obtain access. He hoped, therefore, that the House would not refuse the Railway Company now that which they might have very hard work to obtain hereafter, and which they would undoubtedly require. So far as the question of open spaces was concerned, within a radius of half a-mile from this burial ground there were 34 acres of open spaces. He had a list of 18 open spaces within half a-mile of the centre of this ground, and they amounted altogether to an area of 34 acres, exclusive of the wide streets and roads which existed in the neighbourhood, and which might be counted as open spaces. Leaving out the question of the removal of the dead bodies interred in this ground, he hoped the House would see that it was desirable to support the decision of the Committee, and to ratify the decision arrived at last week.

Mr. O'KELLY said, he hoped the House would not allow itself to be influenced by the interested views of hon. Gentlemen who supported the Bill, and who told them how many open spaces there were in this district. Everyone knew that these so-called open spaces were not open to the public, and that, especially, they were not open to the poor. There was not within half-a-mile of this place any open space that was open to the poor. But within half-a-mile of the point which the Railway Company sought to take possession of, there was a large mass of population living in most crowded dwellings. The people in the district certainly required all the air and all the open spaces they could get. He thought it almost indecent that Railway Directors should come down to that House, in order to support a Railway Company in taking possession of every plot of land that belonged to the people.

Mr. MUNTZ said, he wished to point out that the land did not belong to the people, but to the Trustees of St. James's, Westminster. He had not the honour of being a shareholder of the London and North-Western Railway Company; and, therefore, in anything he said, he was altogether independent of the Company. All he desired, however, was to caution the House against upsetting the decision of the Committee upon the Amendment which was brought forward, after the question had been virtually decided a week ago.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, the House had been recommended by several hon. Members not to disturb the decision of the Select Committee, and not to attempt to do anything to alter it, because it was a decision of a Committee of the House. Now, that was not an argument which for one moment would hold water. If the House were to be bound by the decisions of its Select Committees on Private Bills, the third reading of a Bill in that House would become a farce. Since this question was before the House last week, a circumstance had come to light which materially altered the state of the case; and that was, that the representation of the parish of St. James, not the churchwardens, but the popular representation of that parish—namely, the Vestry of the ratepayers—were opposed to this transaction. If, then, the ratepayers of the parish, who were most interested in getting the money, and the parish, which was interested in keeping the burial-ground as an open space, were opposed to the Bill, and if the Railway Company—who were the only persons really interested in the matter—were satisfied, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) really proposed to give the Railway Company that which was right and fair—namely, all the space they actually required. If they were not satisfied with that, he did not think any Member of the House—whether he were a Railway Director or a proprietor of railway shares—had a right to say that the House had come to an unjust decision in referring the Bill back to the Select Committee. He had been induced to be present at the discussion for the purpose of hearing anything that might be said in favour of the Company; but he was completely persuaded that their case would not hold water.

Mr. KENNY said, he wished to ask Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order, whether a Director or a shareholder of the London and North-Western Railway

Company was to be considered as a person having a direct and pecuniary interest in the question at issue; and whether, in the event of any such person recording his vote in the Division, that vote should be disallowed in pursuance of Standing Order 196?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Original Question is, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. KENNY, again rising, said, he had addressed a question to Mr. Speaker, and he thought he was entitled to receive an answer to it. Perhaps he had better repeat the question. It was, whether a Director or shareholder of the London and North-Western Railway Company was to be considered as a person having a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the question at issue; and whether, in the event of such person recording his vote in the Division, that vote should be disallowed in pursuance of Standing Order 196?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question raised by the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) is one for the determination of the House. If the House thinks proper, it may allow a Motion to be made to the effect mentioned by the hon. Gentleman.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE: After the Division?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes; after the Division.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 173; Noes 157: Majority 16. — (Div. List, No. 85.)

Mr. KENNY: I put to you, Sir, a few minutes ago, a point of Order, which you said it was for the House to decide. I find that in the Division which has just taken place, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) has recorded his vote in favour of the Bill. As he is a Director of the London and North-Western Railway Company, and as I interpret the Rule to mean that a Director of a Railway Company is a gentleman pecuniarily interested in the affairs of that Railway Company, I beg to move that the vote of the right hon. and learned Gentleman be expunged from the list.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Vote of Mr. Plunket be disallowed."—(*Mr. Kenny.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) has moved that the vote be disallowed. I have to inform the House that any hon. Member having a direct pecuniary interest in the Question before the House is not entitled to vote. But, according to the usual practice, I apprehend that the House will desire to hear the right hon. and learned Gentleman.

Mr. PLUNKET: I rise, Sir, to answer the appeal you have made to me. I will only say that I am not acquainted with the precedents upon this question, if there be any; but my impression was that I was acting within my right in recording my vote. And I think I can reduce the opposition of the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) to an absurdity, by stating that, to my knowledge, a good many hon. Members who voted against the Bill on this occasion are shareholders in the Company.

[The right hon. and learned Gentleman then withdrew.]

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: I wish to say, in corroboration of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's statement, that I am a shareholder, and that I voted in opposition to the right hon. and learned Gentleman.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER: I also am a shareholder, and I did the same.

Mr. CAINE: I should like to know whether or not shareholders are held to have a direct pecuniary interest in this question?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter for the determination of the House. The House will say whether the interest of any hon. Member is such that his vote should be disallowed.

Question put.

The House *divided;*—Ayes 36; Noes 254: Majority 218.—(Div. List, No. 86.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—(Queen's *Consent* signified).

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—THE LATE EX-GAIKWAR OF BARODA.

Mr. M'LAREN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether there are any reasons why so much of the money formerly belonging to the late ex-Gaikwar of Baroda, and now in the hands of the Indian Government, as will provide for the claims of the English agents and advocates of the late ex-Gaikwar against his estate, for services rendered, should not be paid to such agents and advocates by the Indian Government; and, whether it is the fact that claims of that nature, which the late ex-Gaikwar was desirous of meeting, are still unsatisfied, owing to the delay of the Indian Government in paying the money?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, the unspent balances of the amount annually set aside from the Baroda Revenues for the maintenance of Mulkar Rao are not in the hands of the Indian Government. They have been treated as lapsed to the Baroda State at the close of each year; and it is for that Government to deal, as it may think proper, with claims such as those referred to by my hon. Friend.

SOUTH AFRICA—ZULULAND—THE BISHOP OF NATAL.

Mr. DILLWYN asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government have received from the Bishop of Natal a reply to Sir Henry Bulwer's charges against the Bishop of undue interference in the affairs of Zululand; and, if so, will he include it in the next issue of South African Papers?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, I have received only this day the document to which my hon. Friend refers, and I have not yet been able to read it; but I have no doubt it will be included in the next issue of Papers.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: When will they be ready?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: After Whitsuntide.

GROUND GAME ACT, 1880—SPRING TRAPS (SCOTLAND).

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Her Majesty's Government will move Parliament to restore in Scotland the liberty to protect crops from injury by allowing the use of spring traps in rabbit runs; a liberty the people of that country enjoyed prior to the passing of the Ground Game Act of 1880, but of which, under a recent decision of the Court of Session as to the meaning of that Act, they are now deprived, while in England and Ireland there is no such deprivation?

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL: I rise to Order. I wish, before the answer is given, to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the statement contained in the latter part of the Question is not debateable?

Mr. SPEAKER: I see no ground for interposing between the hon. and gallant Member (Sir Alexander Gordon) and the House. The part of the Question to which the hon. Baronet (Sir Herbert Maxwell) refers contains a reference to a recent decision of the Court of Session with regard to the meaning of the Act. How far that would be correct I am not aware. It may be matter of controversy.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Perhaps the hon. Baronet opposite will allow me to answer the Question. The latter part of the Question of my hon. and gallant Friend is, I think, framed under a misapprehension. The law is the same for all the Three Kingdoms in this respect. My hon. Friend says that the Act of 1880 took away the rights which were previously enjoyed. In one sense that is true; but hardly, perhaps, in the sense which my hon. and gallant Friend understands it. It did not take away really from the tenant farmers anything which, as a rule, they enjoyed; because, under the terms of their leases, they were prohibited from killing game in any way whatever. But, during the progress of that Act through the House of Commons, it was represented to me that if persons, whether tenants or others, were allowed to set spring traps in the open everywhere, they would kill a great many things besides rabbits, which nobody desired to kill. For that reason, and also because I think the use of spring traps at all is a cruel thing, I was very willing to limit the use of spring traps, not as against the tenants only, but as against everybody, proprietors as well. That was what really took place. Accordingly a clause was inserted, by which no person is allowed, whether he be proprietor or tenant, to set a spring trap in the pen, for this reason—that it kills a great many animals which it is not desired to kill. That was the real meaning of the insertion of the clause. As far as I know, certainly in England, there has been little or no complaint of the operation of that clause. There are plenty of other ways of killing rabbits besides spring traps, and they have been found efficient. As to the decision to which my hon. and gallant Friend refers, of the Court of Session in Scotland, I understand that my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate is contemplating the introduction of a measure to remove the difficulty which has arisen on that decision.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 16—SECRET EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that a witness summoned privately under the Act for the Prevention of Crime (Ireland), 1882, before a magistrate, and then and there compelled to give evidence, can have anything suggested to him and put into his mouth, and taken down and attributed to him, and then be threatened with prosecution for perjury unless he swears to what is thus taken down; if there is any Clause in said Act which precluded persons so examined at secret inquiries having the benefit of a solicitor to protect them from misrepresentation as to what their evidence really was, and to protect them from prosecution for perjury; if Mr. P. Sullivan swore, at a recent inquiry at Ennis before Mr. Clifford Lloyd, that he asked over and over again to have his depositions corrected, and that they were not so corrected; and, if the Irish officials or advisers of Her Majesty's Government are prepared to extend the protection of a legal man to witnesses so pressed and examined?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the first part of this Question appears to convey the notion that the responsible magistrates, intrusted by Statute with the duty of conducting inquiries for the purpose of the detection of crime in Ireland, have been, or are likely to be, guilty of misconduct in the discharge of their duty, as imputed in the Question. I must decline to give any answer to that part of the hon. Member's Question, further than to say that there is no foundation whatever for the charge conveyed, and that the Government feels, as Parliament felt when it was passing the Crimes Act, that the magistrates, designated for the purpose by the Statute, may be safely intrusted with the discharge of the duty imposed upon them. As regards the second and fourth paragraphs of the Question, I have to state that a person examined as a witness under the Crimes Act is not entitled, under the Statute or otherwise, to have a solicitor present on his behalf, and the Government do not intend to propose any alteration in the law in this respect. As to the third paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, I must decline, as I have already done, to enter into a discussion as to a particular statement made by a witness in a judicial inquiry which is still pending.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Might I ask whether one of the gentlemen who was appointed special resident magistrate has not been dismissed for misconduct?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Undoubtedly, Sir, in so large a service as this it has happened that a special resident magistrate has been called upon to resign; but the only deduction to be drawn from that is that the Executive consider that, as a body, their standard of integrity and ability should be very high indeed.

Mr. HARRINGTON: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman, arising out of this Question, whether it has come to his notice that, in a case at Mullingar, in which I was interested, five resident magistrates were present when a witness swore that they had never read his depositions to him, that he had never read them himself, and that, as he stated afterwards, they were not true?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I must ask for Notice of the Question.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CASE OF PATRICK KENNEDY.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. Sexton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that a man named Patrick Kennedy, of Beltra, near Rathlacken, Ballina, county Mayo, died on the 25th ult. through want of the necessaries of life; whether, on the 13th ult., twelve days before his death, Patrick Kennedy was visited by the Rev. Hugh Conway, the parish priest, who administered the sacrament to him, and, finding him to be in need of sustenance, gave some assistance, and directed Kennedy's wife and son to make known his condition to the relieving officer; whether the wife and son made separate applications, without avail, to the relieving officer; whether the first action taken by the relieving officer was on Tuesday the 24th ult. the day before Kennedy's death, when he gave a visiting ticket for the doctor, who paid the visit that evening, certified that Kennedy was dying, and ordered that five shillings should be given; whether the sum of three shillings, eventually granted, was only given a few hours before Kennedy's death, and too late to be of any use; and, what notice the Government will take of the case?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have received, by telegraph, Sir, a copy of a Report made by the Clerk of the Union on this case, referring to corroborative evidence, which will be forwarded by post, from which it appears that Patrick Kennedy had occupied between four and five acres of land, and had lived in the same house with his son-in-law, a letter carrier or postboy, in receipt of 12*s.* a-week wages, and who states that Kennedy had been unwell for 12 months, and that there is no ground for the assertion that he died from want of the necessaries of life. The relieving officer alleges that the first application he received in the case was made on the 19th ultimo, and that he then gave 3*s.* and reported the case to the Guardians, who approved of his action. He further states that it was not until the 23rd of April that Mrs. Kennedy applied to him for a medical visiting ticket, which he gave to her, and the doctor visited the man on the next day.

STATE OF IRELAND—AGRARIAN OUTRAGES IN MILTOWN MALBAY, COUNTY CLARE.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state how many outrages of an agrarian character have been committed within a radius of seven miles of Miltown Malbay, County Clare, during the past three years; if he will state the number of men from that district at present under arrest charged with conspiracy to murder, &c.; if he will state the number of witnesses which have already come forward to give evidence against these men; whether one Francis Egan has already been twice committed to gaol for refusing to give evidence; if it is a fact that Egan has declared he has no evidence to give; and, if so, whether the Government could accept any information from Egan, the trustworthiness of which would be thus so questionable; and, if there is no evidence to criminate any of the prisoners, they will be immedietaly discharged from custody?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, I am informed that the number of agrarian outrages committed within the time and radius specified is 32, and that 10 men have been arrested in the Miltown Malbay district on the charge of treason-felony and conspiracy to murder. Three witnesses have been examined. I have already, in reply to a former Question, stated the facts as to Egan. He was a witness who swore an information, and subsequently refused on two occasions to be sworn again, and was committed to prison. It is for the magistrate before whom the inquiry is held to decide as to the trustworthiness of the evidence adduced. The Government have no intention of interfering with the course of the inquiry.

MR. KENNY asked how it was, when only one murder was committed, that 10 men were still detained in custody on such a charge, when they could not possibly have taken part in it?

[No reply.]

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS (WELLS UNION).

MR. R. H. PAGET asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether, seeing that eighteen out of twenty parishes composing the Wells Union (including a thickly populated parish of an urban character) have adopted, under the sanction of the Education Department, the 4th Standard as the Standard for exemption from school attendance, and, seeing that the purely agricultural parish of Meare has experienced great inconvenience from the adoption of a higher Standard, he will favourably consider an application from that parish to place its Standard of exemption on a common footing with a large majority of the parishes of its union?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, there are 16 parishes in the Wells Union, four of which are under boards and the rest under school attendance committees. Three out of four boards, of which Meare is one, have the 5th Standard for total exemption; the remaining parishes have the 4th. The bye-laws in Meare were passed in 1877; and, if the attendance of the children had been regularly enforced, they would have had no difficulty in passing the 5th Standard by the time that they were fit for labour. It would be quite impossible, in a case such as this, to lower the Standard fixed so long ago, and that by the school board itself. There is, no doubt, inconvenience attending inequality of Standards; but the proper remedy, in the interests of the children and of the schools, is to level up, and not to level down. Children under 10 years of age are passing the 4th Standard in increasing numbers every year; and complaints are coming in from the clergy, school managers, and teachers, which are confirmed by our own Inspectors, that, owing to the low Standards adopted by so many school attendance committees, children are leaving school earlier than heretofore, and that the schools and the children are suffering in consequence.

SUNDAY TRADING (LONDON)—LEGISLATION.

Mr. GRANTHAM asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government has any intention of introducing any Bill for the restriction of Sunday Trading and Hawking in London?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: No, Sir; the Government has no intention of introducing a Bill on the subject at present.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—ABSENCE OF A SENIOR EXAMINER.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it is a fact that a "Senior Examiner" in the Education Office has been absent on full-pay sick leave for more than 12 months (£800); whether, during the entire absence, this officer has been receiving an extra "acting" personal allowance (£100); and, if he will state how much money the same officer has received for work done during the period referred to in the Wreck Court and elsewhere?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, the gentleman referred to in the hon. Member's Question, after a service of nearly 35 years, was disabled by illness, and had six months' sick leave allowed him, no failure of health having, during the whole of that time, ever interfered with his attendance at the office. At the end of his sick leave he returned to his work in the Department, when his health again broke down; and as, during the whole of his long official career, he had been a most valuable and efficient public servant, charged with important and onerous duties, another absence of six months on sick leave was granted to him. He received full pay during his absence, including an allowance of £100 granted to him by the Treasury, "as strictly personal to himself." I understand that, at the close of his first absence of sick leave, he was employed for three and a-half days as an assessor in the Wreck Court, for which he received a payment of 35 guineas. The hon. Member is probably aware that he was specially qualified for the employment, as he was a distinguished mathematician, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and formerly Principal of the Government School of Naval Architecture. I regret to say that he has now retired from the service.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR wished to know whether the consent of the Treasury had been obtained for this arrangement?

Mr. MUNDELLA: I would rather have Notice of that Question, and answer it to-morrow; but I believe that whatever has been done has been done in the usual course.

IRELAND—THE DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE AND THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE COMMITTEES OF INQUIRY.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. Sexton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the Report of Evidence taken by the Committee of Inquiry on the Dublin Metropolitan Police (which evidence appears to have been completely taken when the Committee addressed their letter of the 18th of October last to the Under Secretary for Ireland), and also the Report of Evidence taken by the Committee of Inquiry on the Royal Irish Constabulary (which Evidence, according to the Report of that Committee, was closed on the 20th of October last), have not yet been circulated among Members of the House; and, whether the Government will ask the House to take up the Motion for the Second Reading of the Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill before the evidence taken relative thereto is placed in the hands of Members?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, these Reports and Evidence were not originally prepared for presentation to Parliament, but for the information of the Government. It is only recently—comparatively recently—that they decided to circulate copies of the Evidence; and, since then, no time has been lost in pushing forward their preparation. The Reports were presented and circulated in advance, as that could be done without the delay which would have been involved in waiting for the preparation of the very voluminous Evidence. The Government hope that the second reading of the Bill will be taken before Whitsuntide; and they hope that hon. Gentlemen will get sufficient information as to the principle of the measure from the very able Reports—which I cannot but think are very able—to enable them to decide on the principle of the Bill on the second reading. It is fully expected that the Evidence will be put in the hands of hon. Members before the Bill is brought to its Committee stage. I may, for the convenience of hon. Members, state that I do not propose to ask the House to take the second reading of the Bill to-night.

MR. GIBSON: In reference to this matter, perhaps this would be a convenient time to put a Question regarding it, as I believe there is considerable misconception in Ireland on the subject. I wish to ask, Is it a fact that this Bill contains all the proposals that the Government intend to put forward for the amelioration of the condition of the Irish Constabulary and Police?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, that certainly is a very important question, and I am very glad to have an opportunity of stating my views on it. The scheme of the Government, with some very slight exceptions, is what was recommended by the two Committees of Inquiry. The part of that scheme which requires legislation is embodied in the Bill now before the House; but the rest of the scheme, including the very important provisions for raising the men's allowances, and for carrying out those details in the promotion and discipline, which, perhaps, as much as anything else, will enhance the comfort of the corps, will be communicated to the men, I presume, by Circular from the Inspector General and the Chief Commissioner, and embodied in the Rules of the Force. But, by legislation or otherwise, it may fairly be said that the entire scheme, as put forward by the two Committees of Inquiry, will be adopted by the Government.

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—MR. SHELDON AMOS.

MR. MOLLOY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in the event of taxes being sought to be raised to enable the Egyptian Government to carry out the views of Mr. Sheldon Amos (now alleged to be a member of a Committee to arrange measures for carrying out Lord Dufferin's Constitution), that the coupons on the debt "must be paid at all hazards," Her Majesty's forces now in Egypt will not be allowed to interfere should the Egyptian peasants refuse to pay such taxes, until they shall have been voted by their own duly elected representatives?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, I regret that the alleged appointment of Professor Sheldon Amos should cause so much disquiet to the hon. Member; but it is impossible for me to reply to a purely hypothetical Question, and to say what Her Majesty's Government will do under circumstances which have not arisen, and which are not likely to arise.

COMMISSION ON TECHNICAL EDUCATION—THE REPORT.

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the second portion of the Report of the Royal Commission on Technical Education, especially the part relating to Ireland, will be published?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, the Commissioners still have evidence to collect in Ireland; but I expect that the second part of their Report will be prepared before the end of the Session.

SOUTHPORT FORESHORE.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether his conference this afternoon with the local authorities of Southport has altered his views with respect to the sale of the foreshore; and, if he will state what course he proposes to take under the circumstances?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, I have not yet had time to consider the arguments addressed to me by the deputation from Southport, which left me only about two hours ago; and, until I have done so, I can scarcely be expected to answer the Question. But, at the same time, it must be understood that there can be no question of receding from a binding contract. I may add, however, that I am willing to use my good offices as a mediator between the Corporation of Southport and the riparian proprietors; and I have good reason to know that the proprietors will gladly avail themselves of those good offices as far as concerns the foreshore opposite the town of Southport, and the terms on which it should be given to the Corporation. I have stated this to the deputation which was with me this afternoon; and I am not without hope that reasonable counsels may prevail, and that an amicable arrangement may be arrived at, especially if the subject be left to be treated, as it should be, as a matter of business.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman's answer referred to the foreshore of the borough of Southport, which was a very small part, or to the foreshore of the whole of the town, marked brown on the map, with which the right hon. Gentleman was acquainted?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, I have stated that I have offered my good offices as mediator between the parties, and that I am willing to use those offices of mediator between the Corporation and the riparian proprietors; and, therefore, I mean to use my good offices, not applying them to one or to another particular part of the foreshore. I have reason to know that, so far as opposite the town of Southport is concerned, the riparian proprietors will be glad to avail themselves of the Corporation offer.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS: But that is a very small portion of the foreshore. ["Oh, oh!"] I am sorry to ask the Question again. ["Order!"]

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: I presume, when the right hon. Gentleman opposite speaks of the offer of his good offices, he did not confine them to any one particular part of the foreshore, but extended them to any part in regard to which there was any question between the two parties.

Mr. DODSON: Certainly.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — DRAINAGE CONSOLIDATION (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. MARUM asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, in order to submit the Drainage Consolidation (Ireland) Bill to the consideration of the Country during the Whitsuntide Recess, he will introduce the same before Friday next; and, whether it will contain Clauses, as suggested, providing for the collection of Drainage Rates by Poor Rate collectors similar to provisions to that effect contained in section 16 of "The Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882?"

Mr. COURTNEY: Sir, I hope to introduce the Drainage Consolidation Bill before the House rises, and that it will be circulated, so as to be considered during the Recess. The suggestion in the second paragraph of the Question has been considered; but its adoption would, it is believed, involve more trouble, expense, and friction in collection than the present system of receivable orders.

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION) — THE EARL OF DUFFERIN'S DESPATCH.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is in a position to state what facilities would be given to the House for the discussion of Lord Dufferin's Despatch and of the new Egyptian Constitution?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, I am not in a position to reply to the hon. Baronet's Question, which should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I am not aware what basis there is for this Question. It seems to me to be proposed on the supposition that it is the duty of the Government to afford, out of its own share of the time of the House, opportunities to Members, who may be so disposed, to discuss every question of public interest. That is not my understanding of the relative positions of the Government and of private Members. My understanding is, that a certain portion of time is allotted to the Government, in order that they may lay before the House the consideration of those questions upon which they require the aid of the House; and that another portion is allotted to private Members, in order that they may bring forward any questions connected with the conduct of the Government or otherwise which they may think deserve the attention of the House. I have no doubt my hon. Friend feels that the portion of the time of the House appropriated to private Members is very much crowded; but, then, that is exactly the case with the Government. We are likewise very much crowded; and, out of our poverty, we are not able to afford him any portion of our time.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: In explanation, I may be allowed to say that I asked the Question because, on the occasion of the last debate, we were told by the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice) to wait for Lord Dufferin's despatch.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882 — SECTION 16 — PRIVATE EXAMINATIONS AT DUBLIN CASTLE.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether "The Metropolitan Police Office," in Dublin Castle, in which the secret investigations under the 16th section of the Crimes Act have been held, has been within the last fifteen years used as a "police office" in the sense of a court in which police charges are ordinarily entertained; and, if not, whether it satisfies the requirement of the 16th section, that persons summoned to give evidence in this way should be examined "at a police office, or the place where the petty sessions for the district in which the offence has been committed are usually held?"

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, in reply to this Question, I have to say that police charges have not been ordinarily entertained at the Metropolitan Police Office as mentioned in the first paragraph. As to the concluding paragraph, I have to state that I am advised that the Metropolitan Police Office does satisfy the requirements of the Statute, as a place where inquiries authorized by it may be held.

MR. O'BRIEN said, that perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be able to tell the House whether Mr. Curran had examined, in Dublin Castle, a number of witnesses from places outside Dublin, as, for instance, Curraghmore and Mullingar. Did not the Statute require the examination to be conducted before the Resident Magistrate of the district in which the offence was alleged to have been committed?

MR. TREVELYAN: I must have Notice in answering in the House of Commons for any officer of the Executive Government.

MR. HARRINGTON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen the report in that day's papers of the imprisonment of two gentlemen in Cork, for refusing to answer questions having no reference to the offence specified in the summons?

MR. TREVELYAN: I thoroughly understand that case, Sir, which the hon. Gentleman gave Notice of, at length, yesterday, and I think it would be more convenient if I deferred answering the Question until then.

ADJOURNMENT—THE DERBY DAY.

MR. BOURKE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, considering the prospect of advancing the Bills mentioned in Her Majesty's Speech has now improved, he will propose that the Whitsuntide Holidays should extend over the Derby Day, thus giving to the House three more days holiday; and, whether he would consider whether an arrangement might not be made by which the Government might take Friday the 25th as a Government night in compensation for Monday the 21st, which would be the only day they would lose by meeting the wish of the House for a longer adjournment?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, in regard to this Question, my wishes are in one direction, and my necessities, I am sorry to say, are in another. I am afraid it would not be compatible with the duty of the Government to advise an extension of the Vacation. It is possible that some hon. Members of the House may find means of extending it for themselves; but I am afraid we cannot assist them further. As to the latter part of the Question, I quite appreciate the object with which it is put, and I acknowledge its equity. But I think, if the right hon. Gentleman has observed what has lately taken place, he will find that any proposal on our part to alter the Standing Order as to the course of Business on Fridays would probably be made the subject of a not very short and not agreeable discussion; and I am bound to say I do not think it would be a desirable course to raise it.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL — RECOMMENDATION OF PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES.

Mr. STANLEY LEIGHTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government have any intention in the Corrupt Practices Bill of providing against interference with the freedom of constituencies by declaring that the recommendation of candidates through political agencies or persons unconnected with a constituency shall be considered an attempt to exercise undue influence?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, in this Question, I have no doubt the hon. Member has in view officious, and what may be called impertinent, interference; what the constituency might resent as dictation—and if he can discover any means of defining that kind of operation by words suited to an Act of Parliament, and will propose them and put them on the Paper, in all probability my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General will be glad to give them his best consideration. But I am bound to say I think his words, as they stand in the Question, are a great deal too wide, because he proposes to enact that any recommendation of a candidate to a constituency by a person not belonging to the constituency shall be considered an exercise of undue influence. It appears to me that that would be a distinct prohibition to every constituency to seek any information whatever outside that constituency about any person whom they might think of making a candidate which it might be very desirable that the constituency should have.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose a Vote in Supply for the purpose, described in his Notice of Motion, of making "adequate provision for the interests of any South African Chief who may have just claims on them;" and, if so, whether he will give the same undertaking, with respect to such a Vote, which he has given with respect to that for the salary of the Transvaal Resident, viz. that it shall be brought forward at a convenient period of the Session, and, if necessary, taken out of the regular course?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I believe that the latter part of this Question describes correctly what has taken place with regard to the Transvaal; and I should say that, if occasion arises to ask for money for the purposes indicated in the first part of the Question, it certainly would be asked by the method of submitting an Estimate; and we should submit that Estimate at the earliest moment, when we were able to form a judgment of what would be required. We should also consider that Estimate to fall under the same regulations as that for the salary of the Resident in the Transvaal; but the time has not arrived when we shall be able to say whether money will be required for that purpose or not. It is possible that the arrival of Sir Hercules Robinson in this country, which is expected to take place shortly, will advance our decision on that subject.

PARLIAMENT — PRIVILEGE — PARLIAMENTARY OATH (MR. BRADLAUGH).

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I wish, as a matter affecting the Privileges of the House, to call your attention to a paragraph which appears in all the papers this morning, in reference to Mr. Bradlaugh. It refers to the Resolution passed by the House last Friday, and it states—

> "Mr. Bradlaugh's position is, that the Resolution is absolutely illegal, and he will disregard it and disobey it in the same manner as on February 21st last year. He will do this in such a way as may be most convenient to himself."

Further on, the paragraph states—

> "He is advised that he has a clear right to take and subscribe the Oath by himself. Mr. Bradlaugh will previously hold as many large meetings as possible, and these meetings will culminate in a large London meeting. In any contest that may arise with the House, he will be always ready to submit to an arrest, without questioning the grounds; but he is advised that the use of physical force by the House to prevent his obeying the law is unlawful; and, as it

appears, from Mr. Justice Field's decision in Bradlaugh *v.* Erskine, that he has no legal remedy for such unlawful physical force, he will take sufficient means to protect himself against what he terms the disgraceful force used against him outside the House on August 3, 1881."

I venture respectfully to ask you, Sir, Whether, having regard to the alleged threats of Mr. Bradlaugh to "disregard and disobey the Resolution of the House," and to "take sufficient means to protect himself against what he terms the disgraceful force used against him outside the House on the 3rd of August, 1881," you will communicate to the House whether you will take the necessary steps to protect the House and its Members from the consummation of the outrage threatened, and which may take place at any moment?

MR. LABOUCHERE: Before you answer that Question, Sir, will the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lewis) allow me to ask him whether or not he is aware that the paragraph he has read emanates from Mr. Bradlaugh? The hon. Member states that it appears in this morning's papers; but I did not understand him to say that it is signed by Mr. Bradlaugh.

MR. LEWIS: I did not state positively that it came from Mr. Bradlaugh. I used the words "alleged threats." The copy I have read appears in *The Times* and all the morning papers. It has also appeared in the newspapers throughout the country. In Manchester, where I was this morning, it was published in exactly the same terms. My Question was carefully guarded by the use of the words "alleged threats."

MR. SPEAKER: The House has recently passed a Resolution bearing on the claims of Mr. Bradlaugh, and it will be my duty to see that the Resolution is observed. With regard to the contingency contemplated by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), I think the House will probably be of opinion that it is not for me to take notice of what appears to be an unauthorized report. If any further action on the part of the House should be necessary, I have no doubt the House will, in its wisdom, give me such instructions as may be required.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Is it in the power of Mr. Bradlaugh, as at present circumstanced, to repeat his action of last year, when he advanced to the Table without being called on by you, Sir, went through the form of taking the Oath, and threw on the Table a piece of paper, signed by him, which circumstance led to a very unpleasant and disgraceful scene. I want to know, Sir, if it is possible for Mr Bradlaugh, by so advancing to the Table, again to disturb the proceedings of the House, and to repeat the scene of last Session?

MR. SPEAKER: I should consider that Mr. Bradlaugh would be disobeying the Rules and practice of this House if he were to come to the Table to take the Oath without having been called upon to do so by the Chair.

MR. LEWIS: I beg to give Notice that, having regard to the answer with which Mr. Speaker has just favoured the House, I will put a Question to the Prime Minister on Friday, as to whether the Executive Government have, or will provide, sufficient strength to prevent the outrage contemplated?

EAST INDIA (EXPENDITURE).

MR. E. STANHOPE said, he would ask permission to call attention to the Notice of Motion which stood in his name for that evening. He desired simply to move that it was necessary that early steps should be taken to reduce the expenditure. The concluding part of the Resolution, which suggested the appointment of a Committee, was not contained in his Notice; but it was an *addendum* to be moved by some other Member, which, by mistake, had been printed as part of his Motion.

SOUTHPORT FORESHORE.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the Sale of the Southport Foreshore to the Lords of the Manors.

MR. ONSLOW said, he rose to Order. He wished to know whether the sale of a piece of land by the Government was a matter of such urgent importance that it was necessary to move the Adjournment of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that Mr. Jesse Collings be now heard? [*Cries of* "Aye, aye!" *and* "No, no!"]

The pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported that Motion to rise in their places, and not less than 40 Members having accordingly risen in their places:—

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said: I have to apologize to the House for the course I am taking; but when the House has heard the statement I have to make, I think hon. Members will be disposed to agree with me that no apology was necessary. Looking to the urgent importance of the question I am about to discuss, I was in hopes that the answer of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Dodson) to the Question I put to him earlier in the evening would have been of such a character as to have made it unnecessary for me to bring this matter before the House in such a way; but, unfortunately, such is not the case, for the right hon. Gentleman is positive that he will not recede from the partial sale which has been effected; and he will only promise to use his good offices with the Lords of the Manors, so far as a very small portion of the foreshore is concerned.

MR. DODSON: Perhaps the hon. Member will allow me to repeat that my good offices were not offered in respect to one part of the foreshore only, but on the question in general.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS, continuing, said. It is only a stronger way of putting my case. The right hon. Gentleman has reason to know, as I am informed, that the Lords of the Manors, who have supposed rights over a small portion of this foreshore, can now be forced to come to terms; but that if once the purchase is completed, these landowners, whose title is now doubtful, will have a clear title from the Duchy of Lancaster, and will refuse to come to terms, in which case the Corporation will have to fall back upon the good offices of the right hon. Gentleman. I do not for a moment doubt that those good offices will be used in the most rightful manner; but the case is one of the greatest urgency, and if this sale is carried out against the wishes of the Corporation, it will mean disaster and partial ruin to the town. The case is one of very great difficulty, I know; but if the right hon. Gentleman likes to make an effort, he will be able to stop this great disaster which is impending over the borough of Southport. I have heard the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, in times gone by, use strong, but not exaggerated language, as to the benefit and the glory, and the credit which municipal and local governments bestow upon the country at large. I am inclined to think that the municipalities, and all those who are engaged in the task of local self-government, should receive the very strongest consideration from the Central Government; and I am, therefore, glad the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister is present, because it has been said to me during the past week—"If we could only get the Prime Minister to know the merits of this case, we are sure he would not allow us to be victimized in this manner." For this reason, as I have said, I am glad to see the Prime Minister in his place to-night. Now, I have had nearly 20 years' experience of local government and municipal government in almost all its phases, and in almost all kinds of work connected with it; and I say, in all my experience, I have never known treatment so cruel and so much to be lamented as that to which this municipality is now being subjected. Southport is an important town, and has within 30 miles of it 4,000,000 of persons. It has been described as the sanatorium of the district; and in the town itself, there is a population exceeding 40,000 persons, while the increase is more rapid than in any other part of England, for it has twice doubled its population within the last 20 years. The local government of the town and the municipality are very popular, for they have done a great deal for the town in the way of establishing all sorts of institutions, such as gardens, baths, libraries, and an aquarium; and they considered it absolutely necessary for the prosperity of the town that the land of the foreshore should not go from them. To use the words of the Mayor of the town—

> "It will be a sad thing for us to have to rely on the tender mercies of the representatives of the landowners in any improvements we have to make."

To put the case plainly, the local authorities have published a map of the foreshore. They divide it into two parts—one part coloured brown goes all along the front of the town, and is about 4,000 acres, the frontage to the sea being several miles. The land adjoining belongs to the borough of Preston, and contains about 5,000 acres. These two lots of 9,000 acres have been sold by the Duchy for £15,000, about 5,000 acres to one landlord and 4,000 to another, and it seems to me there is only one way out of this compact. The Mayor and Corporation are willing to give almost anything for the foreshore in front of their town. In order to prevent the sale being carried out, they are willing to give a premium on the price paid for the land to the extent of 5 or 10 per cent. They are even willing to give £15,000 for the one plot of 4,000 acres, leaving out altogether the larger plot of 5,000 acres, which is agricultural land. I just want to refer to the correspondence which has taken place in this matter, and I will detain the House as briefly as I can. I will quote no more than is absolutely necessary. The question was first raised by the Corporation of Southport in October, 1880, on their application in regard to the land to the Duchy. The Duchy sent a surveyor to survey the land they proposed to buy, and Mr. Cartwright, the surveyor, named a sum of £9,000, and wished to know if the Corporation would purchase on these terms. On the 19th March, 1881, an additional piece of land was asked for, and correspondence went on regarding it until April, 1881, when a letter was addressed to the Duchy, asking for some information as to the claims made on the foreshore by the trustees of the two landlords in question. On April 13, 1881, the Town Clerk wrote and stated that the reason the Corporation wished to have this information was because the trustees of those two landowners claimed to be the owners in fee of the whole of the foreshore, coextensive with the borough of Southport. On May 24, 1881, the Town Clerk further wrote, and speaking on the Southport and Cheshire Railway Bill of 1881, then before Parliament, said they had petitioned against it, giving the authority of Mr. Whitaker that the foreshore belonged to the Duchy. The Attorney General of the Duchy, in evidence given on the Bill, disputed the rights of those two landlords, but declared that the Duchy had full rights. There was, therefore, the opinion of the Attorney General of the Duchy and Solicitor General of the Duchy in support of the contention that those landowners had no claims to the foreshore in question, and that the Duchy had full powers over it. On July 4, 1881, the Town Clerk wrote to the Surveyor General of the Duchy, and asked the very pertinent question whether, as the purchase of this piece of land would probably involve a lawsuit, it could not be obtained at a lower price than the sum named? A few days afterwards, the Surveyor General, in acknowledging the receipt of the letter, said that the town authorities appeared to lay too much stress on the validity of any claim which might be set up adverse to the Duchy in regard to the piece of land in question; but added that the Town Clerk was quite at liberty to use such arguments, in order to get the price of the land reduced; and, having regard to the fact that the land was to be used for public purposes, he was prepared to advise the Chancellor of the Duchy to let the Corporation have it for £10,000. The Corporation then endeavoured to get from the representatives of the landowners an abstract of their title, or something upon which they founded their title. The Duchy complained of the delay on the part of the Corporation; and that delay could be explained by the fact, which was perfectly well known, that Corporations in general referred those matters to Standing Committees, and that was the course followed in this case. On August 26, 1881, the Town Clerk wrote, saying that the Council had decided to purchase the foreshore from the Duchy. That letter was acknowledged by the Surveyor General, who, in his reply, on the 29th of August, said the terms of the agreement would be drawn up by the Solicitor of the Duchy. On the 9th of September, the Town Clerk wrote, and asked for an interview, in order that they might discuss certain matters arising out of the subject, prior to the business being referred to the Solicitor. The next letter from the Town Clerk was of September 15, and said that he was instructed by the Sub-Committee to recommend the Town Council to purchase the rights of the Duchy in the foreshore for £9,500. On the 14th of October, he wrote again to the same effect; and asking if it would not be better to send a proof of the agreement, embodying the terms of the purchase, for perusal? Mr. Whitaker, writing the next day, said he thought it would be better to prepare a draft agreement, embodying the terms, and that it should be sent to him for his approval. Then there is nothing of importance in the Correspondence until we come to the 7th of September, when Messrs. Prior, the London Agents of the Southport Corporation, wrote to Mr. Whitaker, enclosing the proposed agreement for the purchase of part of the foreshore on the part of the Corporation. I may say, in passing, that the agreement has never been formally rejected. It was not returned to the Corporation, and it is in the hands of the Duchy at the present time. I am told that all agreements, when they are done with, are returned, and that the legal advisers of the Corporation lay great stress on this point. There was in the terms of the agreement a clause to the effect that, subject to the authority of Parliament being obtained, the vendors agreed to sell, and the purchasers to purchase, certain portions of land, being part of the foreshore, for the sum of £9,500. If the Act of Parliament was not obtained by the 1st of September, 1884, then it would be void; and it was signed by the London Agent of the Corporation and the Town Clerk, and addressed to Mr. B. Inglehardt on the part of the Duchy. Coming down to the 4th of January, 1882, the Solicitor to the Duchy wrote to say that it would be impossible to deal with the draft agreement until he had had an opportunity of conferring with some of the heads of the deputation on the 27th of January, 1882. Mr. Whitaker, writing to the Town Clerk, said that, although he had had no definite instructions, he had had the opportunity of forming an opinion on the subject, and that he felt some confidence in stating his belief that sanction might fairly be anticipated of the arrangement provisionally; and, in the interview which was to take place with the Chancellor, he thought the representatives of the Corporation ought to be prepared to state the sum that could be paid down as whole or part of the purchase money. That was a very serious alteration; and the representatives of the Corporation asked that they should go back to the original agreement, as they were not prepared to pay down the purchase money. I now come to the letter of the 21st February, 1882, which is the most important of the whole correspondence, and which the Duchy set great store by, as they say it put an end to the whole correspondence. But there is not one word in the letter putting an end to the correspondence, and I venture to say that no hon. Gentleman who hears it read will dream that any such thing as breaking off the negotiations was intended in it; the Town Clerk simply wrote to Mr. Whitaker, to the effect that it was of vital importance to the town that the foreshore in front of it should be in the hands of the Corporation; and that accordingly the Committee had decided to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy to receive a deputation, in order to show him that it was impossible for them to enter into anything but a provisional agreement, and to ask him also to sanction such an agreement, after showing him the desirability of the foreshore being in the hands of the Corporation. That deputation was never sent to the late Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. John Bright), and reasons why it was never sent have been given by the Corporation. There are other letters; but in none of them is there any question of putting an end to the negotiations. They wished to try the claim of the landowners to the foreshore before they purchased it; and, in fact, there is a letter from the Town Clerk to the Corporation to the trustees of the landowners, to the effect that he would accept service of a writ in order to try the matter, as the Corporation were anxious to have the matter settled. Other correspondence followed, which brought the matter down to the present time. On March 29, the Town Clerk wrote again to the Solicitor to the Duchy, saying he hoped, at an early date, to wait upon Mr. Bright; but all these things showed that there was simply a hitch in the negotiations. Then there was a letter calling Mr. Whitaker's attention to a debate that had taken place in the Southport Town Council, when a Town Councillor had said that the Duchy had offered to sell the whole of the foreshore for a sum of less than £15,000. In reply, the Solicitor to the Duchy wrote, saying it would be time enough for the Duchy to commence litigation when its rights were infringed. On January 4, 1883, there was a letter from the Solicitor to the landowners, furnishing the Corporation with the long-expected abstract of title, comprising some 136 folios, with maps, &c.; and the Town Clerk, having examined it, reported, on the 24th March, that the landowners had no title to the foreshore. In fact, the right of the Duchy to sell the foreshore has never been contested. They agreed to a clause; but the Duchy felt their full right of sale, or they would not have considered the question of selling. This was on the 6th of April, and on the 7th, the Mayor of Preston, in cross-examination, was asked by the landowners' counsel to whom the foreshore belonged, and he replied—"To the Duchy of Lancaster." "But," said the counsel, "you are aware that we are the owners," to which the Mayor replied—"No; I am not." No doubt, the landowners were somewhat frightened at the position which the Duchy were taking with regard to its rights in the sale of this larger portion of the foreshore to the Corporation of Preston; and also by the evidence of the Mayor of Preston, a man of great standing and influence in the locality. Therefore it was that, on the same evening, they opened negotiations with the Duchy. This was on the 6th April; and without troubling the House further, I may say that, on the 9th, the Mayor, who happened to be in the Committee Room of the House, heard, almost by accident, that the foreshore had been sold to the landowners. I am sure that, on such a matter, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister will extend the sympathy which I know he feels for municipalities to this Corporation, placed, as they are, in this unfortunate position. The Town Clerk wrote to Mr. Whitaker, Solicitor to the Duchy, expressing a desire to avert a state of things which those members of the Corporation who were in London considered would be disastrous to the best interests of the town of Southport. They claimed the right to regard the original offer of the Duchy, to sell the foreshore to the Corporation, as still open; but, at the same time, they offered, if necessary, on their own responsibility, to vary the terms which they had offered. This, in my opinion, shows the earnestness and public spirit of these men, who, as members of the Corporation, without profit to themselves, but with that patriotic feeling which has made England what it is, take part in managing the affairs of the community in which they live, and give their services for the good of their fellows. This is a spirit which has long distinguished the English people, and which, in the case of Municipal Corporations, produces as good and earnest work as is done by any body of men, however well paid they may be, or however high the honours which they may receive; and I say that such men, who represent authorities best in English life, should receive the hearty care and consideration of the Government. These gentlemen knew very well that they must run risks, as members of other Corporations have done. They knew there was no time to go to the Corporation; and, therefore, they were prepared to sign a contract, making themselves personally responsible for the payment of the purchase money, in the event of the Corporation declining to endorse their action. They knew the landowners had their creatures in the Council, and that others of the body, under fear of threatened litigation, might sway the Corporation into backing out of any contract that might be made, as the Town Clerk, in the letter which I am paraphrasing, said—

> "The members of the Corporation then present in London, consisting of the Mayor, an Alderman, and two Members of the Council asked for a favourable answer from the Duchy, on the ground, if on no other, that the public interest was of no less interest and solicitude to the Crown than to the Corporation."

That was on the 9th of April, and on the 15th there came out certain elaborate heads of an agreement between the Duchy and the landowners, for the sale and purchase of the foreshore for £15,000, £2,000 of which was paid down almost immediately. On the same day the Town Clerk received a reply from the Solicitor to the Duchy to his letter of the previous day, to which I have referred. Mr. Whitaker, the Solicitor, said that the proposal of the members of the Corporation had been submitted to the Duchy authorities, who had decided upon accepting the offer of the landowners. This resulted in further negotiations, based upon a protest on the part of the Corporation of Southport, who maintained that they had been promised the first refusal, and demanded that no other offer should be entertained until theirs was disposed of; and in reference to this point the interviews between the authorities of the Duchy and the representatives of the Town Council are worthy of attention. To those representations Mr. Whitaker replied that all negotiations were off; but added that he would entertain an offer if made before 3 o'clock in the day; this communication being received at 1 o'clock. The representatives of the Council retired, and, after consultation with the Town Clerk, they returned and made an offer of £9,500, with an offer, if necessary, to go up to £10,000. The Surveyor General and the Solicitor to the Duchy declared, however, that that amount was useless; and when the Corporation's representatives tried to ascertain what would be taken, one of those two gentlemen took out a pencil and figured down £12,000 as the amount that would be accepted. That was at 3 o'clock. At length they got the time extended to 5 o'clock, and ultimately until 7 o'clock, as if they were criminals asking for a short respite because they hoped a reprieve would arrive, instead of being the representatives of the Corporation of a great town. I feel somewhat warmly about the treatment of these gentlemen, for I believe in Corporations and in representative local government. The deputation then offered £12,000 on their own personal responsibility. They came down to this House at 4 o'clock, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) expressed his sympathy with them, offered his assistance, and asked the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy to give them an interview. Surely, this was a cheap enough thing; but it was refused. Later in the evening the request for an interview was renewed, after the arrival of the Mayor of Southport, who had posted up for the purpose again. It was again refused, and I will not trust myself to say what I think of this refusal. The excuse of the right hon. Gentleman for his refusal was, that there was a point of law involved; but I would ask what had any question of law to do with the Duchy of Lancaster? These gentlemen were willing to buy certain lands from the Duchy, and, in doing so, to take the risk of whatever legal proceedings might be instituted against them on that account; and the Duchy was not asked, or expected, to protect the Corporation against any lawsuit on the part of the representatives of the landowners. It turned out, however, that the question of law had to do with the matter in another and more objectionable way, because it was announced in the Committee on the Ribble Navigation Bill, on the next day, that the foreshore had been sold by the Duchy to the landowners, and the counsel, in stating the fact, said that the Duchy had sold, "Peace instead of war." What, as a matter of fact, had they done? In a conflict between 45,000 people and their rights the Duchy had taken the side of the two landowners against the 45,000, and had given them a legal and an unquestionable title to the foreshore; and they had done this, with the original agreement between themselves and the Corporation in their possession. It had never been returned or annulled in any way. The Town Clerk of Southport wrote a further letter to Mr. Whitaker, on the 12th of April, renewing his protest against the right of the Duchy to sell the foreshore, in face of the non-cancelled agreement to sell to the Corporation; and to that he received the somewhat off-hand reply that Mr. Whitaker declined to make any reply to inquiries which he deemed "wanting both in pertinence and propriety." Then, on the 19th, there was a letter from the representative of the landowners to the Duchy of Lancaster, in which it was stated that the landowners owned 19-20ths of the land within the borough of Southport, and had, therefore, far greater interest in the welfare of the town than the Corporation. The fact, however, that, because they already possess 19-20ths of the land in the borough, therefore the remaining twentieth should be given them is a position I venture to dispute. The Corporation also protested against this, because they knew that if the remaining twentieth was handed to the landowners, they would become masters of all the position relative to the progress and improvements in the town. An offer has been made of the good offices of the Duchy with the Lords of the Manor, as regards the treatment of the Corporation in this matter; and, as an illustration of that treatment, and how little those good offices may avail, may I mention that in 1878 the Duchy of Lancaster sold to the Corporation 120 acres of land for £340 for the purpose of making a carriage drive and other improvements; but the landowners claimed for the rights in the same land no less than £21,000, and it was only by threats of litigation that they were induced to abate their demand until it reached £7,000, which the Corporation paid. It is, after all, a sort of Rule of Three sum; if, in 1876, the landowners claimed £21,000 for 120 acres of land, with a defective title, or no title at all, what are they likely to demand for 4,000 or 5,000 acres, over which they have a full title conferred by the Duchy of Lancaster? The whole sea front of the town will be in the hands of two people, and the Corporation, before they can make their intended gardens and other improvements in that direction, will have to buy back this land for some fabulous sum; while, as the Mayor had said—"Parliament has no idea how we are ground down from the same quarter." There is yet another very serious matter. Last year a scheme was promoted for the making of a railway along the foreshore—in fact, along the whole front of that town. One of the landowners is favourable to that scheme, which may be brought forward again; so that the town stands in danger of having this railway made at no distant date, to the utter ruin of the community. I would, therefore, renew my appeal to the Prime Minister and to the Chancellor of the Duchy, that, even at the risk of a small loss to the Duchy, they will secure the foreshore to the inhabitants of the town. I beg of them to remember that the public interests of a great borough of 45,000 people, rapidly increasing, a town which, as the sanatorium of a large district, is worthy of far more consideration than the interests of two landowners, who, however respectable they may be—and I have no word to say against them in that respect—have no right to control the interests of the large population of the borough. I can only say, in conclusion, that if the Government persist in ratifying this bargain, they will not only commit a blunder, but they will turn a blunder into a disgrace.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

Sir EDWARD WATKIN: I am bound to say, Sir, that I have never seen a greater blunder than has been made in this case by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster; and I can only assume that it must have occurred, or, at any rate, originated, in the interregnum between the resignation of his Predecessor, the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), and the appointment of the present Chancellor. What the Government have done has simply been to place a monopoly in the hands of two landowners, as against the public and the Corporation of Southport. Is it to be supposed that these contracts entered into suddenly, and to some extent in the dark, should be carried out without Parliament having any knowledge of them at all? The House is made cognizant of most contracts by their being laid on the Table; and I would ask whether it is to be assumed, for a moment, that the Chancellor of the Duchy is to be allowed to make a contract vitally affecting the interests of the 45,000 inhabitants of Southport, and millions of people outside it, without the House having any control over the transaction? It is time the House should show its authority over these contracts, made for the Duchy by a single Member of the Government. There are places where the Board of Trade hold that the foreshores should belong to the country; and I maintain that, if they are alienated at all, it should be in the interest of the public, and not of private individuals. One Department responsible to Parliament is protecting the interests of the country in this direction; while a practically irresponsible Member of the Cabinet is bartering them away. In this case a bargain appears to have been made with the landowners, without notice to persons with whom the Duchy had previously been treating; and it seems to me to have been an act of the grossest bad faith. At any rate, it would be so regarded among common-sense men of business. It is a bad bargain in itself, and ought to be reconsidered; and I hope the House will step in, as far as it can, and insist on an inquiry being made, with a view to having the whole matter put right.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he would suggest to the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) to use his endeavours with his hon. Friends, in order that they should shorten their speeches in relation to this question, or they might lay themselves open to the charge of Obstruction. He (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) thought that a great deal of unnecessary fuss had been made about the matter, and that it might safely be left in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, the case to which his hon. Friend (Mr. Jesse Collings) had called attention was, no doubt, one of great hardship to the town immediately concerned; but a much wider question than the interests of Southport was involved in it, because it had reference to the rights and interests of many towns throughout the Kingdom. The question was, whether the Crown, as a Corporation, ought to have regard solely to its private interests; or whether it should have regard to the interests of the public? He (Mr. Arthur Arnold) unhesitatingly maintained that those who acted for the Crown, as a Corporation, ought to have no regard for the private interests of the Crown to the exclusion of public rights. The question was one of vast and far-reaching importance. He believed the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Dodson) had acted in strict accordance with the traditions of the Office of the Duchy of Lancaster—that was to say, he had endeavoured to make as much money as he could, to be transmitted to the particular purposes of the Duchy. In doing so, he must be held to have acted in accordance with the policy of those who conducted the business of the Duchy. He (Mr. Arthur Arnold) could only regret the impotence of the House in this matter. He wished to call attention to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman was the only servant of the Crown in that House over whom the House had absolutely no control. He was the only Member of the Government over whose administration the House had no authority. The House did not vote his salary, which came from the income of the Duchy; and it was open to question whether the House ought to recognize and give Parliamentary title to the acts of an officer over whom it had no control. That was a subject which, he thought, was fairly open to discussion; but he thought it was beyond question that the sale to the Lords of the Manors of this foreshore was a transaction which the House should condemn. He hoped the House was not disposed to approve the transaction, and he could only say for himself that if his hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich thought it right to go to a division, he should vote with him, as a protest against the action of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster with regard to this matter.

Mr. DODSON: Sir, the hon. Gentleman who has brought forward this Motion (Mr. Jesse Collings), and the two hon. Members who have spoken since, have all of them spoken as if the Duchy of Lancaster had been the absolute or undisputed possessor of this foreshore; but I must remind them, when they talk of the hardships of the foreshore being in the hands of riparian proprietors, that they were claimants, and strong claimants, to the exclusive possession of the foreshore. It was a legal question whether they were not the owners of it; therefore, if the Duchy had sold their interests to the Corporation, the Corporation would still have had to deal with these riparian owners, and they would have had either to fight it out with the riparian proprietors, or make terms with them. The hon. Gentleman who brought forward this Motion made very light of the claims of the riparian proprietors, and, in one part of his speech, said that Mr. Whitaker, as Solicitor to the Duchy, had declined to admit them; but there was practical proof of the difficulty created by the claim of the riparian proprietors. What took place in 1878, to which the hon. Member has himself adverted, and to which I called the attention of the deputation who waited upon me this afternoon? In 1878, the Duchy sold its interest in part of the foreshore to the Corporation for a sum of about £300, or a little more; and the Corporation had next to negotiate with the riparian proprietors, and to pay them some £7,000 or £8,000 for their titles to the same part.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS: Since then, the abstract of title has been given; and, that having been examined by the Corporation, it has been found that no title really existed at the time. The Corporation would have sued the landlords to get that money back, but for the fact that they are precluded by some formality. Therefore, what occurred in 1878 has been proved to be a different matter, and the case does not apply at all.

Mr. DODSON: The abstract of title was furnished to the Duchy. It showed, at all events, a fightable claim. But I will put it upon still higher grounds. The Corporation were perfectly aware of the difficulty which they would have with the riparian proprietors if they acquired the interest of the Duchy; for there is a letter, written in 1881 by the Town Clerk to the Solicitor to the Duchy, in which he uses this phrase—

> "The Corporation, in purchasing the foreshore from the Crown, will be most certainly purchasing a heavy lawsuit with it."

Had they acquired the interest of the Duchy, they would have still the claims of the riparian proprietors to deal with, and the Corporation had learnt by experience that it is a very serious question to deal with. The hon. Baronet who spoke from the Bench above (Sir Edward Watkin) said it was a matter of bad faith on the part of the Duchy officials. Having held the Office for so short a time, the expression does not apply to me, for I was not Chancellor when the negotiations took place; but, on behalf of the officials of the Duchy, who are gentlemen who discharge their duties loyally and faithfully, I must protest against any imputations of bad faith raised against them because they interpreted certain documents differently from some other people, the representatives of the Corporation. The hon. Member who introduced this question went, at great length, through the Correspondence, and gave a *résumé* from his point of view. I trust I may be allowed very briefly to point out the view of the Duchy. The position is this—About two years ago the Surveyor General of the Duchy and a Committee of the Town Council of Southport entered into a verbal arrangement for the sale by the Duchy of their rights in the foreshore to the town. The terms of the arrangement were, unfortunately, not reduced into writing, as they ought to have been, and there is a question between the parties concerned as to what they really were. As a sample of the inaccuracies which have, unfortunately, become current in consequence, I may refer to a letter which the hon. Member himself has brought forward and quoted. It was stated, at a public meeting, amongst other things, that the Duchy had offered to sell the whole of the foreshore for a sum of less than £15,000, and to guarantee the town from all lawsuits in any shape or form. Now, the fact is, that it is the practice of the Duchy never to enter into covenants for title, and, therefore, it never gives a guarantee; and the Corporation had knowledge of this, for it had been so informed on a recent purchase of part of this very foreshore. This shows how loosely the negotiation was conducted, and how little reliance is to be placed upon the recollection of anything not reduced into writing. But the contention on the part of the Duchy is this—that whatever were the terms of the verbal agreement, it is admitted, on both sides, that they were to be subject to the sanction of the Chancellor of the Duchy on the one side, and the Corporation on the other. Further, it is quite clear, from the letter of the Town Clerk on the 14th of October, 1881, that in his view the price and the area were the only terms agreed on, and the other terms were to be arranged between himself and the Duchy Solicitor afterwards. A dispute afterwards arose, as to whether the agreement was to be a provisional one or not. When the draft agreement, formulated by the Committee, was sent to the Duchy Solicitor, he found it was to be provisional only, upon the Corporation asking, if they thought fit, for Parliamentary sanction at any time within three years—in other words, that the Duchy were to be fast bound for three years, while the Corporation remained free. The Duchy Solicitor objected to that, stating that he was not prepared to accept an agreement involving the proposition. In February, 1882, the Town Clerk wrote to the effect, that he must adhere to the proposal laid down, or that the negotiation must come to an end. Surely that was breaking off the negotiations. Then he goes on to say—

> "Inasmuch as it is of vital importance to the town that the foreshore should be in the hands of the ratepayers, it is proposed to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy to receive a deputation from the ratepayers, and request him to sanction an arrangement similar in principle to the draft already sent."

No copy of the draft was sent as proposed to the Chancellor. No application was made to receive a deputation, and, as a matter of fact, no such deputation took place. Then there came the letter which the hon. Gentleman referred to—namely, the letter of the 29th March, from the

Town Clerk to the Solicitor of the Duchy, in which he said he was informed that the solicitors to the Lords of the Manors proposed to submit their claim to a Court of Law; and that the Corporation, "as intending purchasers," were anxious to know what course it was proposed to pursue, and asking to be informed at an early date.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said, the letter referred to by the right hon. Gentleman described the Corporation as intending purchasers, and yet he said that the negotiations had been broken off.

Mr. DODSON: Yes; I say so; for the letter of the 29th of March is not a renewal of negotiations with the Duchy officials; but, on the contrary, it re-states the intention of the Corporation to appeal to the Chancellor. The Solicitor to the Duchy answered, on the 19th of April, to the effect that he had no information to give. The position, therefore, was that, in February, the Town Clerk, on behalf of the Committee of the Corporation, broke up the negotiations, and said he would appeal to the Chancellor, and on the 29th March he wrote to ask for certain information. The date of the letter in which they broke off negotiations with the Duchy officials was the 21st of February, and the letter to which he had just referred was the 29th of March, 1882. After this letter they took no steps to approach either the officials or the Chancellor in any way. After 12 or 18 months had elapsed, surely the Duchy were entitled to consider not only that negotiations were at an end, but that there was no intention of re-opening them. I have a further confirmation of that, and that is that the view taken by the Town Clerk and the Corporation themselves was to the effect that, by their letter of the 21st of February, negotiations were broken off. The Town Clerk, in March, 1882, distinctly stated to the solicitors to the landowners that the negotiations between the Duchy and the Corporation had terminated. In May, 1882, the Corporation gave practical proof of this, for they entered into an agreement with the landowners for the purchase of an easement over part of the shore; although, in February, the Town Clerk had said he could enter into no agreement with them, unless the Duchy would waive its claim to the foreshore, neither could he settle with the Duchy unless the landowners would waive their claim. This, again, was a further confirmation of the fact that the Corporation did not look upon the title of the trustees as valueless. Our contention is that not only were the negotiations with the Duchy admittedly terminated, but that the Corporation were absolutely in treaty with persons claiming adversely to the Duchy to purchase from them a part of this very foreshore. In this state of the case the Duchy and the landowners were brought together in a Committee Room in which the Ribble Navigation Bill was investigated, and the representatives of the Corporation were there in the Committee Room for several days, sitting side by side with the representatives of both. They made no effort to re-open negotiations with the Duchy, nor any attempt to deal with them for the foreshore till the 9th of April. The riparian proprietors made an offer to the Duchy on the morning of that day; and on that day the Corporation, whether they had heard of that offer or not, I do not know; but they came forward with an altogether new proposal, and not with a suggestion to revive the old negotiations. They made us an offer in the afternoon. The two offers were very carefully considered; and we concluded that the offer of the landowners was, on the whole, the best, and it was attended with the great advantage that it closed the door against litigation. The Duchy were perfectly free to deal with either party, or with neither of them. ["Oh, oh!"] That is the position we take up. We maintain that, inasmuch as the negotiations with the Corporation had failed, we were entirely free to deal with anyone. Now, it has been said we ought to have specially considered the interests of the Corporations as a public body, and that, in dealing with such matters, we ought not to forget the claim of public bodies. My answer to that is that it is the practice of the Duchy in such matters to weigh and consider such claims on the part of public bodies; but we do not think that they are to outweigh all other considerations. In this particular case, if we had given a preference to the Corporation, and accepted from them what we thought an offer, on the whole, less good for the Crown than that made by the riparian proprietors, we should still not have placed the Corporation in the position of being masters of their own foreshore, because they would even then have had to deal with the riparian proprietors. It is said the latter have asked a largely-increased price for their right above that which they had themselves given to the Duchy. I am not aware what they have asked; but if they have demanded a larger price than they gave to the Duchy, they did so for the very simple reason that they now own the whole title to the foreshore. The Duchy, as it were, formerly held one-half, and the riparian proprietors the other half. Of course, when the two halves are put together, whoever has got them will ask for the whole considerably more than one party would ask for his half. The hon. Member said I had refused to give an audience to certain members of the Corporation on the evening of Monday, the 9th, when we had decided to close with the offer of the landowners, and the matter was placed in the hands of the agents of the Duchy on the Ribble Navigation Bill, to settle with the landowners upon the basis of that offer. After the Committee had broken up that evening I was asked to go out into the Lobby to speak to some gentlemen connected with the Corporation. I felt it would be quite impossible for me, having intrusted the matter to the agents of the Duchy, behind the backs of those gentlemen, personally, to enter into negotiations with anyone.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: What I complained of was that a simple request for an audience on the part of the Mayor and Corporation of Southport was refused by the Chancellor of the Duchy; and I complained of the want of courtesy and of the want of appreciation of the position the Corporation occupied.

MR. DODSON: I can assure the hon. Gentleman there was no intention to display a want of courtesy or want of appreciation of the Corporation's position. The reason why I declined to see the representatives of the Corporation was simply the one I have mentioned. In conclusion, I can only say I greatly regret that there should have been any disappointment felt by the Corporation at the conclusion arrived at. I cannot, however, see that their position would have been so very materially better if they had acquired our disputed title to the foreshore. I can only repeat what I said to the deputation which waited upon me this afternoon—namely, that if I can, by using my good offices as mediator, in any way bring about an amicable settlement between the two parties concerned, it will afford me very sincere pleasure to do so.

MR. SLAGG: As one of those who know Southport very well indeed, and also as one acquainted with the cirstances of the case, I feel bound to say a few words with regard to this very serious grievance. Southport is a most enterprizing place. It has an energetic Corporation; and the very essence of its success as a watering-place is that it should have control of this foreshore. In that respect I consider they have received very terrible injury indeed. It must be clear to the House that there is a very great difference between the position Southport now holds and that which it would have occupied if the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster had treated it as it ought and deserved to be treated. The difference is this—that the riparian proprietors have now got possession of that valuable, and to Southport indispensable, foreshore; and whatever is spent upon it will be for the substantial benefit of those proprietors, instead of for the benefit and advantage of the town and public at large. It seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman had, at one time, an opportunity of dealing with the Duchy's rights in a manner advantageous to the Corporation of Southport; but that opportunity was lost. He had, in fact, a golden opportunity of dealing with all the interests involved in a way which would have been satisfactory to each of the parties; and I fail to gather from the right hon. Gentleman's answer whether he was tempted from that rational course by a desire to avoid a law suit, or a desire to get more money for the Duchy property. It seems to me that there was no difficulty in so treating the question of the transfer of the property, that the rights of the Corporation might have been absolutely and entirely safeguarded. The Corporation of Southport were perfectly prepared to buy the property with all the risks attaching to it, and I am sure they would have confronted the legal difficulties with confidence and success. The case of the Corporation is one which, to my mind, has really no avenues of explanation open to it. The people of Southport have a great grievance, and I hope it is not yet too late to reverse the policy of the Duchy in this matter. I understand that the affixing of the seal to a document is the culminating act in transactions of this character, and that the seal has not yet been attached in this case. I hope, therefore, that the strong representations made to the right hon. Gentleman will induce him to exercise all the influence in his power in order to avert what threatens to be a great disaster to the town of Southport.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I admit that, apart from the method in which this matter is introduced, the question is one which may be fairly brought under the discussion of the House. There are two lights in which the matter may be viewed. The one is the conduct of an administrative Department of the Government, and the other is to obtain the utmost possible advantage for the Corporation of Southport that the present situation will admit of. There may or may not be grounds for what has been done by the Government. My hon. Friend who has just sat down (Mr. Slagg), expressed a hope that the strong representations which have been made to the Government will be allowed to have an important bearing upon the agreement which have been virtually made. Now the question of affixing a seal to a legal agreement is not a question which, it is very easy to say, could be determined by statements made in the House of Commons. However worthy the attention, these statements in themselves might be most obviously dealt with, mainly upon the position the negotiations have attained, and on the duties attaching to the parties between whom the stage has been reached. My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Dodson) has said that he is most anxious to afford all the assistance he can towards a settlement of the matter in a way that should be satisfactory to all parties. I have no wish to say anything in extenuation of the moral conduct of the Government, because that is not a matter which at this moment we have in view. I take it that my hon. Friend (Mr. Collings) will do the best he can for the Corporation and people of Southport, and I know enough of Southport to be able to understand the great interest and importance of this question to the people; but my right hon. Friend stated that he was most anxious to offer all the assistance he could, by mediation, towards securing a just settlement of the matter. I do not think, even if my hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich had shown that there had been some defect in the conduct of the business on the part of the officers of the Duchy — which I cannot for one moment admit is the case—that it would justify my right hon. Friend in doing less than fulfilling the obligations honourably attaching to him in the present state of the negotiation. I am acquainted with one of the riparian owners of these estates. It is a great, and a most important estate; and I am quite convinced that such people as the trustees of the Scarisbrick Estate ought to be well aware that they would be pursuing a most unwise course, in the interests of the locality generally, in their own interests also, if they were to attempt to make an extreme use of any rights they may have acquired. My right hon. Friend and myself are under the impression that it is the desire of those parties to deal equitably in the matter. If that be so, can the hon. Gentleman do better than endeavour to strengthen the hands of my right hon. Friend in the offer of mediation he has made for the general good and general advantage of both parties? His offer is by no means limited to one particular part of the foreshore. He is perfectly ready and desirous to be of use with respect to the whole question. Therefore, there can be nothing better than endeavouring to strengthen the hands of my right hon. Friend in giving effect to the offer which he has made. Let my hon. Friend by all means censure anything which has been done; but, in the present case, no one can say in honour, by usage, nor by law, it is possible to arrest a regular negotiation for the sale of property, when everything has been agreed upon, and when nothing remains but the formality of affixing the seal. I cannot certainly see the advantage of pressing upon my right hon. Friend that which is morally beyond his power to do. I hope it will be seen that I am not acting as a partizan. I sincerely desire that the best that can be done should be done. I will not enter into any question as to the nature of the very long and complicated correspondence which has taken place; but I am certain my hon. Friend will do wisely if he endeavours to aid my right hon. Friend in his purpose of working in the best way he can to secure the equitable settlement of the question.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he felt bound to say a word or two on the question, seeing that the principles which were raised interested not only the people of Southport alone, but all municipal boroughs which possessed a seashore. The Prime Minister, unfortunately, gave the go-bye to these principles; for speaking persuasively, as he always did, his speech simply amounted to the statement that there was no use in crying over spilt milk, or adopting a policy of recrimination, and that the best thing was to rely upon the good offices of the Duchy. If, however, the right hon. Gentleman, instead, had given only one or two words of sympathy, and of the extreme impropriety of using these ancient rights of the Crown to make money, it would have been more satisfactory to many hon. Members. He (Mr. Stanley) contended that these ancient rights possessed by the Crown should never be severed from the Crown unless they became vested in public bodies such as Corporations or Harbour Trustees; and as the Duchy stood in the same position, it ought not to be allowed to traffic in these rights. There might be those who thought the Duchy of Lancaster had the right, as well as any other person, to put the money in its pockets regardless of public necessity. Let them look at the position of Southport, held in the grip of these lords of the manor; in future they would not only be lords of the land, but lords of the sea also. Although they were told that the trustees of the Scarisbrick Estate would act desirably in the matter, it was not always found that the owners of large estates went in a large-handed, generous manner towards the public; but the larger the estate, the greater the territorial power. The mere fact of the Scarisbrick Estate being so large, made it all the more dangerous to give to them the power to hamper all the improvements of the borough. He should rather think that the town of Southport would be better off if the soil belonged to 50 people than to one. At present it was in the power of that one possessor to impede the development of the town, and he would necessarily be afforded many new weapons for extortion. The town would be bound over hand and foot. He should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster what he would think, if such an attempt had been made on any town in which he was interested? He (Mr. Stanley) had been told that the foreshore of Scarborough also belonged to the Duchy. How would the constituents of the right hon. Gentleman feel, if the owners of the soil were to come in, and behind the back of the town of Scarborough buy the rights of the Crown? How would the right hon. Gentleman like to see all the activity and development of Scarborough, as a seaside resort, fettered by such foreshore powers? He (Mr. Stanley) was sure, if such a question should arise in reference to Scarborough after this debate, that there would be no fear of Scarborough's rights being bartered away for a few thousand pounds to the Duchy. He protested strongly against making use of these ancient rights for the private profit of the Duchy; and he hoped one good result would follow from the debate—that the House would never again see a Minister of the Crown promoting a private bargain, with respect to the Crown's property, which would put a large and growing town under the thumb of a landowner, without consulting the wishes of the people who were principally interested in the matter.

Mr. LEAKE said, he should have preserved the studious silence he had hitherto maintained, had he found that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had taken up the interest of his constituents in this subject; but as he (Mr. Leake) had waited in vain, he felt that, as the Representative of the adjacent division of the county, it was his duty to say a word or two. He regretted to hear the Prime Minister say that the negotiations had gone too far to be broken off. The only consolation they got was the promise that the best efforts of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster would now be used to repair what was undoubtedly a disaster. Personally, he wished the right hon. Gentleman had still in his hands the power which he possessed in April, and that it might be used to enable the rival claimants to come to an amicable settlement. He had parted with that power; and he (Mr. Leake) could only trust that the right hon. Gentleman would still find the resources of reason and persuasion as powerful and successful as they would have been then. He did not complain of bad faith as regarded the Duchy; but what he did complain of was, perhaps, quite as fatal in a Public Office—namely, the bad policy of the Government in using the ancient powers they possessed, not in defence or support of the growing wants and necessities of large communities in their midst, but in aggrandizing and perpetuating those comparatively obsolete rights of lords of the manor, which were almost an anachronism now; that was certainly bad policy, and he was the more distressed that it should proceed from a Liberal Administration. He trusted that from that discussion and from that incident a very different policy would be adopted in the future in all such Offices as were not directly responsible to the House, and that they would consider that, though those rights were of antique foundation, their use had, in the present time, ceased, and they must be adapted to modern requirements.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, he rose, not to prolong an already too long debate, but to protest against the deliberate manner in which the Radical Party had that evening wasted the time of the House. The hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings), having asked a series of Questions about a purely local question, and expressed dissatisfaction with the answers, had called upon his Radical Friends to support a Motion for Adjournment. The hon. Member was also supported by hon. Members below the Gangway on the Opposition side of the House; but that was not to be wondered at, for one of their number had declared that their policy was a policy of Adjournment. The hon. Member for Ipswich had detained the House for an hour and a-half with an enumeration of the grievances of some wretched watering-place in Lancashire, which might, no doubt, be of considerable interest to the place concerned, but which did not, in the least, interest hon. Members who represented other places in that House, and who had come down to listen to matters of far greater importance. He did not forget—indeed, he wished to call attention to the fact—that the hon. Member who had so occupied the time of the House with that Motion was the same hon. Gentleman who asked the Prime Minister the other day, whether he would not consider the propriety of keeping the House sitting through the autumn, until all the measures of the Government mentioned in the Queen's Speech should have been passed. He was astonished, under those circumstances, at the unblushing effrontery of the hon. Member in bringing on the Motion he had done that night. He objected in the strongest manner to these Motions for the Adjournment of the House. He had never made that Motion at Question time, nor had he ever supported any Motion of that kind himself; and he would recommend the Prime Minister and Lord Granville, when next they should feel inclined, at the Aquarium or elsewhere, to animadvert on the Obstruction of the Conservative Party, to look nearer home, and to call attention to the tactics of hon. Members of their own Party below the Gangway.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MOTION.

EAST INDIA (EXPENDITURE).

RESOLUTION.

Mr. E. STANHOPE, in rising to call attention to the increased expenditure of India, and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that early steps be taken to reduce the expenditure of India; and with this view it is necessary in the first place that a Committee be appointed to inquire into the working of the Act of 1858, for the better Government of India (21 and 22 Vic. c. 106),"

said, that the hon. and gallant Member who had just sat down had rightly interpreted what would be the feeling of the country with regard to the action of the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings). That hon. Member seemed to think that the subject to which he had drawn attention was of far greater importance than a question of great difficulty and intricacy affecting our Indian Empire and to desire to postpone an issue which the Government themselves were ready to meet. It was not his intention to discuss the subject which he was bringing forward in a Party spirit, and though he believed that the figures which he should lay before the House would prove conclusively that the present Viceroy of India was very much the most extravagant of all those who had held the Office, he was of opinion that a fair and impartial consideration of the subject would lead to the conclusion that, of all the Viceroys who had recently been in India, there was not one more entitled to credit for patient and persevering attention to details and for an anxious desire to reduce expenditure than Lord Northbrook. Nor did he intend to discuss generally the recent Budget Statement of the Indian Finance Minister. He intended to address himself exclusively to two points. The first he would formulate thus—Had there or had there not been an increase of expenditure in India? And the second was — Were there any special reasons why the increased expenditure, if any, was specially dangerous to India? The last time that questions of this kind were seriously taken in hand was in 1879, when the present Postmaster General placed a Motion upon the Paper, and showed a most sincere desire to reduce the expenditure of India. He was followed by the right hon. Gentleman now the Governor of Madras, who laid down certain views with regard to the reduction of the expenditure of India, which were taken up shortly after by the present Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman the present Prime Minister said—

> "My hon. Friend the Member for the Elgin Burghs (Mr. Grant Duff), who is by no means given to exaggeration in his views of Indian policy, but whose reputed disposition is, on the contrary, to colour it too favourably, has fixed the measure of retrenchment he considers necessary to give solidity to Indian finance at £4,000,000 a-year. That is a very grave statement, and I do not believe it is an exaggerated one. It means that there must be a reduction of what we may call 10 per cent, or from 10 to 12 per cent all round in the real Expenditure of India."—(3 *Hansard*, [246] 1748.)

If that was the opinion upon the other side of the House, upon the Conservative side opinion was no less unanimous. The late Government anticipated any discussion on the subject by announcing that the time had come when increased and vigorous efforts should be made to reduce the expenditure of India wherever it was possible. They were prepared to deal with the home charges, although it was his duty to inform the House that the total amount of these charges over which the India Office had any real control was only £275,000. They appointed a Committee at the India Office to go into every single item, and that Committee for months investigated every detail on which they thought a reduction of the expenditure might be made. The Government of India also took the matter up and announced their intention, so far as they could manage it, to carry out a reduction of expenditure in all branches. No one could doubt that a great effect was produced by these measures of 1879 on the ordinary expenditure of India in 1880. It would probably be a controversial point if he were to endeavour to state the exact effect of the measures taken by the Indian Government. Nor did he desire to pay special credit to Lord Lytton and his Government; but he did want the House to consider what had happened since 1880. Everyone who had looked into the figures must be aware that the expenditure of India had gone on steadily and continually increasing from that time. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for War, when Secretary of State for India, speaking upon the subject last year, referred to a statement recently made by him (Mr. Stanhope) in that House. He said—

> "The hon. Member (Mr. E. Stanhope) is reported to have said that since 1880 the Expenditure has been raised £3,500,000. I cannot, of course, tell what were the exact figures on which the hon. Member based that statement; but I presume that his calculation was somewhat as follows:—I may probably take him to mean that, deducting from last year, 1880-1, the charge for War Expenditure and the Frontier Railways, and deducting, also, the charge for the present year for Famine Insurance, and adding the sums to be drawn from the provincial balances, the excess of Expenditure in the present year over that for the year 1880-1 would amount to £3,500,000. Taken that way, I believe the statement is substantially correct." —(3 *Hansard*, [273] 1707.)

Let the House ponder the effect of that statement. No war was going on in India, no famine was extending its ravages throughout the country, and no exceptional circumstances existed, crops were fairly good, and the general prosperity of the country was about the average, and yet, in two years, the expenditure of India had been raised by £3,500,000. But it was not his intention to limit his remarks to the last three years. Let them make a comparison of a wider character. And, in order to compare fairly the ordinary expenditure of different years, it was necessary to exclude all items of an exceptional character, or which fluctuated from causes wholly independent of the State. For these reasons, he deducted all the expenditure incurred in different years for famine, loss by exchange, the Egyptian and Afghan Wars, and frontier railways. He also eliminated those most disturbing items, the provincial surpluses and deficits, and also the very fluctuating results of our expenditure upon productive public works. The ordinary expenditure arrived at in this way for the 10 years up to 1880-1 averaged £36,500,000; in 1881-2 it amounted to a little over £39,000,000; and this year, 1883-4, it was estimated at £39,500,000, showing an increase of ordinary expenditure of no less than £3,000,000 sterling. No one could doubt that that was an enormous increase. No doubt, this increase might be in part due to exceptional circumstances, and, indeed, it was mainly accounted for by one item; but it was none the less enormous. If the House would allow him, he would analyze it as shortly as he could. If anyone would take the trouble to examine the different heads of expenditure he would find a considerable increase in almost every case of importance with one significant exception. It was one which they should all gladly recognize. There was no substantial increase under the head of ordinary Army expenditure. The net average cost of the Army during the 10 years ending with 1880-1 was just under £15,000,000. About the middle of the period it was at its lowest, mainly owing to the great exertions of Lord Northbrook. In 1883-4 it was estimated at £15,198,000. It was also quite true that the increase would have been converted into a large decrease in India if it had not been for the rapid growth of the charges for the non-effective services in England over which the Government of India had no control, and many of which had been imposed without consulting them. The causes of this increase could not be better expressed than they had been by Sir John Strachey—

> "This increase has, for the most part, been caused, directly or indirectly, by changes of system which have been introduced at various times, and has fallen chiefly on the non-effective charges, the growth of which has more than swallowed up the important economies carried out in the effective charges. The additional payments in the shape of pensions at their capitalized value, which have been unavoidable consequences of the abolition of the old Indian Army, have increased the yearly non-effective charge by £750,000, and the increase in payments on account of European troops who have served in India amounts to about half that sum. The increase of military expenditure, which from its nature has been beyond the power of the Government of India to control, is the most unsatisfactory part of the financial history of the last few years."

Therefore, in his opinion, the Government of India could not be justly charged with neglecting serious attempts to reduce Army expenditure. But the most important step was taken by Lord Lytton, who appointed a Commission, including such distinguished authorities as Sir Ashley Eden and Sir Frederick Roberts, to inquire into the whole subject. The Commission reported in the year 1880, and made suggestions which would, if carried into effect, have reduced the cost of the Army by £1,250,000. Some few of their minor proposals had been carried out, and as criticism had been a good deal expended upon them, he hoped the House would allow him to read the short passage in which General Wilson, the able military Member of Council explained and justified the changes which had been made. He might add that his whole Minute was well worth careful perusal. General Wilson said that he approved the present Army Estimates—

> "Because they maintained the British Army at its normal strength in batteries and regiments, and they provided for an addition to the aggregate strength of the Army, had provided each regiment with an additional British officer, and had effected a change in organization which had brought about the elimination from the ranks of the Bengal Army of the non-fighting classes, while adding to the establishments of the regiments retained men of the warlike classes. This had been done, and improvement in establishments had been gained at a considerable reduction of expenditure, while, consequent on the liberal concessions sanctioned by the Secretary of State to the men discharged, and the care exhibited by the military authorities, the changes had been carried into effect without a murmur, and without any of the disquieting effects which were by some anticipated."

No one could read that Minute without feeling the greatest satisfaction at the result of carrying out one of the proposals of the Army Commission. But all the principal proposals of that Commission — and especially that as to the Presidential Armies in India —though the recommendations of the Government of India had been received upon them, had not yet been dealt with, and the question he should like to put to the Government was this—How long did they mean the present deadlock to continue? The recommendations of the Commission on this head had been substantially adopted by the Government of India; but they had been opposed, obstructed almost—if they understood rightly the speech of the Secretary of State last year—by the Council of the Secretary of State. In the midst of this divergent opinion the Secretary of State had been unable to make up his mind. It was, however, a serious matter, for these views had been before the Government at home since 1880, and yet they had been absolutely unable, up to the present time, to arrive at any decision on a question which was one of a most pressing character. The House had to deal with the question absolutely in the dark, for no Papers were before them, and he urged upon the Government, if they could not make up their minds in this matter, to have the courage to publish some part of the Report of the Royal Commission and see if they could not gain the support of the country. He would take next the main heads of increase, the largest of which was, of course, that of public works. He hoped they would not to-night wander into any general discussion upon the merits or demerits of public works in India. Everybody admitted that the extension of public works was of paramount importance to the development of the resources of India, and most people would also gladly recognize the fact that that outlay, notwithstanding many mistakes and some waste, had been substantially a successful outlay, which was year by year bringing, upon the whole, good returns into the Exchequer. But should they not all admit also that any such outlay must not be increased beyond what India could safely bear, and that it ought to be made upon fixed principles, not liable to constant variation? The increase of expenditure on this head was best shown by the Return for which he had recently moved, and which was known as No. 142 of the present Session. It showed at a glance what was the net charge upon the Revenue of the year, in respect of all classes of public works. With the permission of the House he would summarize its results, which were most remarkable. In the first six years—that was, between 1873 and 1879—the average net charge upon the Revenue of the year was £5,348,000. Then two favourable circumstances occurred. The net result from the irrigation works then, for the first time, began to show a profit instead of a loss; and, secondly, the purchase of the East India Railway Company by the State then first began to bring in to the Imperial Exchequer, as its share of the profits of the undertaking, a sum which had since averaged more than £1,000,000 sterling. These favourable circumstances ought at once to have produced a marked effect in reducing the net charge upon the Revenue; and this they did. In 1879-80, the net charge was £3,774,000—a diminution of £1,500,000; and in 1880-1 it was £3,408,000. But in 1881-2, the first year for which Lord Ripon was responsible, it rose at once to £4,934,000—an increase of £1,500,000; in 1882-3 it went up £700,000 more; while in 1883-4 the total net charge on Revenue was estimated at £6,615,000. Making allowance for a peculiar mode of entering the expenditure upon protective public works during the last two years, he was still entitled to say that the net cost to the State of all classes of public works was now greater by £2,700,000 than it was in 1880; or if they took the single item of public works ordinary, it would be found that the cost of these works was £1,750,000 higher than it was in 1880-1. Sometimes he had heard it said that these works were unfairly cut down in the latter year. Let them then compare the figures of the present year with the average of the five years before 1880, and even then it would be found that the increase was no less than £1,500,000. And he would ask the House to remember, if it should occur to anyone that £6,500,000 was not, after all, a large sum to be expended on public works out of Revenue in so large a country as India, that the real question was whether India could afford to pay that amount, and also that it was entirely exclusive of the capital expenditure upon public works, which, taking one year with another, might be put down at about £8,000,000 annually. Part of this increased expenditure on public works was of course due, as the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War had told the House, to the activity of the provincial Governments and local bodies in the construction out of funds at their disposal of minor local improvements very necessary for the progress and development of the country. But here again there was great danger. He observed that the provincial Governments had in April, 1882, accumulated very large balances, owing to restrictions put upon their expenditure in previous years. These balances were being spent at the rate of £1,500,000 a-year, and though this expenditure was perfectly legitimate, and an essential consequence of the contracts entered into with the provincial Governments, it was evident that in another year these balances would be exhausted, and they would of necessity have to curtail their expenditure on this head to an enormous extent, or to devise some fresh means of raising revenue. And the new system of local self-government was likely to add to this danger, because it must involve new establishments and contingent expenses. He now came to the great bulk of Civil Service expenditure. Passing over items which he knew were capable of satisfactory explanation, he found that, comparing 1880-1 with the present year, and speaking in the language of the new forms of account, the "direct demands upon the revenue," which comprised to a large extent the cost of the collection of revenue, had increased by £465,000; the Post Office and Telegraph Services by £274,000; and the "salaries and expenses of Civil Departments" by £536,000. Almost every head in the last class showed an increase, and one only a substantial decrease. But he would take a wider ground. Instead of making the comparison with 1880-1 only, which might have been in some respects exceptional, he would take four groups of years, the first group of four years comprising Lord Mayo's Viceroyalty, the second and third groups the Viceroyalties of Lord Northbrook and Lord Lytton. Each of these groups consisted of four years. The last group he took comprised the three years of Lord Ripon. He borrowed this mode of comparison from the well-known work by Sir John Strachey. He would take first the Effective Civil Services, which included 14 main heads of expenditure. The average annual expenditure under Lord Mayo was £11,750,000; it rose to £12,400,000 under Lord Northbrook, to £12,457,000 under Lord Lytton, and to no less than £13,439,000 under Lord Ripon. In the first year of the whole series, 1869-70, it amounted to £12,100,000; in the present year it was estimated at £13,689,000, or an increase of over 12 per cent. A few items were remarkable. He found it took £409,000 more to administer law and justice, £311,000 for police, and £118,000 for law and printing than in 1869-70. Taking next the Non-Effective Civil Services, the average annual expenditure started in Lord Mayo's time at £1,278,000, and had risen in Lord Northbrook's time to £1,660,000, in Lord Lytton's time to £1,995,000, and in Lord Ripon's time to £2,081,000. In the first year it was £1,151,500, and in the last £2,104,500, or an increase of over 80 per cent. The House would, he felt sure, while pardoning him for detaining them on matters of detail, admit that his case, as regarded a large increase of expenditure was abundantly made out. He now came to the second part of his argument. Why was the increased expenditure of which he had spoken especially dangerous to India? The House would anticipate that he referred, in the first place, to the subject of famine. Fortunately, for the last few years India had been remarkably exempt from famine. But they might look with mathematical certainty to a recurrence of that visitation before many years were past, not less disastrous than former ones or less difficult to cope with. What was the effect of a series of famines upon the finances of India? All their resources would have to be directed to the saving of life, and the Government would be compelled to borrow on a large scale for the purpose of meeting the famine expenditure. Nor could the borrowing be confined to India, whose means of borrowing in any single year were narrowly limited. The borrowing would have to be in England, and it would have to be in gold. He would be told that the proposal made a few years ago, with regard to a Famine Insurance Fund, met all difficulties. He did not underrate the value of that proposal which had been made by Sir John Strachey and Lord Lytton, for they deserved the gratitude of India for what they had done. So far as they proposed to lay aside £750,000 annually as a famine insurance, they had given great strength to the financial position of India. He did not think he could say so much for the protective works, because, though they might do much to diminish the suffering of small localities, they did not greatly diminish the burdens of the Government of India in the event of a widespread famine. But it had not always been possible to lay aside even the annual £750,000; and this led him to touch upon the second great danger caused by a large ordinary expenditure in India. It lay in the enormous remittances which had to be made to this country, and which amounted to £18,000,000. The effect of those remittances was not fully felt till 1871. Since that time it had been felt more and more until the enormous amount to be remitted had resulted in forcing down the price of silver to a point which caused great difficulty to the Indian Government — one of the greatest, indeed, with which that Government had to contend. The loss in a single year by exchange had been as much as £3,000,000 or £4,000,000. In 1881-2 the Secretary of State had said that the bills amounted to £18,000,000 sterling, and, in order to satisfy the demands necessarily made in this country, the Government had had to sell silver to the extent of 22 crores of rupees. That was an operation of gigantic magnitude, greater probably than any other Government had to undertake, and which, depending as it mainly did upon the condition of the silver market, it was hazardous to assume could be always effected in any particular year. And, indeed, experience showed that it had not been effected. During the last 10 years of which the accounts had been published, the aggregate amount that ought to have been remitted was £153,000,000. The amount actually remitted had been £129,000,000. That left £24,000,000, which had to be borrowed; and though, of course, it was not all unproductive expenditure, yet it had increased the future annual burthen of the remittances, and in this way they had grown, and would go on growing, unless immediate steps were taken. And he ventured to say that in his opinion the only way of grappling with that grave danger was either to develop trade in India, or to reduce the debt in England. [Mr. J. K. CROSS: Hear, hear!] He was glad to hear that cheer from the Under Secretary, because in 1879 the hon. Gentleman was doubtful about the policy of reducing the Indian Gold Debt. But whether we desired to develop trade, or to reduce debt, a surplus was equally necessary. Where was the surplus to come from? Sir John Strachey had, by a policy which included some increase of taxation, provided a surplus of £4,000,000. But that surplus was given away last year, no doubt in a manner most beneficial to India; but the result was that no surplus was left. And though it was true there was some slight elasticity in the Revenue, its result was not large, and as it was hardly possible to increase taxation, it was difficult to see how any increase of Revenue was to be obtained. It was doubtful, indeed, if you could rely on the existing Revenue, and especially on the opium revenue, as fresh fields were being opened in China and elsewhere for the cultivation of that drug. Therefore, the only remaining means of obtaining a surplus was by economy; and in his opinion the policy of reducing expenditure ought to be continuously and steadily followed. But the possibility of doing so unfortunately depended on each successive Viceroy. One Viceroy cut down expenditure, and another, to gain popularity, increased it again. Take, for instance, the post of Public Works Minister, which was abolished by Lord Lytton on the specific ground, admitted by everybody, that you would thereby obtain a more complete financial control over public works, Lord Ripon had immediately re-established. The result of this sort of change was apparent. One important item was that of superannuations. There had been an increase of 80 per cent in recent years in that item. That increase was a monument of fluctuations of policy. But, after all, it was not the Viceroys who were so much to blame as the House of Commons. In 1879 it was recognized in that House that the reduction of Indian expenditure was a matter of paramount necessity.

But in 1882 it was increased by £2,000,000. That was not the way to carry out economy, or to instil into the minds of the Government of India the necessity of doing what was, no doubt, unpleasant and, at the same time, exceedingly difficult. But the importance of the question could hardly be exaggerated, and on his responsibility he declared without hesitation that unless some decisive step were taken in the direction of economy a crisis must arise. A cry for reduction would spring up, and then, perhaps, a demand for a sudden reduction of Expenditure would be forced upon the country in a manner most injurious to the welfare of India. Then, in the panic which would arise, a cry would be made for the dissolution of the tie between India and this country, lest, as had very rarely happened, India should become a burden on the finances of this country. The only way of establishing on a firm basis the connection of India and this country was by boldly grappling with the question, and by recognizing to the full the paramount necessity of a reduction in the Expenditure of India. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Mr. R. T. REID, in seconding the Resolution, remarked, that the Debt of India, which was only £30,000,000 in 1840, had risen to £106,000,000 in 1872, and to £156,000,000 in 1882. The Prime Minister had pointed out a short time ago that the cardinal rule of finance was to keep the expenditure within the income; but, as a matter of fact, there had been within the last 10 years five surpluses and five deficits in Indian finance, showing a balance of some £4,000,000 to the bad. In one of his Mid Lothian speeches the Prime Minister had stated that the Expenditure of India was rapidly increasing, it being then £58,978,000 a-year, and that if it continued to increase at the same rate for a few more years the people of England would be called upon to take upon their own shoulders the £135,000,000 of East Indian Debt that then existed. But in 1882 the Indian Expenditure had risen to £70,000,000 per annum, and the Debt had increased to £156,000,000. Was there any reason to suppose that India could bear that amount of Debt coupled with such an enormous Expenditure? It had been declared many years ago by eminent men that she could not do so. In considering the power of the country to bear these heavy burdens, it must not be forgotten that India was subject to recurrent famines, and that in the course of the 10 years ending in 1871 5,240,000 of her inhabitants had died from famine, while in the 10 years ending in 1881 that number had increased to 6,250,000. But, quite apart from these recurrent famines, a large portion of the inhabitants of India were miserably poor and were always in a state of semi-starvation. But in the face of all this he found that the Superannuation and Pension Fund of the country had increased from £1,450,000 in 1872 to £2,150,000 in 1881, that the cost of collecting the Revenue had increased from £6,050,800 in 1872 to £8,250,000 in 1881; that, whereas the land revenue had only increased from £20,520,000 in 1872 to £21,112,000 in 1881, the cost of collecting it had increased from £2,435,000 in 1872 to £2,983,000 in 1881. During the same period the cost of administering law and justice had increased from £2,273,000 to £3,230,000, although the whole value of the property in dispute was only £15,500,000. The hon. Gentleman, though he had made a very valuable speech, had not made any suggestions as to the method that ought to be adopted of reducing Expenditure. He put it to the House whether it was likely that, as long as there was no real control at all over the gentlemen in India, who were responsible for the financial government of that country, any real reduction of expenditure would take place? Sir Charles Trevelyan put the matter very tersely when he said—"When people spend other people's money, they are generally inclined to be liberal," and that was what had taken place here. At present the control of the Government of this country was far from satisfactory, and by no means complete. He quite agreed with what had been stated by high authorities, that the House of Commons was the place to which alone the people of India could look for support against the extravagance of the officials who were set over them; but he asked what the House of Commons did or what it had done for the purpose of checking the official expenditure? Why, even when the Indian Budget, which afforded an opportunity of discussing the details of Expenditure, was presented, the House was not permitted to enter upon that discussion owing to the late period of the Session. Surely some steps ought to be taken to investigate the working of the Act which was the charter of the Indian people, and see whether some method could not be adopted to effect some real check upon Expenditure. He did not, however, believe there would be any reduction of a substantial character in Expenditure until something was done for the purpose of putting a check upon the able and skilled but autocratic Native officials who had charge of the finances of India, and who seemed to revel in extravagance.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that early steps be taken to reduce the expenditure of India."—(*Mr. E. Stanhope.*)

Mr. J. K. CROSS said, he was quite sure the Government, and certainly he, as a humble official of the Government, had no reason at all to complain of the tone of the debate. But he thought the speeches illustrated very well the truth of the old proverb, which said—"One tale is good until another is told;" and though he could not follow fully the speech of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. E. Stanhope), still, so far as the account he gave of expenditure on public works, he had been unable to verify the statements, or confirm any single set of figures which the hon. Gentleman had quoted. So far as he could make out, the expenditure under this head in 1881-2 was £2,725,000; in 1882-3, £2,631,000, excluding the cost of the Madras irrigation works; and the estimate for 1883-4 was taken at £3,820,000, including £424,000 for the East India Railway.

Mr. E. STANHOPE explained that he had dealt only with Return 142, which he had in his hand, and which showed the net charge on the Revenue of the year for public works.

Mr. J. K. CROSS proceeded to say, that he thought it well the House should thoroughly understand the object of successive Governments in India, in decentralizing the finances of India, and the exertions they made to carry out that policy for a considerable number of years. For that purpose he would go back to the period immediately succeeding the Mutiny, and trace the history of the financial arrangements of India from that time downwards. He would point out that, after the Mutiny, it was seen that the centralization which had been continued up to that time was a very great detriment to the financial arrangements which then existed. It was seen that the attempt to administer, from one centre, the finances of that Dependency, covering an area of 800,000 square miles, and including a population of 200,000,000 of people, was an absolute impossibility. As time went on, various Finance Ministers, one after another, suggested changes of one sort or another, but they did not succeed in getting them carried out. So far as his observation went, it was only under the pressure of very grave anxiety that anything was ever done by any Central Government. The change in the system, therefore, was slow and painful, notwithstanding the urgent representations of the greatest of our Indian officials and the efforts made by Ministers at home from time to time. It was not till 1870 that an attempt was really made to deal with the difficult problem on well-defined lines, when Lord Mayo took the matter in hand. Sir John Strachey said that—

"To Lord Mayo belongs the only effectual remedy for these serious evils. He resolved to give to Local Governments the local standard which they required; to make over to them a certain income by which they might regulate their local expenditure, and to leave to them, subject to certain rules and conditions, the responsibility of managing their own local affairs."

The control of gaols, police, medical services, printing, roads, and civil buildings were accordingly transferred to the local governments. This decentralization was further developed under Lord Lytton; and other services were placed under local supervision, and the management of some of the railways and all the canals was made over to the local governments. The object of that was to throw on the local governments the management of these services and the accompanying revenues. This development of local and provincial life was, according to the testimony of Sir William Muir, Sir Ashley Eden, and others of the best of India's servants, whose ability and impartiality would not be questioned by anybody, succeeding beyond expectation, when to the troubles of famine and exchange was added the outbreak of the Afghan War. This complication of evils could not be escaped except by a heavy reduction of expenditure which was insisted upon. What was the effect of that reduction? He found it alluded to in a Resolution of the Government of India in September, 1881, and the local governments were called upon to contribute during the years 1879 and 1880 a very large sum from resources made their own, the result of which, in the suspension of improvements and works in progress, was very prejudicial. The advantages to India of the plans that had been adopted were very great, and many men who would be supported by the hon. Member opposite had borne testimony to this fact. In proof of those advantages of decentralization, he would refer to the evidence of Sir Ashley Eden, who showed that—

> "The revenues had been increased, useless expenditure had been curtailed, and that funds had been made available for great improvements under all branches of administration."

By placing the funds under the control of the local authorities, they had been able to administer, in a satisfactory manner, those revenues which they were not able previously so to administer. It was not necessary to go into details which would weary the House; but very large sums had been taken away from the central authority, and placed in the hands of the various local authorities, to use for their own purposes; and if any attempt was made to disturb those arrangements, or to curtail them, the result would certainly not be particularly good. He had ventured to lay before the House the reasons which were at the root of this decentralizing system, and he had tried to explain some of the advantages derived therefrom; but he was bound to say, at the same time, that when they denuded themselves of income, and gave over to others the power to control it, it was not quite so easy, as hon. Members seemed to think, for the Central Government of India to exercise any very definite control in the matter. The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Stanhope) had gone, at some length, into the subject of the general expenditure, and he had taken various periods for the purpose of comparing them. He (Mr. J. K. Cross) was unable to follow all the figures the hon. Member quoted, from the rapidity with which he spoke; but he had not a word of complaint to make with regard to those he did hear. Now, in dealing with the matter of expenditure, he would take the last 12 years, and divide them into four triennial periods—first, the three years ending 1874; the second period ending 1877; the third ending 1880; and the fourth ending 1883; and the figures he gave were from Papers 267 of 1881, 214 of 1882, and 139 of 1883. The net expenditure of those periods, leaving out certain balances as the hon. Member opposite had done, was, in the first, £118,000,000; in the second period, £121,000,000; in the third, £132,000,000; and in the fourth, £136,000,000. The hon. Member had said that, in order to make fair comparison, it was necessary to exclude certain items, and he (Mr. J. K. Cross) quite agreed with him. He said it was necessary to exclude the items for famines, war, frontier railways, exchange, public works, and certain balances; but there were two other items which it was equally necessary to exclude, in order to make a fair comparison of the expenditure over which the Government of India had control—namely, superannuation and Army non-effective charges. The hon. Member must admit that those charges were equally out of their control. [Mr. E. STANHOPE: Not of the English Government.] Of the Government of India, he meant. If they had to consider the effect of the proceedings of the Government of England on the finances of India, they would have to go over a very large field indeed. He was speaking of the Government of India; and if they took off the charges for frontier railways, for the Afghan War, subsidized railways, exchange, famine, &c., they must also take off superannuation and Army non-effective charges. Those charges for the period ending 1874, were £35,642,215; for the period ending 1877, £35,830,803; for the period ending 1880, £46,693,780; and for the period ending 1883, £46,191,080; leaving the controllable expenditure in the first period £83,114,490; in the second period £85,239,651; in the third period, £86,006,389; and in the fourth period, £90,719,579. But it must be remembered that, in the last period, £2,965,000 charged to famine expenditure was really in hand, in comparison with former periods, being partly in productive public works, and partly in redeemed debt. Bearing in mind that they had this backset in hand, the increase in charge on controllable items was in the last triennial period, as compared with the 1880 period, £4,713,190, or £1,571,066 per annum; as compared with the 1877 period, £5,479,928, or £1,826,642 per annum; and as compared with the 1874 period, £7,605,089, or £2,533,029 per annum. The hon. Gentleman had complained that some of the charges had unduly increased. Let them take the Post Office charges, for instance. In 1876 there was a great decrease in receipts from official postage. The Postal Union had been joined, throwing a large expense on India. The business of the Post Office had greatly increased. In 1871 there were 2,800 offices in India; in 1877, 3,400; and in 1881, 4,600; and the letters carried had increased from 89,000,000 in 1871 to 158,000,000 in 1881. Other additional expenses had occurred, over which the Government had not had very much control—for instance, the allowance under Treaties; and in the last period—that was, from 1880-3—it had been necessary to make some extraordinary payments to the State of Rajapootana, which had absorbed a sum of £269,000. But, taking all these charges, and including the charges for police, law, and justice, stationery, educational, and medical charges, public works and navigation, the total increase in the period ending 1883 over that ending 1874 was £7,600,000. He must ask his hon. Friend the Member for Hereford to correct one of the figures he had quoted. He (Mr. J. K. Cross) thought his hon. Friend had said that the cost of the collection of the land revenue amounted to £2,400,000 in 1872; but if he referred to the corrections, he would find that that charge came to £2,800,000. Then the charge for police had been alluded to; and he might say that it was necessary that that charge should increase; but what was the charge after all? The total charge for police in India was, nominally, £2,300,000. But was the House aware of how many policemen there were in India. There were 151,000; and, if their cost were compared with the cost of the English police, it would be found that the latter cost about £100 a man, while in India they cost only £16 a man. The charges for stationery and printing had been alluded to, and they had certainly gone up during the last 12 years; but they had increased in nothing like the ratio shown in the statistical abstract. The hon. Gentleman would see that they appeared to have fallen in 1872 to something like half what they had been before, this being an error in the accounts which would be remedied next year. With regard to the development of ordinary public works—an item of considerable importance—he thought he should be able to show that, so far from their being any evil effects connected with it, it was one of the most profitable items of expenditure in which they could possibly indulge. In 1878-80, public works had been, to a great extent, practically stopped, owing to the necessity of reducing the amounts allotted to that account, under the pressure of war, famine, and exchange. He would now go a little further. Having spoken of the items over which the Government of the day in India had a sort of direct or indirect control, he would ask the attention of the House to what he considered by far the most serious items with which they had to deal, and over which they had no direct control—namely, the extraordinary increase in the non-effective charges both civil and military; and respecting this, the statement he had to make was so grave that he would have to ask for serious consideration upon what he might state regarding it. In the triennial period ending 1874, the net civil superannuation charges were £2,575,673, and the military superannuation charges £5,787,441, or, together, £8,363,114; in the triennial period ending 1877, the civil charges were £3,453, 577, and the the military £6,494,919, or, together, £9,948,496; in the triennial period ending 1880, the civil charges were £4,284,373, and the military £7,978,527, or, together, £12,262,980; and in the triennial period ending 1883, the civil charges were £5,534,480, and the military charges £8,541,000, or, together £14,075,480. That was an increase of charge of £5,712,366, on an original charge of £8,363,114, since 1874. But that was not the worst of the case. There had been a very great error in the estimation of the amounts annually required to meet the military charge for pensions; and, year by year, these charges had been very much more than they were estimated by the War Office, and a great deal more than they had been estimated and paid for by the India Office; and there had grown up a debt due to the Treasury, which, at the present time, amounted to no less a sum than £2,000,000, the charges having been underrated or underpaid by £96,831 in the 1874 period; by £711,072 in the 1877 period; by £697,000 in the 1880 period; and by about £514,000 in the 1883 period. If that debt should be converted into a Ten Years' Annuity, and if the first annual payment towards it should be made during the coming year, requiring about £260,000, the total superannuation charges — civil, military, and medical—to be discharged next year, would require a payment of 129 lacs of rupees in India, and about £3,922,000 in England; the total cost to India to provide this payment being 60,000,000 rupees, or one-seventh of the net Revenue of India. Before he sa down he should try to say something more about these charges; but, at present, he would turn to a pleasanter feature in these accounts. The abnormal war expenditure charged to account in the 1880 period was £5,442,343, and in the 1883 period, £7,853,241. We might hope that that would not recur; and, if we escaped the necessity of making any railways in Afghanistan, we should also save a charge which was in the 1880 period, £1,334,350, and in the 1883 period, £2,799,797. On these two heads India might hope to escape a payment of some £15,000,000, besides our own contribution of £5,000,000, which would be saved to us. The Government had, in the meantime, paid the expenses of the Afghan and the Egyptian Wars, charging in the latter 73 lacs of rupees to India, as she had derived immense advantages from the keeping open of the Suez Canal. There remained but four items of charge to mention — namely, exchange, interest, productive public works, and famine charges. The nominal loss by exchange had greatly increased; but really that should be added to the cost of the Home Charges, as it arose from the necessity of remitting the equivalent of the sterling payments which had to be made in England. That was a charge which was entirely outside the control of any individual Government of India. The change which had taken place in the interest and public works charge on the Revenue was the one bright spot in the picture of Indian finance, and it did much to relieve the sombre colours which he had been obliged to use. The interest paid on ordinary Debt had been, in the 1874 period, £15,345,224; in the 1877 period, £12,907,376; in the 1880 period, £13,054,591; and in the 1883 period, £10,631,654, showing the satisfactory reduction of £4,700,000 between the 1874 and 1883 periods. But it was to the productive works to which he must direct their attention as the essentially satisfactory feature. The charge on the Revenue for these works was, in 1874 period, £6,822,992; in 1877, £4,771,255; and, in 1880, £1,912,110. But in the last period there was a gain of £1,708,007. Taking the interest on ordinary Debt and the interest and charges of productive public works together, they found that what was a charge on the Revenue in the 1874 period of £22,168,236 was in the 1883 period £8,923,647, or a reduction of no less a sum than £13,234,589 in the last triennial period as compared with that of 1874. He had said little about the Famine charges. In the period ending 1874 they were £3,883,217; in that ending 1877, £4,990,358; in that ending 1880, £5,784,285; and in that ending 1883, £3,034,469; but in the last period they had the advantage of some £900,000 spent on protective works, and they had reduced the Debt by £2,045,000. With regard to famine, they could only hope for the best, and prepare as well as they could to meet the calamity when it came. He had said that he should speak more fully on the superannuation charges. He had said that that year they would require 60,000,000 rupees, and they were growing still, and would grow for some years yet. There was an idea afloat that the Home Charges for pensions and other Home Charges which had to be annually remitted from India might be easily reduced. It was his painful duty to dispel that delusion. For the next year Home Charges, for pensions and superannuations of one kind or another, would be £3,900,000; the other charges were, in 1881-2, furlough accounts, £501,000; interest on debt, £2,510,000; dividend on guaranteed railways, £6,240,000; passage of troops, £309,000; miscellaneous, post office, &c., £151,000; India Office and Store Department, £218,000; remittance transactions, £502,000; Army effective charges, £615,000; Army stores, £1,332,469; Public Works Department stores, £585,591; total, £16,864,050. Here they had a total of nearly £17,000,000, requiring 204,000,000 rupees, which had to be paid in England. And, so far as he could see, these charges were so well established that the only point of attack was upon the effective Army charges paid here and the stores. With regard to the superannuation charges, they were completely manacled, handed over, bound hand and foot; these charges were planted by law, they grew by custom, they were fostered by the House of Commons, but they were paid by the people of India. They were paid, not in coin, but in kind, like all the other Home Charges; no money came to pay them; they were paid in cotton and corn, in jute and rice, in teas and indigo, and many other products of the soil of India; and as they grew year by year, so year by year they demanded more and more of the produce of Indian soil to meet them. What were their most potent means of meeting these charges? They were trustees for India in this matter; they were bound to do the best they could with their trust. How could they better promote the welfare of that trust than by developing local means of making wealth, the making of roads and bridges, wells, and tanks, making their gaols healthy too? And for these things a generous local expenditure was the first requisite. But not only should they try to meet these charges, they ought to try to check their growth. No one had more emphatically endorsed his opinion than the hon. Gentleman the Mover of this Resolution. How could they so well prevent the growth of these charges as by the employment of more Natives and fewer Europeans? Far be it from him to say a single word against those splendid men who had spent their lives in India in the service of the State; the country recognized to the full the services which they had rendered and were still rendering; but they were costly, very costly, to a poor country, and besides that, when their active work was done, they did not stay in their adopted country. Whereas, if they employed Natives, they were less costly; they did not come home on pensions at 50 years of age, and by employing them in the service of the State, at least they hoped to make their loyalty to English rule more active. He did not speak without authority on this subject; he had the high authority of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire himself. But there were other and very cogent reasons why they must develop by every means in their power the resources and the wealth-producing power of the people of India. Debt was not so easy to pay as it formerly was. The Debts of the world were paid in kind. A pound of Debt was discharged by a remittance of a sovereign's worth of produce. But, unfortunately for the debtor nations of the world, the absorption of gold by Germany and America and other countries, which had adopted gold as their standard of value in place of silver, had caused gold to be harder of acquisition than formerly, and a good deal more produce had to be remitted to discharge a pound of Debt than was the case when most of the Debts of the world were contracted. That told heavily against India. During the average of the last 25 years she had discharged a pound's worth of debt to us by a remittance of 34 lbs. cotton, or 168 lbs. wheat, or 123 lbs. jute, or 192 lbs. rice, or 13 lbs. tea, or 3½ lbs. indigo; but so much harder had it now become for India to discharge that debt, that the pound of Debt which required 34 lbs. of cotton now required 44 lbs.; in place of 168 lbs. of wheat, it required 224 lbs.; in place of 123 lbs. of jute, it required 185 lbs.; in place of 192 lbs. of rice, it required 288 lbs.; in place of 13 lbs. of tea, it required 20 lbs.; in place of 3½ lbs. of indigo, it required 4½ lbs. His right hon. Friend the Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen) had alluded to the strain on gold as a disturbing cause before, and it was one which might well make debtors tremble. But it was a warning to us in India to mend our means of production and improve our roads, to render access to our ports from the interior easier, and, therefore, cheaper, and by every means in our power to aid India in her effort to pay her way. You could not do that by binding ligatures upon her limbs; you might paralyze her, but you could not stimulate her by such a process. From the speeches they had heard that evening, it might be thought that the finances of India were in a rather mournful condition; but it must be remembered that circumstances were very different now from what they were in 1879, when the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lincolnshire made his Indian Budget speech. Then there was war and famine; but since then the salt tax had been reduced 25 per cent, the Customs had been reduced £1,250,000, £2,000,000 sterling had been set aside for famine purposes, and there had been spent on productive and protective works £3,600,000 in the last triennial period more than in the corresponding period ending in 1880. He did not think, therefore, they should regard India as growing poorer and poorer, when they could reduce taxation to that amount, and increase the amount spent on public works, and yet have a fair surplus at the end. From 1871 to 1883 there had been an average increase in exports from India of 30 per cent, while the expenditure had increased during the same period only 7 or 8. During the same period India had absorbed a considerable quantity of bullion and merchandise, the latter being £49,000,000 worth a-year; so that, taking all things together, India, so far from being in a state of poverty, was getting on pretty well under the circumstances, and they were justified in looking forward to the future with hope. Certainly, there was no need to curtail expenditure; indeed, he wished that we had more men in the House who could tell them, by their own experience, of the means and wants of India. He sometimes thought that, if the Council of the Secretary of State were not so numerous, more of the best Indian servants would find places there, and so would keep them more in touch with our Eastern Empire. At that Council Table there sat 15 eminent men, whose collective experience of India must approach five centuries; at least they might spare them a century of knowledge to leaven the ignorance of the House of Commons. And if any eminent Administrator who had left India within the last five years would take his place there, he would tell the House not more earnestly, but with infinitely more effect than he (Mr. J. K. Cross) could, that it was by a generous development of her resources that we might alone hope to make India prosperous. He had tried to put before the House a plain statement of fact; he had pointed out items of charge which seemed to be excessive, and which he would gladly see more fully justified; and he could assure hon. Members that no exertion on his behalf should be wanting in that direction; but with regard to the main items of local expenditure, which he looked upon as the very lifeblood of Indian provincial progress, he must ask the House not to put any obstacles in the way of such generous spending from the income of the year, as would, in the opinion of the Local and Provincial Governments, be productive of profitable results. He must repeat to the House the points he wished to urge—first, there was a great growth of expenditure in several items which might well be earnestly pressed on the Government of India for consideration, but these items were more matters of detail of administration than principles of finance; secondly, there was an enormous increase of superannuation and pension charges, which it was the duty of this House to check by every means in its power, the only means suggested was the increased employment of Natives; thirdly, in order to lighten the burdens of India it was necessary to develop her productive resources, and this would require an increase, rather than a decrease, of expenditure on public works. The Resolution of the hon. Gentleman opposite was too sweeping and too indefinite. He (Mr. J. K. Cross) was as anxious for economy as the hon. Gentleman; but it must be economy which should not fetter progress, and, therefore, he was unable to accept the wording of the Resolution in its present form. But, as both of them had the best interests of India in view, though approaching them by somewhat different means, he asked the House to accept a slight alteration in the Resolution, and he begged to move, as an Amendment to the Motion, these words—

"This House is of opinion that every effort should be made to effect economy in the expenditure of the Government of India."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out all the words after the word "House" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "every effort should be made to effect economy in the Government of India,"—(*Mr. J. Kynaston Cross,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, he could not see that there was any material difference between the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope) and the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. J. K. Cross), except that the Motion actually pledged the House to effect some reduction in Indian Expenditure, whereas the Amendment only stated that the House ought to do its best to effect that object. For himself, he preferred the plain and straightforward Resolution of his hon. Friend; and, if necessary, he should support it. The necessity for effecting any considerable economy rested upon the narrow margin of Revenue which the Indian Government had at its disposal. At the same time, he thought that the hon. Gentleman, in his speech, had clearly shadowed forth a further reduction in taxation. Many persons had been afraid that the abolition of the cotton duties would be pernicious to Indian trade and manufactures. But there had been an increase of 44 per cent in the exports to China, and of 11 per cent in the imports from England. Thus, the abolition had been beneficial to the population of India, both as producers and consumers. Then, the decentralization which had been so largely effected had diminished the resources of the Imperial Government by transferring them to local centres. When the hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. K. Cross) spoke of the surplus during the last two years, it should be remembered that there had in that period been no wars or famines; but as wars and famines might at any time occur, and the Opium Revenue was likely to fall off, it was most desirable to reduce Expenditure so as to be able to meet an exceptional emergency which might arise. His hon. Friend had pointed out the enormous increase in the superannuation allowances and in the non-effective charges, and he had asked how they were to be kept down in future. The only way to keep them down was to reduce our establishments in India. The Under Secretary of State for India had intimated that it was the intention of the Government to expend more and more in public works. He (Lord George Hamilton) had sat on a Committee which investigated that question, together with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Postmaster General, and the present Under Secretary of State for India. After 18 months' inquiry, they came to a remarkable unanimity, and one recommendation was, that in no one year should more than £2,500,000 be borrowed. But, in 1883-4, it was proposed to borrow £3,820,000, or more than £1,300,000 in excess of that amount. The proposed expenditure upon works made out of Revenue was £1,800,000 in excess of that of three years ago. Moreover, £1,350,000 were, in addition, to be spent upon works classified as protective. Thus, nearly £5,000,000 in excess of the amount recommended by that Committee was to be expended this year on public works. When the cash balances increased, it was customary to embark in engineering schemes, which necessitated the creation of new establishments; and thus a heavy additional charge was imposed, which was severely felt at the next period of financial depression. In time of prosperity the Indian Government were told they could afford to enlarge their establishments; and in time of depression they were told they could not get rid of material that had been accumulated. He looked with diffidence upon what were called protective public works; that generally meant that they were non-productive, and that, not being remunerative, they had been pressed upon the Government as protective. The Report of the Select Committee on Public Works said that financial results were generally the best test of public utility. Unless an irrigation work benefited its immediate locality, it could not be of use to an outside district; if the cultivators close to it did not take advantage of it, it did not accomplish its main purpose. His experience as Under Secretary of State for India was that the House of Commons was always ready to support an abstract Resolution in favour of economy, but not ready to support the Minister in resisting any concrete demand for increased expenditure. He realized that on two occasions on which the Government of which he was a Member was defeated in the House. The Government must take advantage of a fit of economy, when it was on, if they desired to act on the Resolution now before the House. As regarded superannuation and the non-effective charges, the rights secured to officers under what was called the Guarantee Clause, which was carried when the Government of India was transferred to the Crown, had hampered the Government in every scheme of Army reform, and it had cost India millions, besides conducing to inefficiency. A Governor General might go out with the best intentions and several schemes of reform in his mind. He knew that he must secure the co-operation of the Services, to whom the changes might be unpalatable, and gradually he found it expedient to abandon his schemes. If the Government wanted to overhaul the administration of India for the purpose of effecting economy, the motive power must come from that House, and from the India Office. The only way by which they could give practical effect to an abstract Resolution such as this would be for the Secretary of State here to intimate that, in deference to the wishes of the House of Commons, he proposed to appoint a small Commission. The Commission ought then to go out to India, and there investigate and supervise each branch of the Civil Service Expenditure. While in India, they should be under the complete control of the Viceroy; they should have power to call up and examine witnesses; and their Reports, tempered with the opinions of those practically responsible for the government of India, should be forwarded to the local, as well as the Imperial Government. The mass of information thus collected would enable the Indian Government to effect the desired reforms, which, he believed, they were anxious to do. He hoped his hon. Friend would carefully consider this proposal. It was one which he knew the preceding Viceroy looked upon with favour. As to the Military Expenditure, Sir Ashley Eden's Commission recommended the abolition of the triple system of military administration as a means of saving £1,250,000 a-year. Successive Viceroys supported that view. Last year the Secretary of State for India summed up the merits and demerits of the proposal. It was important to notice how the present system had stood the test of the late war in Egypt. War was, after all, the only thorough test of a military organization, and every military authority in Europe had had to alter its arrangements in consequence of the experience of actual campaigns. Now, what were the difficulties which the present treble system had caused during the last few months? The Indian Government had had to perform a very simple operation—namely, to select, equip, and embark 5,000 men for service in Egypt—and if there had been one central authority, the duty would have been done with the utmost ease. As things were, the most enormous strain was put upon the various authorities who had to carry out the operations, for they had to work night and day. The reason for that was that there were three separate military authorities in India, so that as soon as the Government began to select recruits for the Expedition, they had to consult three Governments, three Commanders-in-Chief, three Adjutant Generals, three Quartermaster Generals, three Clothing Agents, three Inspector Generals of Ordnance, and a host of minor officials —a necessity which multiplied, to a perfectly absurd extent, the correspondence with the chief military officers. According to the present system, any soldier who passed from one Presidency to another was under the jurisdiction of the Commander-in-Chief of the Presidency in which he happened to be. Sir Herbert Macpherson was sent by the Government of India to superintend the embarkation of goods at Bombay. The consequence was, that all communications to him had to be sent from the Government of India to the Government of Bombay, and from the Commander-in-Chief at Calcutta to the Commander-in-Chief at Bombay. This led to the sending of despatches that were often identical with one another, and to the more serious inconvenience of occupying unduly the time of the officials and of delaying the operations. Again, when articles were wanted at Bombay for a Bengal regiment, they had either to be sent for from Bengal, or to be supplied at Bombay, to the great confusion and complication of the accounts. That was absurd enough; but nothing better illustrated the defects of the present system than the fact that a considerable part of the Madras Army was, at that moment, out of the jurisdiction of the Madras Government. Surely it was high time to establish a central military authority, and that the Government of this country took steps to put an end to this treble system of military administration, which, sooner or later, might lead to disastrous consequences. Objections might, no doubt, be taken to any course that would diminish the importance of the minor Presidencies; but those objections were of no consequence compared to the risks involved in the maintenance of the existing state of things. The treble system largely added to our Indian Army Expenditure, and, in the opinion of many of the most competent authorities, actually endangered our Indian Empire. Could not, he would ask, the India Office enter into some compromise, by which the Commanders-in-Chief of the three Presidencies might be retained, and sweep away the triplicate War Office system that hampered all our military operations? He did earnestly trust that the Government would pluck up courage and insist upon that all-important reform being carried out. They were pledged to retrenchment and reform, and ought now, therefore, to express definitely their intentions as to the change which he advocated.

Mr. PUGH said, that if the Government were prepared to appoint either a Commission to go out to India, and by personal examination see how a more efficient control could be exercised over the expenditure, as the noble Lord opposite the Member for Middlesex (Lord George Hamilton) had recommended, or a Committee to inquire into the subject, as he (Mr. Pugh) would himself suggest, then they might arrive at some real and practical means of enforcing economy. Both sides of the House were agreed as to the necessity for economy; but he thought the difference between the Resolution and the Amendment was very like the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. The result of the one or the other would be absolutely *nil*. With respect to the Amendment which he had put on the Paper, but which he had as yet been unable to bring forward, it was, he thought, amply justified by the speech of his hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for India. The House was desirous to enforce economy; but it had no means of bringing pressure to bear for that purpose. The Commission that sat at Simla was the very best proof they could have of the impossibility of effecting any practical improvement unless they had a spur from that House. If any Viceroy in India were to propose to materially diminish the charge under the head of administration for the Civil Service, it would be perfectly idle for him to attempt to carry a scheme for the purpose, because of the pressure which would be brought to bear against him both in England and in India. The Army Commission sat at Simla a long time, at great expense, and made an elaborate Report. That Report had to be considered by the Viceroy and his Council, by the Secretary of State for India and his Council, then by the War Office, and then by the Horse Guards. What chance had any scheme which had to run the gauntlet of all those authorities? The Council of the Secretary of State for India appeared to him a very unsatisfactory body. It was composed, no doubt, of Gentlemen of the highest ability and the greatest experience, who performed their duty conscientiously and well. But they had no power effectively to control expenditure, or to initiate reforms. They could not expect the Secretary of State to initiate reforms unless he was spurred on by the House or by some other authority; and it was impossible for the Viceroy to carry reforms involving a large reduction of expenditure into effect unless he was supported and urged thereto by that House. It was, notwithstanding what his hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for India had said, high time that there should be some control over the non-effective charges. Both sides of the House were in favour of the appointment of Natives, as far as they might be competent, to discharge the duties required; and, from the steps which the Government were taking for their education, more Natives would be in time found competent. But for many years the employment of Natives would not bring down the non-effective charges. Europeans would still have to be employed to a very large extent; and they would earn their pensions, and return to England to live upon them. The employment of Natives would not, therefore, afford an adequate solution of this part of the question. Neither the Resolution nor the Amendment of the noble Lord would be of any use unless the House insisted upon the appointment of a Committee to inquire into these matters. He had no doubt that the policy of decentralization had done good; but that result arose from the fact that, under that system, the public money was better spent. It was idle, however, to say that actual economy was caused by decentralization. He approved the step taken by Lord Ripon's Government with reference to the purchase of stores in India, which, though not noticed by the Under Secretary of State for India, was a very important and beneficial reform, and one much appreciated by the people of India. He hoped it might yet be carried further. One change which he would like to see was the adoption of a system by which the real net Imperial Revenue would be shown in the Returns. At present the Returns of net Revenue contained items which ought not to find a place in them; for they did not, in fact, constitute net Revenue, and including them only made the net Revenue larger than it really was, and so encouraged increased expenditure. As regarded the Revenue derived from the administration of law and justice, there was great necessity for reducing the cost to the suitors; for the fees now charged gave justice to the rich and denied it to the poor. The export duty on rice was also a subject that demanded the attention of the Indian Government. The rice trade was checked, and the profits reduced to an unremunerative amount, by the combined influence of the cost of transport and the export duty. In the same way, the increase in the wheat trade, which was one of the most cheering prospects in India, though materially encouraged by the Government of India, was stopped in consequence of the difficulty and cost of carriage in remote districts. Major Baring had declared that it was absolutely necessary, for the development of India, that British capital should be largely attracted to the country. The Bill brought in by the Indian Government with regard to the trial of Europeans by Natives had a bearing on that subject; and there was great danger that, if that Bill was passed, it would discourage very much the introduction of British capital into India. Almost all the great works in India were carried on by British capital, and the capitalists insisted upon their undertakings being superintended by Europeans. If Europeans were in any doubt as to their security in out-of-the-way places, it would be difficult to get European management at the price at which it could now be obtained. He would not go into the question as to whether the alarms in consequence of that Bill were well or ill founded; but they constituted a great danger, which should be carefully watched and studied.

Mr. ONSLOW said, he thought the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. J. K. Cross) should have been placed on the Table of the House before now. The Motion of his hon. Friend (Mr. E. Stanhope) had been before them for some weeks, and the Amendment which he himself (Mr. Onslow) had put upon the Paper, to add at the end of that Amendment the words—

> "And this House regrets the decision arrived at by Her Majesty's Government to cast a further burden upon the Revenues of India in order to meet the extraordinary charges incurred by that Government on account of the Military expedition to Egypt,"

had also been in the hands of Members for a considerable time. What happened? They all came down to the House feeling they might have to vote on the Motion of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. E. Stanhope); but, at the last moment, the Under Secretary of State for India interposed with what he called an Amendment, but which was very little different from the Motion. This was a question of great importance, not only to this country, but to India. It was idle and useless for the House of Commons to adopt general abstract Resolutions like the present if, at the same time, the Government at home acted diametrically opposite to the known wishes of the Viceroy and his Council in fastening on the Revenues a burden which they had themselves condemned as unjust, and which they ought not to be called upon to pay. If they were to pass Resolutions of this kind, and if the finances of India were to be left entirely in the hands of the Government at home, and if they placed burdens on India—burdens which India could not be properly required to bear—discussions such as they had had on the present occasion were waste of time. It must be evident to the people of India, from the present decision of Her Majesty's Government, that, however anxious they might be for economy, it was competent for Her Majesty's Government, at one fell swoop, to frustrate the whole of their financial arrangements. The subject came before the House last year on the Motion of the noble Lord who was then Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington); and so strong was the feeling exhibited on all sides of the House that at the last moment the present Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) interposed words which left it subject to the future consideration of the House whether India should be called upon to bear any of the extraordinary charges of the war lately undertaken in Egypt; and he (Mr. Onslow) believed that, had it not been for the insertion of the words proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, the Government would have sustained a defeat. From that time to this they had had no opportunity of bringing the question before the House so as to elicit a vote. He (Mr. Onslow) had put certain Questions to the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington); but the answers he had received had always been unsatisfactory. As long ago as the 11th of June last year he asked the Prime Minister if India was making preparations for the contemplated war, and the right hon. Gentleman replied it was not consistent with public policy to disclose what was going on. Continually he put Questions to the Secretary of State for India; but from him he could get no definite statement. On the 1st of March this year the noble Lord refused Papers on the subject; and on more than one occasion he said he did not think it was to the interest of the Public Service that Papers should be produced. Last year the noble Lord often said that Papers would be produced on the subject when the correspondence with the Indian Government was closed. It was only after great pressure was put on the noble Lord that he produced the Papers which he (Mr. Onslow) held in his hand. Those Papers commended themselves to Members. If the Government of India had been consulted in any way in the matter he should not have raised his voice; if the Government of India had approved of the policy of this country there might have been something said for the imposition of the tax upon India. From the first moment, however, of Her Majesty's Government contemplating war in Egypt the Government of India was never consulted. The first intimation which the Indian Government had on the subject of the expenses of the war was the telegram from the noble Lord, on July 24th, last year —namely—

"Subject to final decision on any representation you may desire to make, we propose Indian Revenue shall bear all expenses of the Indian Contingent serving in Egypt."

Immediately on receipt of that telegram the Viceroy replied—

"We beg unanimously to protest very strongly against the proposal that Indian Revenue shall bear all expenses of Indian Contingent serving in Egypt. As soon as possible we shall address a despatch to your Lordship on the subject."

The Government took some time to consider what their change of policy should be, and the first intimation the House had of the amount which the Government were going to give India on account of the recent war was when the Supplementary Estimate was laid on the Table shortly before the Easter Recess. In that Supplementary Estimate they had a Vote of £500,000 to India for the war. Of course, to India, half a loaf was better than no bread. Hon. Members at the time had not the Viceroy's despatch before them; they had no means of knowing what was the opinion of the Viceroy and his Council. He did not believe that any definite policy was involved in the grant of £500,000; but that, in reality, it was a sum which the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought would fit in with the Budget. It was said the Government of India had accepted the policy of Her Majesty's Government. He could assure the House there was no foundation whatever for such an assertion. The only thing in the Papers which could possibly be construed into an acceptance by the Government of India of the policy of Her Majesty's Government was the congratulatory despatch from the Viceroy. In reply to the telegram of the Secretary of State announcing the grant of £500,000, the Viceroy said it was with satisfaction he received the telegram, and asked the Secretary of State to convey the thanks of the Government of India for the important assistance which Her Majesty's Government had granted. That had been construed into an acceptance of the policy of Her Majesty's Government. It was no acceptance at all, but was merely an acknowledgment for some small assistance that had been rendered the Government of India. There was nothing in any of the despatches to show that the Indian Government was satisfied with the decision arrived at by Her Majesty's Government. His principal contention against India paying any of the extraordinary charges of the war was that the employment of Indian troops in Egypt was on a very different footing from the employment of Native troops in any other part of Her Majesty's Dominions in which they had had to fight, It had been alleged that there was some analogy between this war and the Afghan Wars as far as India was concerned. There was, however, no analogy between the two cases. In the case of the Afghan Wars India knew everything that was going on; the Viceroy was aware of every despatch that was written; from the time of Dost Mahommed until the present Ameer was put on the Throne it had been the policy of the Viceroy and his Council to be cognizant of everything that went on in Afghanistan. The Viceroy and his Council knew nothing of what was going on in Egypt. It was all very well to say that we had undertaken the war for Indian interests and for the protection of the Suez Canal. Last year the Prime Minister himself said that the ends of the Government in Egypt were well known to consist in the maintenance of all established rights in Egypt, whether those of the Sultan, the Khedive, or the people of Egypt, or of the foreign bondholder. There was not a word in any speech of the right hon. Gentleman to show that this war was undertaken in the interest of India. The right hon. Gentleman had, over and over again, said in that House that the object of the war was to put down anarchy in Egypt; he never said it was for the protection of the Suez Canal. However great a ruffian Arabi might be, he had never once attempted to stop the communication through the Suez Canal; and, in point of fact, our communications with India had never been practically interrupted from the time of the bombardment of Alexandria to the end of the war. If India was to be called upon to pay for the protection of the Suez Canal he failed to see why our other Colonies should not be required to do the same. India had, no doubt, a vast interest in the maintenance of a free passage through the Canal, and he admitted that she had a much greater interest in it than any other of our Colonies; but he asked the Prime Minister and the Government if Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, and Ceylon had not a very considerable interest in the passage through the Canal? If they were to call upon India to contribute towards the maintenance of that passage, he asked the right hon. Gentleman why India should not be called upon to pay some of the cost of a European war, during which it would be necessary to preserve our possessions in the Mediterranean? The Viceroy asserted that Egypt lay wholly within the sphere of European politics; and he (Mr. Onslow) thought he was right in saying that that had always been the case. He maintained that there was no precedent whatever for the course which the Government were pursuing in this instance. There was the case of the Persian War, in which, he believed, half the extraordinary charges were paid by India. But, in that instance, India was consulted throughout; she knew what was going on, and it was for the benefit of India that we did not allow Persia to get to Herat. As regarded the first Afghan War, the Government at home knew nothing of what was going on at the time, the whole of it having been managed, or mismanaged, by the Governor General of the day. He failed to see any analogy between those wars and that which had been recently concluded in Egypt which could suggest a precedent for calling upon India to pay a portion of the cost in the latter case. With regard to the war in 1878, it was not for India to come to us *in formâ pauperis*. India never asked for the money that was given to her; she never wanted it; the money was thrust upon her, and at the time she was quite willing loyally to pay every atom of the cost of the war, because she felt it was a war in which she was interested. It might, indeed, be called a war of her own creation, and it was perfectly legitimate for her to pay the expense of that war. If this policy was to be carried out; if we were to tax India at a future time for any particular war which might be undertaken by the Imperial Government, he failed to see where such a policy was to end. By all means let India pay every farthing of the cost of wars for which she was responsible; let taxes be imposed and even money borrowed by her for that purpose if necessary; but he maintained that the principle which the Government had laid down was totally uncalled for and totally unneeded. Finally, he maintained that it would be a great misfortune if the Government, in the face of everything the Viceroy had said, and in the face of the strongest opposition in India, were to outvote the Supreme Council of India in the decision they had arrived at, and at some future day call upon India to pay for that which she thought she was not bound to pay for. He had himself the strongest views upon this subject, and, speaking from his knowledge of some of the opinions with regard to India entertained upon the opposite Benches, he felt sure that if the Conservative Party had adopted the policy of the present Government, the first person who would have risen to condemn it would have been the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett). Although the Forms of the House prevented him from moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice, he had felt it his duty, in the interests of India, to address these few words to the House.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he agreed with the spirit of the observations made by the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow); but he failed to see what was the Constitutional provision by which India could express her views on this subject, or how she would ever be able, judging by the expressed policy of both Parties in that House, to impose an effective check upon any kind of misapplication of her Revenue. The House had always, within his recollection, been practically unanimous in recommending economy in the Indian Administration, in condemning the increase of her Expenditure, and in recommending a return to the moderate Estimates of past times. The House might go on passing abstract Resolutions until the end of the 19th, or even the 20th century; but the Expenditure in India would go on increasing, and the heads of the spending Departments in India would go on laughing at the Resolutions of the House of Commons. There was no Member of the Government Service in India who did not know the exact value of these declarations of good intentions on the part both of individual Members and the House generally. It was the essential character of Indian administration to be like the administration in Ireland in the worst times before the Union—that was to say, along with a considerable amount of honest endeavours to reform the Public Service, there was a vast alliance of family parties, and an enormous nation practically without any power whatever to impose any obstacle to the grossest misapplication of its Revenues on the most cruel enhancement of its burdens. Everyone in the Public Service in India had a cousin, a brother, a father-in-law, or some other relative, who would be assisted, directly or indirectly, by the increase of the public burdens; and they would, therefore, be increased. The great principle of Indian administration was that in every Department there should be a great number of officials paid for doing nothing, and a great number of paid officials assisting them. The Army was a vast nest of jobbery. In the Native Army, there was from 20 to 50 per cent of the European officers of the Native regiments continually separated from the duties of their posts, far away from, and utterly neglectful of, those regiments, but appointed to every kind of office in the Accounts Department, in the Political Department, and other Departments, each of these officers enjoying a post remunerated in proportion to the amount of private influence which he possessed in the highest circles of the Indian Government. In the European Army, in the same way, the expenditure was puffed up and bloated in every possible manner and on every possible excuse. The number of European officers—those peculiarly expensive exotics—was artificially increased; and posts were created for them throughout India, in the Public Works or in the political Departments, exactly as in the case of the European officers attached to the Native regiments, according to the amount of influence which they possessed in the highest circles of the Government. The hon. Member for Cardiganshire (Mr. Pugh) had suggested the advisability of appointing a sort of Supervision Committee for the purpose of trying to carry into effect the Resolutions of the House of Commons. Such a Committee might be of some use; but he could not see that it would be able to effect any reduction of the charge saddled on the Revenues of India for the salaries of the Secretary of State, Under Secretary of State, Members of the Council of India, Secretaries and officers of the Secretary of State, which formed part of the charge for salaries, and amounted to £140,000.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he hoped it would be recorded in India that the hon. and very Liberal Member for Stockton (Mr. Dodds), a most devoted supporter of Her Majesty's Government, had attempted, although unsuccessfully, to cut short this debate upon the Indian Expenditure. He was about to observe, when the interruption of the hon. Gentleman took place, that if the salaries of the Secretary of State for India and his staff were thrown upon the Home Estimates, which they ought to be, because it was for the information of that House and the country—if there was any advantage whatever in that Office—that the Secretariat of India existed, they could secure, year by year, a certain opportunity of discussing the administration of India. It would then be impossible for any Government to evade a regular annual discussion of Indian Expenditure, and equally impossible for zealous Liberals like the hon. Member for Stockton to try to check such discussion by the expedient of counting the House. Nothing more unjust, unfair, and politically dishonest could be mentioned than that this Indian Secretariat was saddled on the Revenues of India. Why should not the Colonial Secretariat be saddled on the Colonies in the same way? The Government did not saddle Australia and Canada with the salary of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, because they dare not. But in India they had a vast slave Empire, infinitely exceeding in numbers and in helplessness the population of Russia in its most servile days; and, being able to do as they liked with India, they saddled upon India the expenses of these officers, who were solely useful in their relation to that House, who were solely useful through the position they held in the House, and who were maintained for the advantage which that House derived from them. He believed the Government saddled India with these expenses in order to deprive the friends of India in that House of the opportunity of discussing the grievances of India which would be open to them if the salaries of these officers were thrown on the Home Estimates as the salaries of the Secretaries of State for the Colonies were. When they talked of introducing economies in India they ought to commence by reducing the expenditure by such items as these, which were strictly in our own control. They ought to insist upon the Secretary of State for India being paid from the Revenues of this country, and not allow it, by a sleight of hand, to be juggled on to the already over-burdened people of India. Why was the cost of the British Missions at the Court of Pekin and in Persia saddled on the people of India, seeing that those Missions were as strictly and rightly a part of the general Imperial burdens as were the expenses of the British Embassy at Constantinople or the Legation at Washington? But, after all, these items were only as drops in the vast ocean of expenses which India had to bear; and the only reason why he had laid stress upon the iniquity of throwing the expense of the Secretary of State for India upon the Indian Revenue was that he saw in that fact a deliberate purpose to avoid discussion which otherwise would arise in the ordinary course upon the Estimates. There was no hope or chance of introducing anything like a substantial reduction in Indian Expenditure until some means were found of curbing the existing nepotism—the favouritism, the wholesale creation of unnecessary posts, the wholesale enhancement of salaries already swollen and bloated, the wholesale payment under any pretext of the money scraped from the people of India, to the foreign officials who swarmed in India. He would mention a specimen of the reckless lavishnesss with which Indian officials, and even ex-officials, were remunerated. In the Accounts for last year he found an item of £5,828 for bringing the Earl of Lytton and his family home from India. That was a public—a national disgrace. He made no imputation upon Lord Lytton, simply treating him as an ex-official; but the idea that a first-class saloon passage, even on rather exorbitant terms, would not suffice to bring him and his family from Calcutta to Charing Cross was simply monstrous. It was a monument of nothing less than political dishonesty. He found that even English newspapers in India, like *The Englishman*, were commenting on the extraordinary extravagance of the more than Regal progress indulged in not only by Viceroys, but by more ordinary officials. *The Englishman* stated that a Viceroy could not travel from Calcutta to Simla by a first-class ordinary train, but must have a special saloon carriage, expensively furnished and adorned with silver, at a cost of 12,000 rupees. If that cost came out of the Revenues of India, he (Mr. O'Donnell) thought Members of the Council might be admonished that their salaries were sufficiently high, and that they might travel without disgracing themselves from Calcutta to Simla by ordinary rates twice in the year, and so avoid this reckless extravagance of saloon carriages at a cost of 12,000 rupees each. A large item in the expenditure of Madras would be found to be the costly progress of Mr. Grant Duff—the most grandiloquent Lieutenant Governor probably that was ever known. Some time ago the Government, not being able to hit upon any other way of remunerating a most deserving supporter of the Administration and a generally respected Gentleman, sent the late Mr. Adam to India and made him the Lieutenant Governor of Madras. He was, however, unfortunately taken away.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. O'DONNELL, resuming, said, he was afraid that in face of what had occurred, and of the concerted Obstruction on the Ministerial Benches, he should not be allowed to conclude his remarks. However, for the purpose he had in view—namely, pressing on the people of India that their only hope was in taking care of themselves and in organizing in their own self-defence—he was by no means sorry to see these continued instances of Liberal intolerance of discussion and Liberal hostility to the interests of India. He wished to point out that there was a legislative change in India which would undoubtedly have the effect of reducing the expenditure. He referred to the change which would alter the present character of the land assessment in India. The Members of Her Majesty's Government might be supposed to have sufficiently recognized the evil, from every point of view, of an unsettled state of agrarian relations, and must have realized how uncertainty in the rent and land tax in India, and the prospect of having the land tax raised in proportion to the expenditure of labour by the cultivator, must dishearten the cultivator, and lead him to prefer to drag on a miserable existence, rather than expend labour, and capital, and skill, only with the result of increasing the demands of the tax gatherer. He would not now go into detail on a matter of that kind; but during the last six or seven years he had received hundreds of letters from all parts of India, from Europeans as well as Natives, recommending in the strongest way the regularization of the system of settlements and its extension to the whole of India. If the land tax were once settled on a permanent basis, all that large portion of the expense in connection with assessment caused by continual survey would be out of the Budget. No Resolution of that House would have the slightest effect until the House hit upon some way of controlling the despotic and unchecked action of the official classes, who at present, to a large extent, ruled India neither for the Indian people nor for the English people, but simply for their own Anglo-Indian selves, their families and their connections, even to the 10th generation.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question again proposed.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he rose to Order, and asked whether the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) intended to move his Amendment?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is too late.

Mr. ONSLOW, rising to Order, said, he had concluded that the Amendment of the Under Secretary of State for India would be carried; and he certainly thought he should have been in Order in moving his Amendment at the end of that Motion. It was not really an Amendment; it was an *addendum;* and, if in Order, he intended to move it. It was an addition referring to increased expenditure in India.

Mr. SPEAKER: The words of the hon. Member for Guildford being in the form of an addition, it is competent to him, if he thinks fit, to move them as an addition.

Mr. ONSLOW said, he would, therefore, move these words as an addition.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "and this House regrets the decision arrived at by Her Majesty's Government to cast a further burden upon the Revenues of India in order to meet the extraordinary charges incurred by that Government on account of the Military expedition to Egypt."—(*Mr. Onslow.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, there was so little difference between the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. E. Stanhope) and the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for India, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, that the Government did not think it necessary to press the Amendment; but the proposed addition of the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) is one which it is impossible for the Government to accept without a division, inasmuch as it is a Vote of Censure. At this time of night I do not propose to enter at length into the subject, after the reply of my hon. Friend, especially as I think it was unfortunate that this subject should have been introduced on an Amendment to the Motion, and interpolated into the discussion on the Motion of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope). The hon. Member obtained an opportunity, which is very rare, of having a discussion, not of a Party character, on a question of great importance connected with Indian finance; and the hon. Gentleman referred entirely to the question of the policy of expenditure, and not to a matter of Party difference. The addition proposed is one which raises many of those questions of Party politics which it was the intention of hon. Gentlemen originally to discard from the discussion. It is unnecessary to follow the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) through the speech he has made, because the difference between the Indian Government and the Home Government, which was very slight, and may now be said to have almost completely disappeared, was greatly exaggerated. The House will observe that the Government of India never did intend, and, in the despatch which has been referred to to-night, stated that they did not intend, that India should not bear some portion of the expenditure of this war. The only contention they raised was that India ought not to be called on to bear the whole expenses of the Contingent. There was very little difference between the view taken by the Government of India and the Government at home. As I explained in a despatch when we made the proposal, it was made in the full belief that a comparatively small share of the expenses of the Expedition would be thrown on the Revenues of India. That was the view I expressed to the House in August last. When we found how much larger the probable cost would be than we had anticipated, we acknowledged that the proposal we had made would, on after consideration, have to be modified; and, in consultation with the Indian Government, it has been modified. The Indian Government thought their share ought to be limited to the ordinary expenditure of the Contingent; but we thought they ought to pay a somewhat larger share. After that admission on the one side and the other we came to a friendly arrangement, not one which could be argued on general principles or be confirmed by precedent, as there are no parallels between the despatch of this Expeditionary Force and the despatch of Expeditionary Forces to the Indian Frontier, the cost of which everyone admits ought to be paid by India alone, and to Malta, the cost of which everyone equally admits ought not to fall in any degree on India. There are many cases varying in character, some of which have been quoted by the Indian Government. There was the Persian War, where all the ordinary, and part of the extraordinary, expenses were paid by India. There was the Abyssinian War, where the extraordinary expenditure was paid entirely by this country. In my opinion, without going into the circumstances of that war, it is far more than to question whether India ought not to have been charged with even the ordinary expenditure of the troops during that campaign, in which she had not the smallest interest, to question that she should be called on to pay the proportion of the cost of the Egyptian Campaign which she is called on to pay. No one denies that India had an interest in the pacification of Egypt, and in the maintenance of the security of the Suez Canal; and no one denies that the pacification of Egypt and the security of the navigation were two of the objects for which the British Government entered into hostilities with Egypt. There may be a difference as to the necessity for these operations; but the Imperial Government must be held responsible for the policy not of Great Britain alone, but of India also; and there can be no doubt that material Indian interests were involved. There were other considerations beyond this which made it desirable that India should pay some substantial proportion of the cost of the Expedition. The House cannot have overlooked the immense costliness of the Expeditions fitted out in the present day, and it is fair to assume that the costliness would be augmented when the Indian Government knows that no portion of the expense falls on their shoulders. The House must remember the immense cost of the Abyssinian Expedition; and, bearing that in mind, it is very doubtful whether, under similar circumstances, Indian troops will ever be employed again. It is desirable where Indian troops are employed, and where Indian interests are involved, that the Indian Government should have before it some motive for the exercise of economy such as that of bearing a proportion of the cost. There has been nothing in the arrangement come to inconsistent with the general principles upon which the relations existing between the two countries are based; and, considering that the proposal made by the British Government has been accepted by the Government of India, and is considered fair by a great number of those who have the interests of India at heart, and who were at first inclined to believe that India should bear the whole cost of the Expedition, I trust the House will not consider it necessary to divide on the question, or censure what has been done.

MR. E. STANHOPE said, he would appeal to his hon. Friend the Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) not to persevere with his Amendment, and would give his reason for so doing. It was true his hon. Friend had been hardly treated by having another Amendment interposed before his; it was true he had a great right to complain; but he must know that a large number of Members had left the House under the belief that his important Amendment was shut out, and that they would not have an opportunity of discussing it. Without entering into a discussion of the question raised, he (Mr. E. Stanhope) hoped his hon. Friend would not persist in his Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that, before the Motion was put, he desired to point out to the House the very serious nature of the question, and what the results would be should the policy indicated by the Amendment be adopted by Parliament. The Estimates of the finances of the year had been laid before Parliament; and according to these Estimates a very small balance indeed remained, after providing for the reduction of the Income Tax by 1½*d.* in the pound and for other remissions of taxation. He would point out to the House that if this Amendment should mean that India was to be repaid not only £500,000, but a further sum of £600,000 or £700,000, there would be a considerable deficit in the year's account; and it would be necessary for the Government—the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill not having been yet passed—to take some measure in that Bill to increase taxation. He did not say how much the additional charge would represent, if raised by Income Tax or otherwise; but, if the whole of this £600,000 or £700,000 had to be paid, there was no question about it that an increase of taxation was necessary. If that was the case, was the House prepared, with barely a quorum present, and between 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning, to adopt the Resolution. ["Yes!"] Was the House prepared, at such an hour as this, and in such a manner, to increase the taxation of the country. ["Yes!"] An hon. Member said "Yes," as though it were a very trivial matter to increase the taxation of the country. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), on the other hand, however, thought the House, in its present condition, should pause—having, practically, approved of the Budget arrangements of the year—before disturbing those arrangements. He would not go over the ground traversed by the noble Lord, and deal with a subject which the House had thoroughly discussed earlier in the Session, when the opinion of a full House was, so far as could be gathered from the expressions of Members, that the adjustment between this country and India was a fair one. The Budget was based on that adjustment, and the Budget Bill had been read a second time; and he could not imagine a more violent course than for Parliament, within a week or two of that adjustment, suddenly to turn round and, by a vote involving an increase of taxation, to upset the arrangement which had been entered into. He urged not those who looked on this as a light matter, but those who looked on it as a serious matter, to combine with the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. E. Stanhope) in his appeal to the hon. Member for Guildford to withdraw his Amendment, or, if they would not do that, to join with the Government in voting against it.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS protested against the ground on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer appealed to the House to reject the Motion. He (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would not say whether the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) was right or wrong; but the whole argument why they should reject his Motion, which was that the Government had made several proposals to the House, and they would be upset by the adoption of the Motion, was the most monstrous that was ever put before the House. The right hon. Gentleman said the House had settled the amount of taxation for the year. They had done nothing of the kind—they had never had an opportunity of discussing it. They had not had an opportunity of discussing the second reading of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill even.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): We passed the second reading and have disposed of the Revenue Clauses.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was aware of that; but what he said was that they had had no practical opportunity of discussing the measure on the second reading. The conduct of this Bill altogether was somewhat extraordinary. They were told on Monday night that the Bill was so essential to the Government—so necessary in the interests of the Public Service—that it would be taken at whatever hour it was reached. At Question time to-day they were told it was necessary that this matter should be settled to-night, and now they were told the Government were not going to bring it forward. It seemed as though they were never to have an opportunity of discussing this question, and they never had had an opportunity of discussing it on the present particular ground. Was this a real argument that, because they had passed a Financial Statement, there was to be no review of the proposal to put a portion of the charge on India? He saw some communications passing between the noble Lord who acted as one of the Whips to the Government and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer—communications, no doubt, which had had something to do with the course of Business this evening; but, putting that aside, he was bound to protest in the strongest manner against the proposition that, because this Motion had been on the Paper for some time, they were not now to discuss it and come to a decision on it. That proposition was a most monstrous one.

MR. ONSLOW said, that, as this was his Motion, he trusted the House would allow him to say a few words upon it. He denied that there had been a compromise on this question. He and his friends some time ago had said that they could not discuss the matter because they had no Papers; and they asked the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give them an opportunity further on. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman think of all this when he inserted the words—"Subject to the future decision of Parliament?" They had not been allowed to bring this matter forward during the Autumn Session. He had taken every opportunity of endeavouring to bring it on; and so strongly did he feel with regard to it that, no matter what any right hon. Gentleman said on the subject, he should insist upon dividing the House.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (who, on rising, was received with cries of "Divide!") said: Hon. Gentlemen cry "Divide!" but surely they will agree that the decision they are asking the House to take is a serious one. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said we have not settled the financial arrangements of the year. Everyone knows they have been settled, practically speaking. If it had been intended to contest them, the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill would not have been read a second time. It is quite plain that hon. Gentlemen opposite did not intend to contest the arrangement proposed to the House with reference to the financial settlement of the year and the taxation to be imposed. What answer has the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on that point? Does he assert that if a new charge is to be imposed on the Exchequer, it will not be necessary altogether to re-cast the Budget? That it will be necessary to do that cannot be disputed for a moment. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that at this time—at 1 o'clock in the morning, with the House in its present condition—we can determine upon the making of a new Budget. The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that the course now proposed is one which will involve an increase of taxation beyond that which has been submitted to the House. It was quite plain that was not a decision which ought to be come to on a Motion like the present. If a question of such a grave character was to be introduced and decided upon, it ought to be introduced and decided upon in a very different manner than that now suggested. It was quite impossible that they could play ducks and drakes with the Revenue of the country in the way proposed. After 1 o'clock in the morning, it was proposed to overthrow the whole of the financial arrangements of the year, or, in other words, to pass a Resolution which involved an entire re-casting of the Estimates. Against such a course he must protest. It was not the manner in which finance had hitherto been dealt with in the House; and he could not believe that Gentlemen who were in a condition of responsibility would do anything to involve the finances in serious irregularity, and to overthrow the solidity they had been in the habit of employing upon questions of this description. He could not believe that the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) would be supported by those who were anxious to give solidity to the finances of the country.

Mr. A. F. EGERTON considered the whole question was now within the power of the House of Commons, irrespective of the financial arrangements which had been made on the other side of the House. The question before them was a very simple one—namely, whether the Indian finances were to bear any part of the expenses of the Egyptian Expedition? His own mind had long been made up on the point. He was strongly of opinion that India ought to bear a part of the expenses of the late war; and, therefore, he should record his vote against the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Onslow).

Mr. SLAGG said, he cordially agreed with the Opposition that India should bear no portion whatever of the war charges; but, at the same time, he considered that a vote taken at this time, and under the present circumstances, would be most unfair and altogether meaningless. He was perfectly convinced that a great number of Members had left the House under the impression that this Amendment could not possibly be put. Therefore, a vote taken upon it now would express no conviction whatever. Under the circumstances he could not support the Amendment. It was impossible to conceive that any financial steps could be necessitated in consequence of a vote taken under such conditions as the present.

Mr. MARJORIBANKS said, he did not think the present was at all a proper time to take a division upon the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow); and, therefore, he begged to move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Marjoribanks.*)

Mr. THOMASSON said, he desired to ask the Government if, in the event of the debate being adjourned, they would afford the House another opportunity of discussing the question?

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the application of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Thomasson) was most reasonable. There was only one interpretation to be put upon the Amendment—namely, that it amounted to a Vote of Censure upon the Government. That being so, he did not see how the Government could refuse to give an early opportunity for discussing the matter.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he could assure the hon. Gentleman the Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) that the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. J. K. Cross) was not, in the least, intended to prevent his (Mr. Onslow's) Amendment being moved. If the debate had come on early in the evening and been concluded, the Government hoped that the Amendment of the Under Secretary of State for India would have been accepted by the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope). No doubt, a great number of hon. Members had left the House under the impression that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Guildford could not be moved; and, therefore, a vote taken now would be taken under very unfortunate circumstances, and would not, in the least, represent the real meaning and intention of the House. It was very desirable that the debate should be adjourned—indeed, it would be the duty of the Government to adjourn it to a most favourable occasion. ["When?"] In the absence of his right hon. Friend the Prime Minister, he could not say what opportunity would be given for the discussion. He trusted it would not be a discussion which would last very long, and he should certainly think it his duty to represent to his right hon. Friend that an opportunity should be given on an early day.

Mr. ONSLOW said, the noble Marquess had made a fair offer; but he would, nevertheless, like to ask one question. The noble Marquess said that an early day would be given. They all knew what that meant. Did it mean that a day would be set apart some time about the beginning of August?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, if this debate was adjourned, the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill must also be adjourned. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said the House was not competent to express an opinion upon the point at issue, if the taxation of the year was once fixed. The right hon. Gentleman, therefore, must agree to postpone the proceedings of the Customs Bill. As to the immediate subject before the House, he deemed it right to point out that the House had not had an opportunity of discussing it. The House last year expressed an opinion hostile to calling upon India to pay the whole cost, and in the Supplementary Estimates a sum of £500,000 was voted to India in regard to the war expenses. That sum was accepted by the House because they had no option or power of increasing it. He hoped it was understood that if the debate was now adjourned, it would be resumed before the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill was passed.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, he would remind the noble Lord opposite (Lord George Hamilton) that the taxation clauses of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill had been agreed to. The only portions of the Bill now remaining for settlement were questions of collection—questions of a minor character.

Mr. PUGH trusted the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow) would withdraw his Amendment. The offer made by the Government was a very fair one.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, he had omitted to say that the Government would undertake to find a day for the debate before the middle of July.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 77; Noes 17: Majority 60.—(Div. List, No. 87.)

Debate *adjourned* till *Thursday.*

The Marquess of Hartington

QUESTIONS.

—∞:o:∞—

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE BILL.

Mr. HICKS asked whether or not this Bill would be brought forward on Thursday? He trusted the matter would be placed beyond doubt, because hon. Members had been brought down, day after day, and remained sitting on those Benches night after night, in the vain expectation that the Bill would be discussed. The House was informed, at Question time, that it would, in all probability, be brought forward in the course of the evening; and it was not until after 12 that the announcement was made that the Bill would not be taken. He submitted that it was a great hardship upon independent Members that that practice should go on so long, without any opportunity being afforded them of discussing the provisions of the Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, no one was more anxious than himself to proceed with the Bill; but he was unable to resist the appeals made to him not to take it at a very late hour. He believed he was acting in accordance with the general wish of the House in proposing to take the Bill next Thursday.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, the observations of his hon. Friend the Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Hicks) were justified by the facts of the case. Certainly, a great number of hon. Members had come down daily who were interested in the provisions of the Bill; and it was not until past 12 o'clock that they learned that it would not come on. He trusted that the same reasons as those just stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not operate on Thursday next, and that the Bill would be taken on that day, if possible, at an early hour.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, he would take the Bill on Thursday, at as late an hour as the House would permit. He did not, however, wish it to be understood that he meant by that 2 o'clock, for he had already explained to those who had made communications to him upon this subject that, in view of the importance of the Bill, it would not be respectful to the House to take it at an unduly late hour.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (UNREFORMED) BILL.—[BILL 156.]

(*Sir Charles Dilke, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Hibbert.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST said, that the titles of High Admiral, High Ranger, and Lord Lieutenant of the Isle of Purbeck, were enjoyed by the Lord of the Manor, under the Charter of Corfe Castle. He asked if those privileges could not be retained under this Bill?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, in reply, said, he could see no objection to that, and if any words were necessary to be inserted he would confer with his hon. Friend upon the subject.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

NATIONAL DEBT.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved,* That it is expedient to authorise the conversion, from time to time, of Perpetual Annuities held by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, on account of Trustee and Post Office Savings Banks, into Terminable Annuities, and to provide for the payment of such Terminable Annuities out of the Consolidated Fund.

2. *Resolved,* That it is expedient to authorise the conversion of an amount of Perpetual Annuities standing to the account of the Postmaster General, on behalf of the Court of Chancery, not exceeding, in the whole, forty million pounds capital stock, into Terminable Annuities, and to provide for the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of any loss that may arise by means of the conversion of Perpetual into Terminable Annuities, and to provide for the payment of such Terminable Annuities out of the Consolidated Fund.

3. *Resolved,* That it is expedient to authorise the exchange of a portion of Annuities, terminating in the year 1885, for longer Terminable Annuities, and to provide for the payment of such Terminable Annuities out of the Consolidated Fund, and also to extend the period for which a Terminable Annuity may be granted under "The Savings Bank Act, 1863."

4. *Resolved,* That it is expedient to redeem a portion of the Terminable Annuity created under "The Indian Loan Act, 1881," and held by the National Debt Commissioners, on account of Post Office Savings Banks, by the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of one million pounds to the said Commissioners.

5. *Resolved,* That it is expedient to make provisions as to the conversion, creation, and application of Terminable Annuities.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. TREVELYAN, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the town of Killarney, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. TREVELYAN and Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 172.]

METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of an unhealthy area situated at Saint George-in-the East, within the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 173.]

METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of an unhealthy area situated at Limehouse, within the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 174.]

METROPOLIS IMPROVEMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (NO. 3) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State for the improvement of an unhealthy area situated in Lambeth, within the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 175.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 4) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Cheltenham, the Local Government District of Croydon, the Borough of Dorchester, the Rural Sanitary District of the Hendon Union, and the Local Government Districts of Malvern and Willenhall, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 176.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm certain Orders of the Local Government Board, under the provisions of "The Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876," as amended and extended by "The Poor Law Act, 1879," relating to the Parishes of Black-Torrington, Bradford, Bridgerule-East, Carhampton, Dodington, Fulwood, High-Hampton, Hinders-Lane-and-Dockham, Holford, Monksilver, Old Cleve, Pancrasweek, Pleasley, Porlock, Pyworthy, Selworthy, Stogumber, Sutcombe, Upper Langwith, and Withycombe; to the Townships of East-Dean, Hucknall-under-Huthwaite, and Sutton-in-Ashfield; and to the Tything of Lea-Bailey, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 177.]

BOARD OF WORKS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. COURTNEY, Bill to consolidate and amend certain Acts and enactments relating to the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland; and for other purposes, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 178.]

CHARITABLE TRUSTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, Bill to amend "The Charitable Trusts Act, 1853," and the Acts amending the same, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 179.]

TRUST FUNDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JAMES STEWART, Bill to extend the powers of Trustees in Scotland in relation to the investment of Trust Funds, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JAMES STEWART, Mr. MACKINTOSH, and Mr. CRUM.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 180.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 9th May, 1883.

Their Lordships met for the despatch of Judicial Business only.

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 9th May, 1883.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolutions* [May 8] *reported—Ordered—First Reading—* National Debt * [182]

*Ordered—First Reading—*Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment * [183]; High Court of Justice (Service of Writs * [184]; Companies (Colonial Registers) * [185].

*Second Reading—*Agricultural Holdings [42], *debate adjourned;* Theatres Regulation [81], *put off;* Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment [91], *put off.*

Report— Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders * [144].

QUESTION.

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—SURREY (TRIAL OF CAUSES) BILL.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a Question to you on a point of Order. I observe on the Paper to-day that the Surrey (Trial of Causes) Bill is down for a second reading as the second Order of the Day. The Bill was introduced by the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton); but I also see on the Paper today a Notice in the name of that hon. and learned Gentleman of his intention to move, "That the Bill be read a second time upon this day six months." What I wish to ask you, Sir, is, whether an hon. Member can possibly be in Order in moving that a Bill be now read a second time, and in then moving an Amendment, "That the Bill be read a second time upon this day six months?"

MR. SPEAKER: It is quite clear that the hon. and learned Member would not be in Order in making both Motions.

MR. MONK: When the hon. and learned Member moves the second reading of the Bill I will move that the Order be discharged, on the ground that the hon. and learned Member has now, for two consecutive Sessions, neglected to have the Bill printed in compliance with the Order of the House. The hon. and learned Member obtained a second reading for it last year; but the Bill has never been printed, and, consequently, cannot be in the hands of hon. Members.

MR. WARTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give Notice that, on an early day, I shall move, as a new Standing Order—

"That, on Wednesday, if the House be not made at half-past 12 o'clock, it be adjourned."

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∞:0:∞—

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

(*Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Monckton.*)

[BILL 42.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, that, before proceeding to move the second reading of the Bill, he felt that he could not approach the subject without saying a word with regard to one who in "another place" was about, a few days ago, to stand in a position similar to that which he now occupied. A short time since those who were interested in the question were waiting anxiously to hear Lord Vernon move the second reading of his Bill on the subject of agricultural holdings. It was with deep regret that they found that Lord Vernon was not in his place when the Order was called, and it was with still deeper regret that they heard that his work had been stopped by the hand of death. As a Staffordshire man and a neighbour of Lord Vernon, as one who had seen his work in agriculture, as one who had seen how deeply he was interested in the matter now before the House, as one who had seen him acting as a member of the Chamber of Agriculture, and even carrying his labours into a foreign land, where he did such good work among those French farmers ruined by a devastating war, he felt that he could not approach his task that day without, on behalf of many in the Midland Counties who knew Lord Vernon as an active and intelligent landlord, of persons abroad who had known his energy on their behalf, and of the very many who knew how deeply he was interested in agriculture, first venturing to lay upon his newly-closed grave this tribute of admiration and deep respect. In submitting this Bill for a second reading, it might be well to say a few words upon the condition of things that existed before and the condition that was brought about by the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. Before that Act was passed, and when an inquiry was about to take place, or was taking place, with regard to the compensation that should be paid by the incoming to the out-going tenant, those upon whom had been laid the burden of an arbitration had, where there was no written agreement, to make an inquiry first of all as to what was the custom of the part of the country in which the holding was situated; and, having found that out, to settle and award compensation. Attention having been directed to the subject, the result was to lay down, instead of the vague custom, a scheme upon which compensation should be awarded. That which was uncertain and undefined was made clear, and persons claiming had now, as under an agreement, a scheme of compensation under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. That Act, however, was not made compulsory, and it was in the power of the landlord and the tenant to agree together not to adopt the Act or certain parts of it. There were many who at the time thought it would have been better to make that Act compulsory, but perhaps no one put that view into words more clearly than did the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), who told them that when the next General Election came on they would be pressed to make the Act compulsory. And most rightly did the hon. Member prophesy, for the Act had not been in operation more than a year or two before they were most of them pressed upon the matter, and certainly when the General Election came on in 1880, four or five years after the passing of the Act, the subject was brought prominently before them by their constituents. He (Mr. Staveley Hill) having thought carefully over the matter, undertook at the General Election to do his best to repeal those clauses of the Act which enabled landlords and tenants to contract themselves out of it and so to make the Act compulsory. Upon the meeting of Parliament in 1880 three Bills were brought before the House for that purpose, one by himself, another by the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire and several Gentlemen associated with him, and a third by the Members for Bedfordshire and Banbury. Those three Bills were dropped after the first reading, none of them having come to a second reading. In 1881 practically the same three Bills were brought forward again, though two of them had adopted the title of Tenants' Compensation Bills. Some of these were read a second time. In 1882 the three Bills were brought forward again under similar titles. Some were read a second time and one went into Committee; but all were eventually dropped. This Session there were again three Bills before the House, the one he now brought forward for second reading, another proposed under the same name as two of the Bills of last Session by the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), and the third introduced by the hon. Member for Great Grimsby (Mr. Heneage). It would be contrary to the Rules of the House for him in any way to discuss the provisions of the two other Bills, either by proceeding to dilate upon what he might think superfluous in them or by differentiating them from his own and indicating what he considered deficiencies in them. It would be possible perhaps for him to discuss them as measures that had been brought forward in past Sessions, but he did not desire so far to trespass upon the Rules of the House. He, therefore, merely said with regard to them that they were measures which were far more in the landlords' interest than the tenants', and scarcely so considerate of the tenants' interest as his own Bill. Instead of proposing the simple rules of reference under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875, they introduced a more complicated system of valuation, and there was one difference especially which they had from his—namely, that whereas they referred only to future tenancies, this Bill dealt with all tenancies, whether leasehold or from year to year, and whether existing or future. He did not think there was any point which, either in regard to his own or the Government Bill to be introduced to-morrow, he should press more earnestly on the part of the tenants than that all tenancies, whether existing or future, should be dealt with. He failed to see why a contract of tenancy entered into under other circumstances, but now existing, should not be dealt with in precisely the same way as future tenancies and have the same advantages that they would have. The principle he had adopted in this Bill was to alter as little as might be the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. He had only altered it upon points upon which he should have a word to say when he came to speak more particularly of the details. The main point upon which the Bill was introduced was that with regard to present and future tenancies, the power given to the parties of contracting themselves out of the Act should be taken away unless there was existing between the landlord and the tenant an agreement giving compensation equal to that which the tenant would be entitled to under the Act of 1875. So far as the principal provisions went, there was but slight alteration in the present Bill from that which he brought forward in 1880. But since 1880 there had appeared a strong piece of evidence in its favour. In 1882 the Agricultural Commission reported, and in a Report signed by the whole of the Commissioners it was said—

> "Frequent reference has been made to the effect of the Agricultural Holdings Act, and the expediency has been generally suggested of making compulsory the clauses of the Act which relate to compensation in all cases where compensation is not absolutely secured by custom or by agreement."

Those words were an exact recommendation of this Bill. Lord Vernon had made a separate Report, in the first clause of which he said—

> "You must secure compensation to the tenant, because unless you do the maximum fertility of the soil of the country cannot be uninterruptedly maintained."

That put the reason for the Bill on the very strongest ground upon which legislative interference with contract could be placed, for it was the duty of the Legislature in dealing with the question of Agriculture to attain the maximum fertility of the soil. Lord Vernon said that that result could only be accomplished by securing compensation to the tenant, though he went on to say with reference to future agreements—

> "Although every out-going tenant is in my opinion entitled to be compensated for the beneficial value of the improvements which he may leave upon his farm of which he has not reaped the entire fruit, landlords and tenants should be left perfectly free to make such arrangements as regards compensation as may seem to them to be desirable."

Further on he said—

> "In the absence of any agreement by a landlord for compensation for certain feeding stuffs and manure, compensation should be secured to him by Act of Parliament."

This all pointed to a requirement that there should be a secured compensation to the tenants which might induce expenditure of energy and capital. As an effect of the Act of 1875, and as a reason why the power of contracting out of it—at any rate with regard to the terms of their existing tenancies—should not be left to the landlord and tenant, he would, with the permission of the House, quote from the Report of the Commissioners, which said—

> "Upon many estates fresh agreements have been entered into in accordance with the spirit of the Act, adapted to local peculiarities and circumstances."

They had it, therefore, upon the authority of the Commissioners that to obtain the greatest amount of fertilization of the soil it was necessary to secure adequate compensation to the tenant, and that since the Act of 1875 the tenants upon many estates had had the full benefit of the Act, and that this should be extended to all tenants. Therefore, he said that their legislation should not proceed against those who obeyed the Act, but should rather seek by compulsory clauses to bring under it those, if any, who had set it at defiance. On all estates and in all cases an amount of compensation should be secured to the tenant which would insure his endeavouring to attain the maximum of fertility. The objection with which the promoters of this Bill were met was the old objection that they were doing away with the right of free contract; this had been discussed so fully last Session that it was not necessary to enlarge to any extent upon it now. A Society, which counted among its members several distinguished men, had in a pamphlet circulated that morning gibbeted together the promoters of all these Bills as persons who were interfering with the right of free contract and treating grown persons as babies. He ventured to submit that if there was any case in which the rights of free contract could ever be set aside it was that of the occupancy of land. The occupiers of land stood upon a very different footing to that which was taken by parties to other contracts. A man, if he took land in a good season, took it with a sanguine hope of success, and with perhaps a certain amount of carelessness. They all knew that when men took farms they did not always consider sufficiently what it was they were entering into. An agreement was put before them as the estate agreement, which they too readily signed, and it was of the utmost importance to the public that the cultivators of the soil should be secured that which would insure the greatest amount of fertility. Agreements for occupancy were of comparatively modern date. He could not find any earlier than the middle of the last century, and he believed it was towards the close of the last and the beginning of the present century that agreements for occupancy with all their covenants, with all their rules and regulations with regard to compensation, came into force. They were, no doubt, the offspring of middle men and lawyers, all of whom, he was afraid, had been great incumbrances upon the land. These agreements had certainly gone far to do away with the old practice, which only bound every man to farm according to the custom of the country in a good husbandman-like manner, and entitled him to claim his compensation from the incoming tenant according to the custom of the county. That was not by a string of clauses put forward by the landlord for his protection, or framed by a shrewd tenant to enable him to escape from his duty to the soil; but it had received the sanction of a long period of time, and long experience had shown it to be the best method of dealing as between the out-going and in-coming occupier of land. To come to the question of free tillage, his experience, both as a landlord and tenant, taught him that it would be far better to do away with all restrictions which hampered the cultivation of land. If a tenant was fit to be trusted with a farm he was fit to be trusted to farm it—and he had long thought that agreements which laid down hard-and-fast rules as to what a man should or should not do, without any provision as to the reason, had gone far to bring about the bad state of things which at present existed. This Bill and the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875 were to be read as one, so that whatever the Bill did not contradict in the Act it confirmed. The principal clause in this Bill was the 3rd, which provided that—

> "Notwithstanding anything in sections fifty-five, fifty-six, and fifty-seven of the principal Act, it shall not be competent for either a landlord or tenant to withdraw himself from the compensation provisions of the said Act contained in sections five to nineteen, inclusive of the said Act, unless there shall be provided under or by an agreement subsisting between them at the time of the termination of the tenancy a compensation to the tenant at least equal to that provided by the said Act; and for the purpose of determining whether the compensation provided by the agreement is of such equal amount, be it enacted that, notwithstanding anything contained in the agreement for tenancy, or any

other agreement between him and his landlord, a tenant may give notice, in the manner provided by section twenty of the said Act, that he will proceed to make his claim either under that Act, or under the system of compensation contained in the Schedule annexed hereto as though no agreement were subsisting between them, and thereupon all the clauses contained in the said Act as to compensation, so far as they may be applicable to each case, shall apply between such landlord and tenant, and all questions as to compensation shall be settled in manner provided by the said Act, and the agreement for tenancy and any other agreement existing between the landlord and tenant shall, so far as any question in respect of compensation between such landlord and tenant is affected thereby, unless the tenant shall make his claim thereunder to the exclusion of either of the other systems of compensation mentioned herein, become and be wholly void and of no effect."

Under this clause the tenant would find no possible cause of complaint of want of compensation, either under his written agreement, or under the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act 1875, or under the system scheduled to this Bill—which was, of course, open to any amendment that might be suggested—as he might exact full repayment for all his outlay. The 4th clause was as follows:—

> "Where under any of the provisions of any such subsisting agreement of tenancy the landlord has made any payment or outlay, or has given to the tenant any other valuable consideration in respect of the said tenancy, and the tenant shall, notwithstanding such agreement, give notice for compensation under either of the other systems mentioned herein, such landlord may give notice of counter-claim in respect of any such payment or outlay or other valuable consideration in the manner prescribed by section nineteen of the principal Act."

This fully protected the landlord against a tenant, who, after reaping the benefit of an agreement, might try to set it aside. The 5th clause provided that—

> "No such claim for compensation or dilapidation in respect of any act done or omitted, or of any outlay incurred, before the giving or receiving of the notice to quit, shall be allowed unless the particulars thereof shall have been delivered before the expiry of *six* months from the giving and receiving of such notice to quit; but the party upon whom such claim shall be made shall have a further *month* from the date of the delivery of such particulars for the making any counter-claim in respect of any such claim."

Under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875 notice of claim must be given within a month of the termination of the tenancy, and this Bill fixed six, although he rather preferred that the limit should be three months before the expiration of which the particulars of all claims for outlay then made must be handed in, so that the landlord in letting, and the in-coming tenant in taking, would know exactly the terms upon which they were dealing. The 6th clause dealt with what was called in the Act of 1875, "Improvements of the First Class," and he thought he should carry the House with him in the Amendment he proposed in that respect. With regard to permanent improvements or other improvements of the first class, the Act provided that the tenant could not claim for them unless the work had been done with the written consent of the landlord. But the landlord, as they all knew, frequently gave his consent verbally, and if he lived that was sufficient in most cases; but tenancies were often terminated by the death of the landlord, and where there was no written consent the tenant under the existing law would have no claim. What he proposed was that it should not be necessary to produce the landlord's assent in writing to entitle the tenant to compensation if he could show to the satisfaction of the Court that the improvements were in fact made with the consent and approval of the landlord. By the Schedule he had introduced a system under which compensation might be claimed not only under Michaelmas holdings, but under Lady Day holdings also. As the result of experience and of advice, he had made some alterations in the Schedule; but these were matters to be dealt with in Committee. The Schedule contained allowances to the tenant on quitting his farm for half the cost of linseed cake, cotton cake, and rape cake which had been consumed on the farm during the last year of the tenancy, providing that the quantity allowed should not exceed the average of the two next preceding years. The second paragraph of the Schedule provided an allowance for one-half of the cost of artificial manures used with the green crops on the farm during the last year of the tenancy, including the cost of carriage. With regard to under-draining, the Bill provided allowances on the 20 years' principle, and it also provided allowances for the cost of marling on a 10 years' principle instead of 14 years. The subject of dry bone manure was a very difficult one indeed, and one upon which there was considerable difference of opinion. Compensation was formerly made on the 14 years' principle, but he had put it at seven years. In the case of dissolved bones he had put the compensation on a four years' principle instead of five. These, however, were matters for discussion in Committee rather than at the present time, and he merely called attention to them now because it was not without considerable inquiry that he had put what seemed a reasonable term of years in the Schedule — a reasonable term of years amongst which the outlay should be divided. There was one point that he had not dealt with in scheduling the Bill, because it was too difficult to obtain anything like an approximate idea of what the compensation should be for laying down permanent pasturage. It was difficult because so much depended upon the way it was dealt with and cared for during the first 10 years. They all knew that during the first two years the grass was mown and no sheep fed over it, and if at the end of the third year fresh seed were thrown down, and afterwards careful attention were given to it, at the end of 10 years there would be really good old turf. Of course, it was a matter of impossibility to make with approximate accuracy anything like a calculation as to what should be paid. It was, in fact, a matter that must be left for adjustment between the parties themselves. There was only one other point he had to refer to. In the other Bills which dealt with this subject they had seen that there had been other tribunals suggested, and other modes of arbitration for obtaining the amount of compensation suggested, than that which had been enacted under the Agricultural Holdings Act, and he trusted that whatever Bill might be brought before the House there would be no different tribunal provided to that which was given under that Act. It was an eminently satisfactory one; it was one which could be worked far more cheaply than any other tribunal that had been suggested; and he hoped that no attempt would be made to substitute for it any other tribunal to which agriculturists could resort for the adjustment of their grievances. He was obliged to the House for the kind attention they had given him, and trusted that they would give a second reading to the Bill, which he now begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Staveley Hill.*)

MR. HENEAGE said, that Members were placed at a disadvantage in being obliged to discuss this Bill without reference to their own measures; and it was a pity that the Bill of the Government could not be at once introduced. He could not agree to the second reading of this Bill, because it embodied one or two principles to which he had the strongest objections. It was said that the Bill would set up the Lincolnshire custom as an alternative to the Act of 1875; but he could not admit that the Schedules would in operation amount to the Lincolnshire custom. And, even if they did, he should require more argument to convince him of the desirablity of setting up a hard-and-fast line, such as was laid down in the Schedule to the Bill. Difference of occupancy and soil and various other conditions made it impossible to put into an Act of Parliament the customs of different counties. With regard to the question of the consent of the landlord in the execution of improvements, he observed that on that point there need be little difficulty if landlords would only attend more to their business themselves, instead of leaving it to their agents. He believed half the difficulties that had arisen between landlords and tenants were due to the fact that landlords knew little of their tenants and estates, but left their management to agents. Difficulties arose because matters were left too much in the hands of agents, who raised rents and at the same time made promises which a change of circumstances made it difficult for them to redeem. He asked, however, could the House get any advantage from a prolonged discussion of this Bill, when to-morrow night they were promised the introduction of a Bill by Her Majesty's Government? He thought it would be better if the debate were adjourned until they saw what the provisions of the Government Bill were than that they should proceed now in a half-hearted manner, and utterly in the dark so far as the Bill of the Government was concerned, which had engaged the attention of some of the foremost statesmen of England. Therefore, with no wish to act in an unfriendly manner to his hon. and learned Friend, he would move the adjournment of the debate, in order to take the sense of the House on that question.

MR. JAMES HOWARD said, having for many years been honoured with the friendship of Lord Vernon, and associated with him in public matters, he also wished to express his sense of the loss which agriculture had sustained by the death of the noble Lord. As to the Bill, he considered it was an honest and straightforward attempt to deal with the question, and, although it did not go far enough, under ordinary circumstances he should have been glad for it to be read a second time. But as on the following night an Aaron's rod would make its appearance which would swallow up all the other rods, he would second the Motion that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Heneage.*)

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he was of opinion that a continuance of the debate would have been of considerable importance for the information of the country, and it might also have had some influence on the Government measure which was to be introduced to-morrow. He thought the Bill now before the House was worth very considerable attention. He did not agree with the principles of the Bill; but, as he could not discuss it on the Motion now before the House, he confined himself to expressing regret that the debate should not be continued. He thought that further discussion would have been of considerable assistance in considering the Government measure, which they would not have an opportunity of discussing for some time, as it could not be expected that there would be a protracted discussion upon it to-morrow night.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, that, under the circumstances, he was willing to agree to the adjourment, as he was satisfied with having brought the matter before the House.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

THEATRES REGULATION BILL.

(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. J. Lawrance, Mr. Macfarlane.*)

[BILL 81.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND said, in moving the second reading of this Bill, he would remind the House that a year ago he proposed a Motion on the subject of the dangers run by the public in London places of amusement, owing to the absence of any efficient system for the safety of theatrical audiences. In introducing that Motion, he produced a vast number of details which were probably in the mind of hon. Members, so that on this occasion he need only refer to them generally. He then showed, without contradiction, the great evils of the conflicting jurisdictions, and the great dangers, from the utter want of system, for the safety of the public that must necessarily exist when left to no less than six different authorities, with different views and guided by different motives. He showed how in London alone these different authorities—namely, the Crown, the Lord Chamberlain, the Metropolitan Board of Works, and the magistrates of London, Middlesex, and Surrey, with the occasional interference of the Secretary of State for the Home Department—held sway over 472 places of amusement, accommodating about 300,000 people, and with powers so ill-defined, and so little known and understood, even by themselves, that they constantly were overriding each other, and could be pitted successfully against one another by anyone whose interest made it worth his while to do so so. He showed how this matter was a very large one to Her Majesty's subjects, concerning nearly 1,500,000 of people weekly in London alone, many of whom were utterly ignorant of the risks they ran. He also showed how in most of the London theatres good fortune rather than caution had prevented the occurrence of calamities as disastrous as that of the Ring Theatre, at Vienna, or the Opera House, at Nice. The average life of a theatre was only 23 years, which of itself showed the absolute necessity for the adoption of measures to safeguard the lives of the 3,000,000 people who on an average weekly used such places of amusement in London. The only way to provide actual safety was by having a proper regard to exits. These should be large enough to enable the audience to escape easily, each part of the house being served by a separate staircase, so that no two streams of people could meet and cause a block; that all doors should open outwards; while every door should be used nightly in order to inspire confidence in case of accident. After a great accident, theatrical managers took certain precautions, but they were soon given up, as they were found troublesome or inconvenient. He found that since the discussion on his Motion, very little had been done in the way of improving the arrangements for safety at theatres, and that those who complimented him when he brought forward his Motion were the first to oppose him when he embodied it in a Bill. The Home Secretary opposed the Bill, because he considered his Office had sufficient work to do already, and because, however much the public differed from him, he believed the Board of Works had sufficient power already. To show the way in which the Metropolitan Board dealt with the theatres, he might say that they had compelled a certain number of alterations at Drury Lane Theatre, which, though perhaps not absolutely safe, was one of the safest theatres, while they had let alone structures which were notoriously dangerous. The Metropolitan Board opposed the Bill, because they said it was an insult to them. His business was not to pay compliments to the Board of Works, but to try to protect the public, the safety of the people being of more importance than the susceptibility of the Board. Since he brought forward his Motion a year ago, no less than 28 theatres had been destroyed by fire, and amongst them the Alhambra, in Leicester Square. What was known with regard to that fire? He had taken great interest in that accident, and he had ascertained that the state of things existing at the Alhambra before the fire was most dangerous. Large quantities of old stage properties were stowed under the first circle seats; there were openings between the boards of the floor, and the fire in all probability arose from a match dropped by one of the audience into the place beneath them. If so, the fire had smouldered for some time before bursting into flame; but 10 minutes after it did so the whole theatre was in a blaze, and if it had been full at the time there must have been a tremendous loss of life. A timbered screen, covered with only one inch of plaster, had been erected 12 months previously by order of the Lord Chamberlain, to separate the stage from the auditorium, and this erection had been discussed by the Metropolitan Board of Works; but they had not power to prevent its erection. The whole back approaches to the stage were through and under old timbered houses separate from the theatre only by wood. One of those places were used as a common lodging-house, and the day after the fire the police had to remove 300 persons from the place. If the theatres were as defective as he believed them to be, many of them were little better than death traps. Now, if these things were not known to the Metropolitan Board, what was the use of their inspection; and, if they did know, what was the use of their power if they did not exercise it? If that state of things existed in one theatre, and was only found out after a fire, how did the House know that the same was not the case in many other theatres? He was afraid the Metropolitan Board knew that the danger existed, and were afraid to grapple with it, preferring that the public should run the risk. His Bill was an attempt to bring the regulation of the whole of the theatres and music halls, under a central authority, in the same way as mines and factories. There was another very strong point, and that was with regard to smoking. It was patent to all theatre goers that this practice had risen to a very alarming extent within the last few years. This was a subject that ought to be dealt with, and could only be dealt with, by a proper central authority. It was an absurd anomaly that on Ash Wednesday the theatres on one side of the Thames should be closed, and those on the other side open, and that fact alone showed the necessity of having one licensing authority. He might mention that the Middlesex magistrates had passed an unanimious resolution in favour of this Bill; and to show it was not crude, unconsidered legislation was shown by the fact that it virtually carried out what was recommended by a Select Committee of that House which sat in 1866. And he hoped that the House would permit it to go to a second reading. He was quite willing to do anything in Committee in the way of amending it that would really promote the objects he had in view.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland.*)

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG, in rising to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said, he thought that a more crude or more unworkable Bill had never been brought before the House of Commons. He thought this a curiously inconvenient time to bring forward the Bill, when they were expecting the establishment of a great Municipality for the whole of London; and, moreover, he thought the House would be very reluctant, by passing this measure, to take away from that Municipality of the future one of the duties which most properly belonged to it. To say nothing of the fact that its drafting was careless and inaccurate, it would not establish one central authority, but would allow both the Home Secretary and the Metropolitan Board to issue regulations, while the power of the Lord Chamberlain would remain untouched. Instead, therefore, of having the one grand central authority which it was the hon. Gentleman's wish to create, they would have three authorities whose action would clash in all directions. Serious charges had been made against the Metropolitan Board; but he wholly denied that they had neglected their duty. They carefully considered the reports of their Surveyor, and of Captain Shaw, and whenever the proprietors of theatres refused to make the alterations required by the Board, the question was referred to arbitrators, who had, as a matter of fact, in each case enforced the majority of the recommendations of the Board. Both at Covent Garden Theatre and at the Royalty everything had been done that the Board had required. Nearly 180 music-halls had been inspected, and in them various improvements were being carried out. A serious indictment had been brought forward against the Metropolitan Board about the Alhambra Theatre. That theatre, however, had been thoroughly inspected before the fire, and the recommendations made by the Board were under the consideration of the Company, and in a short time the theatre would have been closed for the alterations had not the fire unfortunately broken out. The Board took the theatres in turn, and endeavoured to act in such a way that a number of people should not be suddenly deprived of their bread. The hon. Member had stated that 28 theatres had been burnt during the last year. Only one, however, had been burnt in London, and that, he contended, showed the great vigilance of the Board of Works. As a rule, he found the managers of theatres were quite willing to carry out all the improvements that were recommended by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and, therefore, he hoped the House would reject a Bill that was both unworkable and unnecessary.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he thought the best thing the House could do was to follow the hon. Member for Truro into the Lobby and vote for his Amendment against the second reading. So far as he could see, the Bill conferred a sort of jurisdiction over theatres, partly upon the Lord Chamberlain, partly upon the Metropolitan Board of Works, and partly upon the Home Secretary. But where there was divided responsibility they all knew what the result would be. It meant that nobody was responsible. They all knew the condition of theatres before 1878. They were undoubtedly in an exceedingly dangerous condition; but since the Metropolitan Board of Works had had powers he could assure hon. Gentlemen that if they supposed the proprietors of theatres were under the impression that the Metropolitan Board of Works had done nothing they were mistaken. In their opinion the Metropolitan Board of Works had done a great deal too much. They received reports from Captain Shaw; they had an Inspector to visit the theatres; they had got some theatres rebuilt, and others so altered as practically to be equal to rebuilding. There was, in his opinion, great exaggeration as to the danger of fires in theatres. When a theatre was burnt down in any part of the world there was at once a panic, and whatever the authorities might have done to avert danger, they were always blamed for not doing more. The danger did not arise from the fire, but from the panic; and the great object aimed at ought to be to have a large number of exits. Last year an Act was passed enabling the Metropolitan Board to require that the means of exit from theatres should be kept open. He would suggest to the Metropolitan Board of Works that every theatre should be required to be provided, not only with separate means of exit, but also with separate means of entrance.

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, that the new theatres had separate exits.

MR. LABOUCHERE suggested that the hon. Baronet should look into the old theatres to see if it was not possible to make separate exits in them. Each crowd from the different parts of the theatre, instead of joining together on the way out, should have its own means of exit, and the way out should be the way by which it had entered. The Metropolitan Board of Works had made great progress since 1878, and he believed they had thoroughly and efficiently done their duty. It would, therefore, be a mistake to pass this Bill, and transfer the authority of the Board to the Lord Chamberlain and the Home Secretary pending the London Government Bill. He should vote that the Bill be read that day six months.

CAPTAIN AYLMER thought the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had proved the necessity for this Bill. His one argument, in fact, was that the Bill was unworkable; but the only error he could point out was a clerical error in putting "67" for "47" in Clause 1. The hon. Baronet's only objection was that there would be a conflict of three authorities—the Metropolitan Board of Works, the Lord Chamberlain, and the Home Secretary; but there was no real foundation for that objection. The question was whether the Metropolitan Board of Works had done their duty. That was answered by the simple fact that matters were just as they were three years ago. ["No!"] Not a single direction, by means of a finger or an arrow, was to be found in any theatre indicating the means of exit. With regard to the case of the Alhambra, mentioned by the hon. Member for Evesham (Mr. Dixon-Hartland), had the fire at that house occurred a few hours earlier, some hundreds of lives would probably have been sacrificed. There was little prospect now of the London Government Bill being passed in this or in another Session, and he thought it too bad that the public should still be subject to the risk of fire in theatres when a Bill of four clauses would prevent it. He considered that the *ipse dixit* of the Home Secretary, that certain things must be done, was far preferable to the present red-tape system of the Metropolitan Board of Works. No reliance was to be placed on arbitration, which might go on till Doomsday. While the so-called arrangements were being made by the Board of Works some frightful catastrophe might take place. It was said that the Government intended to introduce a measure on the subject; but they had heard of a good many intentions of the Government which had not been fulfilled. As he desired to see the matter placed in the hands of a firm Home Secretary, who would give an immediate order that exits be provided, he should support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. MACFARLANE thought the present state of things most unsatisfactory. He would ask the hon. Baronet one question—whether it was the custom in theatres, when the ordinary seats were full, to place chairs in the gangways?

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, that was entirely contrary to the regulations of the Lord Chamberlain.

MR. MACFARLANE: Then those regulations were not attended to. Was any punishment inflicted on the managers of the theatres in which there was a breach of those regulations? Nothing of the kind was attempted. If this blocking-up of the gangways were allowed to continue, there could be little doubt that some terrible catastrophe would some day happen. What would the President of the Board of Trade say to the owner of an emigrant ship who, when he had let all the existing berths, proceeded to let the lifeboats? Yet these gangways were to a theatre what lifeboats were to a ship. He hoped to see the whole matter placed in the hands of the Home Secretary.

MR. HICKS said, he should support the Bill, feeling that nothing could possibly be worse than the present arrangements in theatres. The hon. Member who brought it forward called attention to the state in which the Alhambra Theatre was immediately before the fire took place, and they had also had a statement from the Chairman of the Board of Works on the subject. He admitted that time was required to prepare plans for alterations in the Metropolitan theatres, but it would have taken little time to go over the theatres and music-halls generally. The first theatre to have been visited was surely the Alhambra, which throughout was in a most dangerous condition; but, although the Board of Works obtained powers in 1874, it was four years before they made any representations to the authorities of that theatre, although they had previously dealt with Drury Lane Theatre, which was in a far different position, and in a much safer condition, inasmuch as it possessed fire-proof walls and facilities for quickly getting the people out. The Metropolitan Board of Works issued eight orders to the proprietors of Drury Lane Theatre as to alterations to be carried out; but it was shown that several of these alterations were quite unnecessary, and that a fire-proof wall would have to be taken down to carry them out. The matter was submitted to arbitration, the orders of the Metropolitan Board were set aside by the arbitrator, the authorities of the theatre made their objections good, and yet were made liable for the cost. Nothing could be worse or more unjust than such a course.

MR. TATTON EGERTON said, that it was part of the argument of the promoters of the Bill that the safety of the public was not sufficiently insured in the hands of the Metropolitan Board. In his opinion, during the last few years the Metropolitan Board had been doing its work extremely well. Out of a total number of 40 old theatres in London they had inspected more than half, and had carried out alterations in more than one-third; they had caused three theatres to be entirely rebuilt; one theatre had been closed by the action of the Board, and another by the action of the Company to whom it belonged because it could not fulfil the requirements necessary for the safety of the public. In the case of old theatres the Board had only power to direct such things to be done as could be effected at a reasonable cost. In the case of new theatres the Board now insisted that there should be exits on each different floor, and that there should be, as far as possible, separate entrances. He allowed that Drury Lane was the safest of the London theatres; but it should be remembered that that theatre had the greatest cubic capacity of all. The Bill proposed to place the jurisdiction in this matter entirely in the hands of the Home Secretary, without appeal. How would managers of theatres like this? It would confer a power exceeding that of the Star Chamber. The Metropolitan Board had to regard in this matter not only the safety of the audiences, but of all persons connected with the theatres, and that was one of the reasons why such stringent rules were brought forward in the Act of 1878. This Bill seemed to leave everything in a loose, haphazard state within the jurisdiction of the Home Secretary, and he should certainly oppose it.

MR. WARTON said, he was surprised at the idea of doing its duty possessed by the Metropolitan Board of Works. In four years it had examined half the theatres, and then congratulated itself on doing its duty. But it was notorious that a great many things were done in theatres dangerous to public safety, such as filling gangways with chairs, without interference from the Metropolitan Board, or the managers being censured or proceeded against in any way. It was only by constant remonstrances in and out of the House that the Board had at last been induced to take some action. This Bill was an attempt to secure the safety of life by putting the power of interference somewhere, and he did not think it could be in better hands than those of the Home Secretary. He had no wish to see such another fire as that at the Alhambra while the House waited for the introduction of the Government Bill. The majority of the theatres were so full of defects that a remedy was urgently and immediately demanded. His experience of them was that the special exits to be used in case of fire were, as a rule, carefully blocked up with rubbish, or even so contrived as to converge in one narrow passage. That was the kind of precaution adopted by the proprietors of theatres at the instance of the Metropolitan Board. The Board certainly had interfered with some of the theatres; but they had shown their wisdom by interfering with the best built and safest houses in London. He should much prefer the simpler jurisdiction of the Home Office; but in the present state of Government Business everything was put off to a more convenient season.

MR. WOODALL said, he was disposed to vote for the second reading of the Bill, not because he joined in the censure of the Board of Works, but because it raised the question of the anomalous and arbitrary powers exercised by the Lord Chamberlain.

MR. BULWER said, he should vote for the Bill if he thought it would insure the safety of the public in the enjoyment of their pastimes; but it seemed to him that to avail themselves of the facilities already provided it would be necessary to have a staff of drilled men to keep the audience in order. As far as he understood it, all the practical good the Bill would do would be to transfer to the Home Secretary the powers now possessed by the Metropolitan Board. That would not touch the real evil at all. The theatres were dangerous, not because they were under the jurisdiction of this or that authority, but because most of them were situated in crowded neighbourhoods, had not sufficient facilities of exit, and no open spaces round them. Besides, as long as crowds were liable to panic, perfect safety could not be secured. The mere transfer of authority would be useless; and he greatly doubted whether the Home Office, already overworked, or any other Department, would be more careful than the Metropolitan Board.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE pronounced the Bill one of the most singular and despotic measures ever introduced into the House of Commons, as its main clause would give the Home Secretary authority over every place of amusement in the Three Kingdoms. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) had praised his right hon. Friend's administration of the Home Office; but he feared that if the Bill were carried the country would probably lose the services of his right hon. Friend. His right hon. Friend would certainly decline to be responsible for the administration of the provisions of the Bill; and he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could hardly think that any responsible politician would undertake the duties thrown by it upon the Home Office. The principle of the Bill was no less objectionable than its practical results, for it would place in the hands of a Central Department powers that might more properly be exercised by a local authority. If the local authority had not the confidence of the public it might be changed; if its powers were not sufficient they might be increased; but reactionary legislation such as the present Bill involved should not be encouraged merely to meet a temporary inconvenience. It would certainly be reactionary legislation to place matters concerning the control of even Metropolitan places of amusement under a Government Department. The best people to control these places were the local authorities. If they had not the confidence of the people they might be changed; but let them not throw these powers over to a great Department of the State. He thought he was interpreting the hon. Member's desire if he took upon himself to limit the Bill to theatres and music-halls only. He had spoken of the wide scope of the Bill; but he gathered, both from the statement of the hon. Member for Evesham and from the whole discussion, that it was intended to apply to the Metropolitan theatres alone. If the Bill were limited as he suggested somewhat of what he had said fell to the ground; and they would have to discuss a new Bill. In London the existing powers were much stronger than many Members had assumed they were. On the 3rd of April, 1882, the Home Secretary said that the 11th section of the Act of 1878 armed the Metropolitan Board with adequate powers to insist on the application of such measures of precaution and safety as might be necessary. The Board were acting upon that opinion, and, as he believed, with great success. As to the inspection of theatres by the Board, it must be remembered that 41 theatres had been inspected and reported upon by Captain Shaw, than whom no one had had more experience in dealing with fires. The hon. Member (Mr. Dixon-Hartland) asked where were his reports. It was not desirable to create a panic by publishing the reports; but they were shown to the managers. It was by no means promised that they should not be published, if it were necessary; but for the present they were held *in terrorem* over the heads of the managers who did not make the necessary improvements. If there should be unwillingness to do this the reports could be made public; but there would be hardship in publishing at once reports that might cause a falling off in the attendance at places of public entertainment, because a calamity had happened in another country. On receipt of the reports the Metropolitan Board of Works set to work, and they had been working steadily ever since. They had prevented danger in the new theatres that had been erected; and with regard to existing theatres they had done as much as could fairly be expected. They had taken the worst cases first and had dealt with them effectively. The proprietors of Covent Garden Theatre had spent £4,500 in carrying out to the full the requirements of the Board. The hon. Baronet the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), as representing the late Government, had taken the same view of this question as the present Home Secretary as to the undesirability, from the public point of view, of transferring these extraordinary powers to the Home Office.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND, in reply, said, at all events it was the discussion of the subject that had prompted the Metropolitan Board of Works to action. He was quite willing that the Bill should apply only to London, and to theatres and music-halls. It aimed only at securing the public safety, and did not encroach at all on the province of the Lord Chamberlain. He believed there were reasons why local authorities could not act so independently as the Home Office. As to the Reports of Captain Shaw, if the Metropolitan Board of Works had done their duty, there could be no objection to producing them, for they would show the great amount of good done by the Board; but if danger still existed it was only right that the public should know. If the Bill were read a second time, he should be quite willing to assent to modifications in Committee.

Question put.

The House *divided*;—Ayes 22; Noes 141: Majority 119.—(Div. List, No. 88.)

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*.

Second Reading *put off* for six months.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1878) AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 91.]

(*Mr. Broadhurst, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Burt, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Rowley Hill.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. BROADHURST, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill said, he might at once state to the House that it contained no new or exceptional principle. Under the present Factory and Workshop Act a child or person under 18 might not be employed in silvering mirrors, making white lead, or melting or annealing glass, nor a girl under 16 in making or finishing bricks or tiles not being ornamental, nor a child under 14 in dipping lucifer matches, and so on. He submitted that the class of work he was now asking the House to prevent young girls under 14 years of age from being employed at was equally objectionable to any of the trades he had enumerated. The brick trade was heavy work for young females, and, indeed, also for grown women. The tile trade was not so heavy, and probably not so injurious to health; therefore, if the House had already prohibited young females under 16 years of age working at the manufacture of tiles and the making of bricks, it could not reasonably refuse to prevent their children being taught the trade of the blacksmith. His Bill would be much better understood if it had been termed a proposal to prevent young girls being taught the trade of the blacksmith. That really was its object. The objectionable nature of the business had been exposed by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Factories many years back, and they had submitted to their chief in London the desirability of grappling with the great evil which women and young females had to contend against in the Black Country. It was not the jealousy of trades unionists which had made the discovery of the objectionable character of this work for girls. It was thought that the increase of education would ultimately destroy that system; but the report of the Inspectors a few years back showed that the school accommodation of the district was very limited, and the means of education quite inadequate. The report declared that the moment the Inspector showed himself in the neighbourhood, the fact of his arrival was telegraphed so rapidly from one shop and one street to another, that all the young children and many of the objectionable scenes in the works disappeared. He had also the greatest difficulty in ascertaining the ages of the children or their school attendances. There was one case in which the schoolmistress certified that a child had attended school 512 times in one week, and when asked to explain how that could be she confessed she was not the best of scholars at writing figures, and that possibly mistakes had occurred. The Inspector went on to describe the nature of the work and its unsuitable character for women and young girls, and showed that the employment of females in such trades was attended with the worst results, and that the men sought for girls as wives who were celebrated, not for the qualities which would make them good wives and mothers, but for the number of nails or the length of chain they could make in a day. The Inspector's report went on to show that wives were compelled by their husbands to work simply to provide them with money for drink; and it also spoke of the wretched and lifelong misery which lay before the women engaged in the nail and chain trades of South Staffordshire and East Worcestershire. The reasonable proposal which he now made to the House was that young female children under the age of 14 should no longer be permitted to be taken from the cradle into the blacksmith's shop and there taught to forge for the rest of their lives, at a wage which was a disgrace to the country and to the trade which flourished on such a condition of misery and starvation as was shown in the Inspector's report. He understood there was to be some opposition to the Bill; but he appealed to hon. Members to support it, not only in the interests of these poor people, but also in the interests of the country at large. The opposition to it was, no doubt, dictated by the foggers and the truck shopkeepers who throve upon this class of labour; but he asked hon. Members to disregard their plea, and to listen to that of the poor mothers and little children. Mr. Redgrave, who, as the House was aware, was always most anxious that his reports should bear the test of the fullest criticism, summed up his annual report by saying, with reference to the report of his Sub-Inspector, Mr. Brewer, that that report was "undoubtedly sensational," and that he could not put into type what Mr. Brewer and others had said on the condition of the Black Country, but that he believed, from what he himself had seen, that the statements were true, and to the remedy he would respectfully leave the Royal Commissioners, before whom he laid Mr. Brewer's report. The Royal Commission had, however, done nothing, and the argument used on a former occasion by the hon. Baronet the Member for Walsall (Sir Charles Forster) was that this state of things would cure itself. He did not ask the House to prohibit female labour in the chain and nail and bolt-making trades altogether. He only asked that female children should not be allowed to be employed in them. One argument brought against his proposal was that if children of 14 were not allowed to commence they could not learn the business. That was not the case, for any intelligent woman of any age could readily learn it. It had been said that there were not many female children engaged in these trades, and that not more than 12 or 14 girls would come under the operation of the Bill; but it was also argued that the measure he proposed would cause a serious derangement of the trade. These arguments were inconsistent; but he thought it was nearer the truth to say that more young girls would come under the Bill than some hon. Members supposed. He would point out, however, that it would be difficult for well-dressed people to discover the real amount of young child labour engaged in the shops, for on the approach of strangers the girls would be sent from the place. Another argument was that the nail-making was not a laborious occupation, and was more of a pastime to keep the children out of mischief. But it was not a question of the labour involved in making a particular nail, but the weary working on for hours and days at that laborious occupation; and he had seen females of very tender years indeed engaged in making great spikes, four and five and six inches long, in which they had to bring to bear an immense amount not only of skill and quickness, but a very great amount of physical strength. They had to forge the iron bar in the fire, to take it out and cut it up into 6-inch lengths, put each piece into the place made in the anvil, hold the header and make the spike. Afterwards they had to point the spike. [The hon. Member illustrated the mode of nail-making with a small machine which he exhibited to the House.] He said that the girl while holding the nail with the tongs, had to use her foot to work a large hammer which did the work ordinarily done in blacksmiths' shops by the striker. This work was pursued 6 to 11 hours a-day by children of tender age. It was a disgrace to the country that it should be permitted. In one shop he had seen a woman of 25 working at chain-making. She was the mother of three children, two of three and four years of age, and one six or eight months old. She worked 10 hours a-day at chain-making, and during that time she was so occupied she had to engage a foster-mother to look after her children. Let her work as hard as she might her income amounted to only between 5*s*. and 6*s*. Out of that she had to pay subscriptions towards carrying the chains to the buyer, for wear and tear of forge, for coal, and for the care of her baby during six days a-week. At the end of all her toil this poor woman earned the magnificent sum of 2*s*. 4*d*. and sometimes 2*s*. 6*d*. in wages. In addition to that, her work had to be done in a dirty shed with a stifling atmosphere, when it was not relieved by a strong draught blowing from square openings in the walls. There seemed to be an opinion that what was required to put an end to this state of things was only additional Factory Inspectors. The bodies with which he was connected had been continually asking for such appointments, but hitherto the staff had not been increased. As far as he could see, there was no hope of the appointment of fresh Inspectors sufficiently numerous to grapple with the evils he had mentioned; and, besides, no Factory Inspectors had power to prohibit the employment of young girls in this labour. The Bill dealt with a trade carried on not in factories and large workshops, but in little huts in the back gardens of nearly every cottage in the district, where effectual inspection was all but impossible. He earnestly begged the House to read the Bill a second time. No one need fear to destroy such an industry as this, or to let in foreign competition. Better a thousand times that there should be foreign competition in this trade than that its iniquities should continue, and that young girls and women should, so to speak, forge their lives away for a miserable profit of 2*s*. 6*d*. a-week.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Mr. MONCKTON, in rising to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said, that the Bill was wholly unnecessary, mischievous in its provisions, and would be cruel in its operation. He believed he could show that it belonged to that class legislation destined for the benefit of the few rather than for the many. The Bill applied only to the nail shops, for, practically, screws, nuts, and bolts were manufactured where girls of this age were not employed. The hon. Member who moved the second reading was perfectly right in attributing to him the opinion that the best way of grappling with the subject was by extending the system of factory inspection, and with this view he had given notice of his intention on the Civil Service Estimates to call attention to the want of a sufficient number of Inspectors in this district. There was no doubt that irregularities did exist, but the only and best way to meet them was by carrying out the proposals of the existing Act. It seemed to him that the speech of the hon. Member for Stoke, and the speeches of those who acted with him in the country, all pointed to the same conclusion, that it was impossible to carry out the Factory and Workshops Act by an inspection such as was provided—in the Dudley district, for instance, where an Inspector and an assistant had to contend with 1,300 factories and over 6,000 workshops. The existing staff could not deal with such an extent. The hon. Member spent a great deal of his speech in denouncing the truck system; but that was simply putting up an evil to knock it down again, for there could not be two opinions about that system. All were opposed to the system, and, that being so, he need not trouble the Committee by dwelling upon it any further. It was almost the unanimous opinion of employers, of clergymen, of people who were able to form a judgment on the Bill and had seen it, that it would practically ruin the district, which was an exceptionally poor one, and where there was no other employment for those women to take to. The hon. Member said he did not wish to debar women from working in the nail shops; but, on the other hand, he could not help remembering a certain meeting of a trade's union committee, a deputation from which met several Members of Parliament and discussed the question; and the hon. Member then said that what they wanted was to eliminate female labour altogether. The House had always been particularly jealous of any interference with, or further restriction upon, female labour; and it had been thought a good thing by some persons to endeavour to stop this particular kind of girl labour, so that girls would be debarred from learning the business, would seek employment elsewhere, and gradually be eliminated from the trade. But this district in question differed from others in that there was no other employment in the neighbourhood, no factories to work in, no want of domestic servants, and, moreover, there was no wish among the persons concerned for any further interference. The work was not so hard, in spite of what the hon. Member said. Olivers with 30lb. force were not used by women, and the only heavy work in which young persons were employed was the spike nail trade. Now, he had taken the trouble to ascertain about this spike nail trade, and he found that although there were nearly 60 families engaged in it, only four of them were under age. If the Bill were only to deal with this particular trade there would be no objection to it—certainly none on his part; but they should not debar children from working at a trade which was certainly fitting for them. Under the Education Act children up to 14 years of age worked half-time, and with this Bill in force these children would be at home doing nothing. He had a letter from a man in the district having opportunity and means of forming an opinion, which stated that if children were debarred from working at the trade under 14 they would lose that suppleness of wrist which was essential to good work. The hon. Member spoke of the wages as a miserable pittance; but there was one thing he did not mention—that the women worked usually not more than four days, sometimes five days, a-week, and therefore the wages represented considerably more than would appear from the speech of the hon. Member. The whole spirit of the Bill came from outside, from the chain-makers in other districts, who thought that with woman labour eliminated from the trade their wages would increase. This was the whole gist of the question. He could claim knowledge of the district not inferior to that of the hon. Member, whose acquaintance with it was of three hours duration, in the course of which he asked the secretary of the association to show him some of the worst cases. If the Bill were carried, it would only have the effect of driving the trade out of the country; it would not improve the position of the men in this or other trades; it would debar young people from learning the rudiments of the trade, and the result would be a foreign supply or the manufacture by machinery. He had a great many letters from persons in the district, but he did not think it necessary to put them before the House. He hoped he had said enough to justify the contention with which he had started, that the Bill was unnecessary, would be mischievous and cruel in its operation, and unworthy of meeting its assumed object.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Monckton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD pointed out that, instead of affecting the labour of a limited number of children in Staffordshire and East Worcestershire, the Bill would put a stop to the employment of all girls under 14 years of age in any large factory where nails and screws were made. No doubt, such a result was not anticipated by the hon. Member for Stoke, and therefore he thought his hon. Friend might do well to bring in an amended measure on a subsequent occasion. There was already a considerable legislative interference with the labour of women and children. Women were not permitted to work in coal mines, and there were many restrictions in regard to the employment of children in factories. And it was a very grave matter that the House should be asked in a short Bill of this kind to make an alteration in the age at which children might be employed under the Factory Act. As he interpreted the sub-section to Clause 1 of this Bill, it would prohibit girls under 14 from being employed in the packing up of nails and screws and preparing them for sale in any factory where the manufacture of nails and screws was carried on. These were perfectly harmless occupations, and he was sure the House would never sanction such a provision.

Mr. BRINTON failed to gather from the speech of the hon. Member for Stoke any definite information as to the number of persons whose sufferings called for legislation which would seriously interfere with the conditions of general employment. Young girls were already sufficiently protected by the

Factory Acts, which required examinations by medical Inspectors. He considered that the plan of making children "half-timers," and so gradually introducing them to full work, was a much better mode of dealing with them than by keeping them from all work till the age of 14, and then letting them take their chance. So far from it being a disadvantage to children entering trade at an early age, it was often kinder to allow them do so, as it enabled them to earn higher wages afterwards. He warned the House against depriving any portion of the poor people of the country of their employment, and he contended that the evils which might exist in Staffordshire and East Worcestershire could be remedied by the appointment of an additional number of Inspectors. For these reasons he should vote for the Amendment.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, it had been his fortune very often to listen to the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. A. Arnold) instructing the House as to the construction of clauses of Bills, and he had scarcely ever known the hon. Member come within measurable distance of accuracy; but the hon. Member had never displayed a more lamentable incapacity to understand the English language than on the present occasion. The most extreme interpretation could not by any possibility bring the class referred to by the hon. Member for Salford within the scope of the Bill. The hon. Member for Salford had evidently misunderstood the provisions of the Bill, as it proposed to deal only with young girls who were employed in the rolling, forging, stamping, and hammering of iron, and did not touch those who were engaged in sorting and wrapping. His object in rising, however, was to say that he understood that his hon. Friend who moved the rejection of the Bill was prepared to support a measure for preventing young girls being employed in heavy work. If that were so, it was for the Government to consider whether it was not possible so to amend the Bill as to prevent even a few cases of hardship. He had no doubt that if the hon. Member for Stoke were to bring such a Bill before the House it would receive careful attention; but it was very necessary to watch over any measure so as not to brutalize women by allowing them to be engaged in degrading occupations. He was in favour of giving the Bill a second reading and modifying it in the direction suggested by his hon. Friend.

Mr. HASTINGS said, he had received a large number of communications on this subject from workpeople and employers in East Worcestershire, and found they were unanimously opposed to the Bill. He knew his own constituency well, and was not aware any ground existed for imputing insanitary conditions to the nail trade. The intentions of the hon. Member for Stoke were no doubt benevolent, but he seemed to know little of East Worcestershire. He (Mr. Hastings) wished the industrial condition of that county to be let alone, and should therefore vote against the Bill.

Mr. ECROYD thought the House should not favour sweeping restrictions on the employment of girls under 14, for it was important that children should receive industrial training at an early age. As one who had taken great interest in the Factory Acts, he could not support the Bill. It was in many cases very important to their best interests that these children should obtain employment. He greatly regretted the low rate of wages so much complained of by the hon. Member for Stoke; but it was a direct result of the unequal and unfair foreign competition brought against English labour by the system of one-sided Free Trade, of which the hon. Member himself was understood to be a supporter.

Sir. R. ASSHETON CROSS said, that the Royal Commission appointed in 1876 to inquire into the Factory and Workshops Act had carefully considered this very question, and their Report on it was the longest they had made in connection with any particular trade. When he was Home Secretary and had to draw up the Bill of 1879, he was at first inclined to include the girls employed in the nail trade within its provisions; but after careful investigation he came to the same conclusion as the Commissioners had arrived at before him, and decided not so to include them. The question was fully discussed when the Bill of 1878 was in Committee, and the feeling against a proposal of this kind then made was so strong that it was not pressed to a division. He hoped the Government would not give way upon this matter; but there was a danger to be guarded against arising out of the wish of the men to stop the work of women for the purpose of keeping up their own wages. Children were generally employed in such work as blowing bellows, and not in hard toil; but there was nothing more degrading in a girl using a hammer than there was in her working a sewing machine.

MR. WIGGIN said, that residing, as he did, where the works to which reference had been made were carried on very extensively, he had no hesitation in stating, without fear of contradiction, that a healthier, more robust, or more active class than the workpeople of the Black Country did not exist in the United Kingdom. This remark equally applied to the women. If in this age of such widespread competition this country had to compete successfully with other countries, it was absolutely necessary that our working-class population should begin at an early age to understand the nature of their work. As regarded these young girls, the law protected them from unfairness, and the work they had to do was comparatively light. It should be borne in mind, too, that all the children to whom reference had been made were only half-timers. By beginning early in life they were enabled later on to earn very much larger wages than they would otherwise do. Knowing the feeling on the subject among the working classes in his district, he should vote against the Bill.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he rose in order to put the House in possession of the facts as to the number of persons employed in these trades, for they had not yet been laid before the House. It appeared from the Reports that there were 896 shops in which the nail and chain trades were carried on. Of these, 364 were shops in which men only, or men with their wives, or women working as occupiers, and, consequently, exempted from inspection, were employed. There were 323 shops in which men and women, or women only, were employed, and were subject to modified inspection only; 183 in which young persons were employed; and 26 in which children were employed. And the Inspector further stated that in only nine workshops female children were employed, and these children numbered only nine altogether. The majority of the people employed in these workshops were women, but not young girls; and, as a matter of fact, the Bill would only affect the nine children. He thought the hon. Member for Salford was right in his view of the construction of the 1st clause of the Bill; but any doubt on that subject might be removed by a suitable Amendment. The question was, whether it was worth legislating for so small a class as nine persons? He himself did not think it desirable.

MR. SHERIDAN thought that any measure dealing with a long-established trade ought to be well considered; and he was, therefore, in favour of the Amendment.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, he had no wish to stand between the House and a division; but, reference having been made to the Report of Mr. Brewer, regarding a district with which he (Mr. Staveley Hill) was acquainted, he wished to state, from his personal knowledge of the district, that the Report in question was absolutely unreliable and untrustworthy.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 44; Noes 124: Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 89.)

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Second Reading *put off* for six months.

NATIONAL DEBT BILL.

Resolutions [May 8] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by The CHAIRMAN of WAYS AND MEANS, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. COURTNEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 182.]

MOTIONS.

UNION OF BENEFICES ACT (1860) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL, Bill to amend an Act passed in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth years of Her Majesty's reign, intituled "An Act for the Union of contiguous Benefices in Cities, Towns, and Boroughs," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL and Mr. EDWARD STANHOPE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 183.]

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE (SERVICE OF WRITS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. ANDERSON, Bill to regulate the Service of Writs of the High Court of Justice in England upon persons in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ANDERSON, Mr.

Cochran-Patrick, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. James Campbell, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Arthur Elliot, and Mr. Armitstead.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 184.]

COMPANIES (COLONIAL REGISTERS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill to authorise Companies registered under "The Companies Act, 1862," to keep Local Registers of their Members in British Colonies, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Macnaghten, and Mr. Salt.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 185.]

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES (LONDON) [SALARIES AND EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament in the first instance, of the Salaries of Commissioners and Officers who may be appointed, and of Expenses incurred, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to provide for the better application and management of the Parochial Charities of the City of London (Queen's *Recommendation* signified), *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at two minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 10*th May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—*Third Report with Evidence*—Land Law (Ireland) *.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Cathedral Statutes * (58); Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) * (59); Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders * (60); Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment * (61).

Second Reading—Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act (1882) Amendment (Audience of Solicitors) * (34); Medical Act (1858) Amendment (52).

Committee—Report—Glebe Loans (Ireland) Acts Amendment * (35).

Third Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (Limerick Waterworks) * (3); Pluralities Acts Amendment * (42), and *passed.*

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92. and 93. be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess.

MEDICAL ACT (1858) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 52.)

(*The Lord O'Hagan.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord O'HAGAN, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, the Bill had been introduced with the object of enabling the Royal University of Dublin to be represented on the Medical Council of Dublin, in the same way that the Queen's University of Dublin was formerly represented on it.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord O'Hagan.*)

Lord CARLINGFORD (Lord President of the Council) expressed his approval of the Bill, which had been rendered necessary by an oversight in the existing Statute.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* the 24*th instant.*

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—MESSRS. NOLAN AND SMITH.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Earl CAIRNS, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Why Messieurs Nolan and Smith, sub-commissioners under the Irish Land Act for the County Antrim district, have been removed from that district? said, the Question was a very short one in itself; but it required some explanation on his part. Their Lordships would remember that a few days ago a conversation had occurred in that House relative to the removal of a Sub-Commissioner for the County of Donegal. The circumstances under which that removal took place were these. Considerable agitation had been got up in the county with regard to the decisions of Sub-Commissioner Bailey on the subject of judicial rents, the tenants being of opinion that he did not reduce the rents sufficiently. There was no accusation whatever against him of any other kind; but simply that, while reducing the rents according to his own judgment, he did not reduce them so low as the tenants desired. The agitation in the county culminated in a public meeting, at which very strong expressions were used, and very strong resolutions were passed, calling upon the Government and the Chief Commissioners to remove Mr. Bailey from his office. The result was that Mr. Bailey was removed from Donegal to Connaught, and his successor for the former place was appointed. It was, however, very soon manifested that the appetite grew by what it fed upon; because, when Mr. Bailey's successor began to discharge his duties, a Question was put in the other House by Mr. Sexton to the Prime Minister inquiring whether he was aware that the new rents fixed by Mr. Bailey's successor only averaged 20 1-3 per cent below the old rents, or nearly 2 per cent above those fixed by Mr. Bailey; and whether the latter had not been removed in consequence of a public meeting calling for his removal in consequence of his fixing the judicial rents too high? The fact was that the new Sub-Commissioner had not taken the hint, as it was expected he would have done, and a fresh agitation had been got up against him. His noble Friend (the Earl of Longford) had asked, the other night, for some explanation of the matter; and, in reply to his Question, the Lord President referred him to the answer which had been given in the other House to Mr. Sexton's Question, which was to the effect that the Chief Commissioners declined to give their reason for removing a Sub-Commissioner from one place to another, but that they went so far as to say that they did not remove the Sub-Commissioner in consequence of what had passed at the public meeting. There was, however, nothing in this statement of the Chief Commissioners that they were not aware of the general agitation which had been got up in the county against the Sub-Commissioner, and that they had removed him in consequence. The matter, however, went further than that, because he must altogether dispute the view which the Chief Commissioners took of their position—namely, that they were entitled to refuse to give any reason for removing a Sub-Commissioner. No one in Parliament would ask, and the Commissioners would be fully entitled to refuse to give their reasons for a judicial decision; but Parliament had a right to know the reasons for a particular administrative act done by an administrative body, which, for this purpose, the Commissioners were. It was not, therefore, for them to say, *sic volo sic jubeo*—"We will give no reasons for our appointment." The question that was asked was not a frivolous one. Here was an agitation in the country, and a public meeting held, demanding the withdrawal of the Sub-Commissioner. Thereupon the Sub-Commissioner was withdrawn. Was that a question on which the Commissioners were justified in saying they would give no reason? But what had happened since then? He now returned to the County Antrim, where the two Sub-Commissioners—Messrs. Nolan and Smith—were engaged in fixing the judicial rents. After they had gone some Circuits, given a number of decisions, and fixed a number of judicial rents, it seemed that the landlords felt very much the extent of the reductions made; while, on the other hand, the tenants thought that the reductions made were not sufficient. That was the complaint—they did not reduce enough. They also held a public meeting; and again he found that the complaint there was that of insufficient reductions. Here was a decision in which it was complained that the reduction was insufficient. The Poor Law valuation was £6, the old rent was £12 15*s*., and the judicial rent was fixed by the Sub-Commissioners at £4 10*s*. He should have thought that even the most sanguine tenant would have been contented with that result—£12 15*s*. reduced to £4 10*s*. Another case was that in which the reduction was not so large, the rent only being reduced £11 6*s*. in £80. Yet the complaint of the tenants was that the decisions of the Sub-Commissioners were not sufficiently pronounced in their favour. At this meeting they thought of adopting a form of resolution by which to justify their dissatisfaction, and one or two resolutions were proposed; but one of the speakers said that would not do. The best way, this speaker suggested, would be to adjourn the meeting, and to accompany that with an intimation that they were adjourning the meeting in order to see what effect the meeting would produce. Accordingly, this was the ultimate resolution arrived at—

> "That this meeting stand adjourned till this day three weeks, when the administration of the Land Act by the Chief Commissioners will be considered;"

—he would ask their Lordships to note that it was not the administration by the Sub-Commissioners, but the administration by the Chief Commissioners, that would be considered—

"and, in the meantime, tenants are requested to consider the advisability of abandoning all intention of entering the Land Courts, or those who have entered are asked to notice the advisability of withdrawing the same."

Was not that a threat to the Chief Commissioners? It was tantamount to saying that they wanted a change in the Judges, that they made their complaints known to the Chief Commissioners, and gave them three weeks in which to decide what they should do. Another meeting was held a few days afterwards in a neighbouring part of the country, at which those present again spoke of the same decisions by the same Sub-Commissioners; and this was the resolution they passed—

"We hereby condemn the members of the Antrim Sub-Commission"—Messrs. Nolan and Smith—"who, during the last sitting at Ballymena, visited the farms of several of our neighbours and friends, for their impertinent and high-handed conduct, and for the very unsatisfactory way in which they examined into the improvements executed by those tenants; and we protest against the reductions given in the several cases as quite inadequate, and hereby advise them to appeal; and that we hereby call upon the Government for the immediate dismissal of these Sub-Commissioners."

Those were the steps taken by the meeting, and the two Sub-Commissioners were removed. Mr. Nolan, he understood, was removed to that penal settlement for over-scrupulous Sub-Commissioners—namely, Connaught; and Mr. Smith, he was told, was removed nobody knew where, and a great deal of apprehension was felt lest he should have gone to some worse place. Perhaps his noble Friend the Lord President, when he spoke, would tell them where Mr. Smith had gone to, and throw some light on the subject. Since then another Sub-Commissioner had appeared upon the scene, and taken his place. Perhaps he ought to add, in order that their Lordships might have the whole of the case before them, that at the meeting in question allusion was likewise made to Mr. Greer, the Chairman of the Sub-Commissioners. It was said of that gentleman that there was not a man amongst them who was more inclined to do justice to the tenants than Mr. Greer. That appeared to be the chief desideratum—to do what was called justice to the tenants. Mr. Greer was not, as their Lordships might expect, removed under those circumstances. What was the consequence of all this? The new Commissioners went into that district, and, unless they were very much more foolish than he took them to be, they went there with what was equal and equivalent to an instruction from the Chief Commissioners that they should avoid the errors of their predecessors. That was, their predecessors did not reduce the rents enough, and it was that which they were to avoid. What was the effect of this on the Sub-Commissioners who were sent away? In their new sphere of action they were to take care that they did not again incur in the same way the displeasure of their superiors. What, too, was the effect on the public at large—the tenants and farmers in all parts of the country? Let them consider what this meant. Here was a tribunal in Dublin, which was, at one and the same time, the Court of Appeal and the executive power which could remove the Judges. It did not hear the cases on appeal; it did not exercise any judicial determination as to whether the reductions were sufficient or insufficient; but, on the allegation of any party that the reduction was insufficient, it removed the Judges. What was the result of these proceedings? They had Sub-Commissioners who exercised their functions for a year, or two or three years, as the case might be, in a particular county, and who in that time decided a great number of cases—possibly thousands. Then a complaint was made that they had not made sufficient reductions, and they were removed. What was the result of that—he did not mean as regards the future, but the past? They immediately set up a batch of tenants—namely, those whose cases had been decided during those years — with a particular and specific grievance of their own. They said this—"Whatever else may be done in the future, we are the victims of these proceedings you have condemned. It is our misfortune that we have had our cases decided by those wicked men who have been sent elsewhere, and we have our rents fixed for a judicial or a statutory term which you have not sufficiently reduced." That was the feeling throughout the country, and, therefore, he was most anxious to submit this matter to the consideration of their Lordships. He hoped they would have something more explicit in the shape of an answer from the Chief Commissioners. They, he must contend, ought, in a matter of this kind, to have an answer from the Chief Commissioners; and, further, he would say, they could not properly and constitutionally continue to refuse, in the manner they hitherto had done, to answer the question.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, that while the noble and learned Earl was developing his intense suspicions of the four gentlemen who filled the posts of principal Land Commissioners in Ireland—gentlemen who, he (Lord Carlingford) thought, were utterly undeserving of such suspicions, but, on the contrary, entirely deserving of the confidence of the Government and of their Lordships' House—he was struck by the fact that the noble and learned Earl had not been able to give them the smallest proof of the effects which he alluded to as being intended by the removal of certain Assistant Commissioners. The noble and learned Earl was compelled to state, at the very beginning of his remarks, that the change made in the composition of the Land Commission in Donegal by the removal of one Assistant Commissioner from one county to another—not a measure of censure or punishment, but a simple transfer from Donegal to Mayo, both counties, as desirable places of residence, being, he should think, very much upon an equality—the noble and learned Earl was obliged to tell them that the reductions of rent had been as great after the change had been made as before. That did not help the case of the noble and learned Earl. As to the Commissioners of whom the noble and learned Earl had been speaking, and what he supposed to have been the cause of the change made in the composition of certain Sub-Commissions, he was bound to say he never before heard of the meetings or speeches to which the noble and learned Earl had referred. He knew nothing of them, and he was absolutely convinced, from his information, that they had nothing whatever to do with those changes. However, he was glad the Question had been put, because it gave him an opportunity of making some explanation of the matter, which he admitted was one of some difficulty. As to the fate of the two gentlemen who had acted in Antrim, he believed that one went to Mayo, and the other, whom the noble and learned Earl appeared to think was wandering through space, had gone to County Armagh, which was not a very dreadful fate. It was quite true that there was something anomalous in these administrative functions being combined with the judicial functions of the Land Commission; but that state of things appeared to be inevitable. He did not know anyone who could so well judge as the Commissioners of the propriety and expediency of the composition of any of these Sub-Commissions, or of the public advantage or disadvantage of appointing a particular gentleman to a particular position, and of quartering him in a particular county. He was not aware that the executive authority, or anyone but the Land Commission itself, could judge of such a question as that. He was willing to admit that, this being an administrative and not a judicial matter, it would seem, on the face of it, that any inquiry as to the exercise of administrative powers should be freely answered in Parliament; but, at the same time, he asked any fair-minded man to consider whether there were not very serious difficulties, purely in the public interest and for the sake of the due administration of the Land Act, in the way of such Questions being freely answered. The Commissioners had strongly and unanimously arrived at the opinion that it would be scarcely possible to deal with these personal questions of appointments or changes, if they were required, in every or any case that suited the purpose either of the noble and learned Earl opposite from the landlords' point of view, or of Mr. Sexton or any other extreme Representative of the tenants in the other House, to state the grounds of their action. They say that, if they were bound to give to the public, by way of answers to Questions in either House of Parliament, their reasons for such administrative acts, they would find it scarcely possible to carry on their duties. He did not deny that there were many cases in which there would be no difficulty. There had been cases of changes made in the Sub-Commissions in which the reasons had been obvious on the face of them; and he ventured to say that those reasons, when they had been known, had been quite as much in favour of the landlords' side of the question as in favour of the tenants'. But there were also reasons, as any noble Lord would see who had ever considered the matter, that must be of so special and personal a kind as to make it scarcely possible to publish them to the world. Questions of the most personal kind must arise in those matters—questions of the harmony among Colleagues sitting on the same Commission; questions of the comparative capacity and ability for the fulfilment of duties, which had to be considered when the Land Commission desired to constitute in every part of Ireland Land Courts, which should be tolerably even in those respects; questions, again, whether the Commissioners possessed a fair knowledge of the part of the country where they had to act; and, on the other hand, whether they had unduly close connection with the district in which they were acting. All those matters were of a kind which might often be utterly unsuited for publication to the world; and if a distinction were to be drawn between a case in which an answer could be properly given, and a case in which it could not; if questions of this kind were to be answered to-day and similar questions to be refused answers to-morrow, the effect would be most undesirable, and probably unjust to the gentleman who was the subject of the inquiry. He thought he ought to say that the Irish Government, and the Lord Lieutenant especially, had looked closely into this matter, which, being one of administration, he was able to look into, and had been furnished by the Land Commission with the fullest and frankest explanations of every change that had been made in the constitution of the Sub-Commissions from first to last. If those changes were to be examined by anyone who knew the country, and who knew the gentlemen concerned, he (Lord Carlingford) was ready to contend that the most suspicious eye, looking at the appointments all round, would find no cause for thinking that the Land Commissioners had been actuated by any undue bias whatever in the arrangements that had been made. Questions much of the same kind had been raised from the opposite point of view in "another place;" and he dared say that it would be thought necessary to meet them in the same way that he had met the Question of the noble and learned Earl. He submitted to the House that there ought to be no suspicion of the motives and intentions of such men as were appointed to compose the Land Commission in Dublin. [*Cheers.*] He hoped that was not an ironical cheer, because he knew no four gentlemen whose character more entirely entitled them to the confidence of that House and of the public. On that ground, and in the belief that any other course would prevent them from performing their duty in employing the Assistant Commissioners in the best way for the public interests, he was not able to answer the Question asked by the noble and learned Earl. He would only add that if the respectful refusal of the Land Commissioners, under those circumstances, to give reasons in any particular case why they had exercised their discretion, should impair the confidence of the House in their judgment, motives, and character, he could not conceive a greater misfortune, or one which would do greater injustice to those distinguished gentlemen.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Lord the Lord President of the Council has concluded a speech, which, I think, evidences the consciousness of a weak case, by a device which counsel who have a weak case often have recourse to—namely, to call witnesses to character. But I think the noble Lord, on reflection, will feel that there is something very mysterious in the progress of these proceedings connected with the Land Act in Ireland. There seems to be an extension of the doctrine of coincidences which is very startling to us, and almost encourages us to believe that there is something in the theory of those metaphysicians who contend that you cannot argue any causation from the effect of one event having followed upon another. Last year we had something of the kind, but not so strong. There was an incident known as the Kilmainham incident, and I think that Mr. Parnell and others on that occasion intimated to the Government that, if they were let out of prison, they would support the measures of the Government; and it curiously did happen that immediately after that they were let out of prison; but there was absolutely no connection whatever in point of causation between the first event and that which followed. Now, we have a very much more remarkable instance of the remarkable extension of the doctrine of coincidences. The noble Lord tells us that these Sub-Commissioners were removed for circumstances affecting their individual capacities and characters. But what happened was that, in these several cases, meetings of the farmers were called, loudly denouncing the decisions of these Sub-Commissioners, because they were too favourable to the landlords, and that in each case, after, and closely after, the denunciation of those meetings, the curious coincidence happened that the condition of character and capacity arose in reference to each of the Sub-Commissioners, and made it necessary to remove them to another place. We can only say that coincidences flourish in Ireland in a manner known to no other country. It is a circumstance which I may mention in passing, and to which we shall probably have occasion to recur when the Evidence which has been printed for the Committee on the Land Law, and which has been laid on the Table of the House, is in the hands of your Lordships. There is a rich harvest of undesigned coincidences in that Evidence. But I think the noble Lord is unreasonable in complaining that the action of the Commissioners in this matter is looked upon with some suspicion. Whatever their excellence may be, at all events they are all Liberals, and three out of four are very strong partizans. Therefore, I think it is too much to assume that necessarily and certainly, in all cases, their minds must be free from partizan bias, when circumstances exist that justify very strong suspicion in an opposite direction. It must be remembered that the whole of the jurisdiction of these Sub-Commissioners is exposed to this particular suspicion, not that it is exercised corruptly, not that it is exercised in a manner inconsistent with the honesty of those who administer it, but that it is exercised, not as a judicial system administering justice between man and man, but as a political measure designed to accomplish certain purposes at the expense of whoever may suffer from them. And this procedure of the Sub-Commissioners is marked by three notes of suspicion attaching specially to these judicial proceedings. In the first place, many of these Sub-Commissioners were appointed from among not only the strong partizans of the Government—that would be a small matter—but they were men who had taken—and avowedly taken—a very strong line upon the precise matter that was the subject of litigation. They had avowed a very strong partiality for one of the litigants in the case; and while that avowal of partiality was fresh from their lips, and its publication was fresh in the knowledge of the public, they were appointed to a position which was nominally judicial. Again, we attach great importance in this country to the irremovability of Judges. We consider it to be one of the most precious guarantees for that independence and impartiality which we all recognize as the essential elements of justice. These men, or the greater number of them, in whose hands is the fortune of all the landlords of Ireland, are appointed from year to year, and they know perfectly well what it is that the Government require; they know perfectly well what the policy of the Government is; they know that the policy is so openly, so undisguisedly avowed, that the Prime Minister said in the House of Commons he could not appoint Commissioners from the ranks of his opponents, because they did not agree with him on the policy of the Land Bill. Knowing this, they know that their official existence—their very bread—depends on the will of the Government; and, with that knowledge before them, how could one expect them to administer stern and impartial justice? My Lords, if men's judgments were not obscured by the passions aroused by this Irish Question, I am sure that with regard to no other matter in the world would they permit such a mockery of judicial impartiality. There is a third note to my mind not less significant. These Judges—almost alone, if not quite alone, among all the Judges of the country—absolutely refuse to give any reasons for the decisions to which they come; they have refused so resolutely, kept their secrets so well, that—up to this time, at all events—not only have they never avowed what their reasons are, but no one has ever been able to form a guess as to the system upon which their decisions are arrived at.

Again and again have we asked witnesses what is the system on which the Chief Commissioners give, what are the grounds which actuate them in, the reduction of rents; and the witnesses have said—"It is impossible for us to give an answer; none of us have any idea." A different answer—an answer opening a new chapter in that science of coincidences which we have studied this evening—may be seen in the Evidence to which I have referred; but it is not an answer which will add to the confidence felt in the Chief or the Sub-Commissioners. These grounds of suspicion appear to me to make it very desirable that the Government should candidly answer, when they are asked upon what ground this great administrative discretion has been exercised. If it is a great administrative discretion to take away from a particular district men who are administering the Act—it may be men with one political colour—and to substitute others who regard their duty, perhaps, in a different light, without imputing improper motives either to the Judges who are removed, or the Judges who succeed them, I say it is about the gravest discretion which any administrative authority can assume—namely, to bias and to affect the course of legislation by the character of the decisions given, to shift the Judges here and there, and to manipulate the composition of the tribunals which pronounce the judgments. What is the result? You wish to promote calm in Ireland—you wish to promote confidence—but, I ask, have you promoted either in the minds of the landlords? They are thoroughly convinced that these tribunals cannot be relied on, and that it is not owing to any system of equity or justice that they have been despoiled of their property. They have been despoiled of their property in pursuance of mere political decisions, not as the result of the decisions of an arbitrator judging between man and man. But what will the tenants say? If they imagine that these reductions were the outcome of equitable decisions, founded upon some system of right, they might acquiesce in them, and say—"These judgments, having been once delivered, cannot be disturbed, and we must accept the system which they have laid down." But if you persuade them—as this manipulation is certain to persuade them—that you exercise an influence over the judgments that are delivered, that they are really the outcome of the policy of the Government, and that, therefore, they will yield to all those influences which guide and affect the policy of the Government, they will say to themselves—"These processes of agitation which have produced this law; these processes which are in our hands, are able to affect the administration of the law; these processes which can drive Sub-Commissioners who are hostile to us from one field of action to another, if applied further and more freely, may give to us a still larger share of that property and of that land which we desire to obtain."

LORD FITZGERALD said, he wished to recall the attention of the House to the question. The noble Marquess had made a bitter attack on the Sub-Commissioners wholly beside the Motion. He did not understand the noble and learned Earl opposite to make any charge against the Sub-Commissioners; but he could not help regarding this Question as a covert attack upon the Commissioners themselves. He wished to explain, however, that the Sub-Commissioners were not appointed by, nor were they removable by, the Commissioners—both the appointment and the removal must be acts of the Executive Government. The Commissioners, however, exercised a very large judicial supervision. The Sub-Commissioners, both legal and agricultural, were divided into Circuits of four each; and the Commissioners had to select the towns which they visited, the times when they visited them, and the cases that go before them. When a Circuit was over it was broken up, and new Sub-Commissioners might be appointed, or changes take place, at the discretion of the Commissioners. It would be exceedingly inconvenient and injurious to the Public Service were the grounds for the exercise of this discretion to be stated, as they would have to be in every case. He could not help interpreting the remarks of the noble and learned Earl as a charge against the Commissioners themselves. It was a charge of corruption against them. That being so, he thought the matter should not have been brought forward by way of a Question, but that the noble and learned Earl was bound to bring it forward in a distinct and pointed shape as a Vote of Censure on the Commissioners. He knew those

Commissioners very well, and he must say that they were gentlemen of the highest honour and integrity, and of the greatest ability, who would not stoop to do any act which savoured in any way of dishonourable conduct. He would advise the Commissioners not to answer any questions put to them on such a subject; they had a delicate judicial supervision to perform in the distribution of the Sub-Commissioners and the allocation of business, and ought not to be interfered with. As far as he could learn, one of the two Commissioners was changed to another district as he had no adequate knowledge of the custom of tenant right; and the other had merely been moved, on the breaking up of his Circuit, to the next county.

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, that the noble Lord the Lord President of the Council had stated that the conduct of the Commissioners ought to be above suspicion. He quite agreed with that; but could it be said to be the case when they made alterations such as those referred to in the Question of the noble and learned Earl? He did not think it could be said, after the way in which the Land Act was administered, that its administrators were above suspicion. It had been stated publicly by the Sub-Commissioners that they were acting in the interest of the tenant, and, by so doing, necessarily neglecting to give fair justice to the landlord.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that when the noble Marquess made such a statement as that which had just proceeded from him, they were entitled to call upon him to give them chapter and verse—the names, the dates, and the facts.

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, the noble and learned Earl asked him for facts. He had seen it stated in the newspapers among the reports of their judicial proceedings—and it had not been contradicted—"We will do what we can in the interest of the tenants." That statement had gone all over Ireland, and it ought to have been contradicted in the newspapers if it was not a fact.

The Duke of ABERCORN said, that after the speeches which had fallen from the previous speakers on that side of the House, he would not have ventured to address the House, but for the fact that he had some knowledge of the Northern counties of Ireland. Of the four Northern counties three returned Liberal Members, and in the fourth there was an anticipation of the same result at the next Election. The consequence was that great pressure was put by some Northern Members on the decisions of the Sub-Commissioners; and if those decisions were not made in accordance with the exorbitant reductions expected by the tenants, public meetings were got up, and in these the Northern Liberal Members took an active part, either personally or by letter. As a result, the offending Commissioners had been removed and sent to Connaught and other places. Anyone who read the Liberal papers of the North of Ireland, and had seen the violent attacks made in them on the Sub-Commissioners, and the exultation with which they announced that those attacks had been responded to by the removal of the Commissioners complained of, could have no doubt that undue influence had been exercised. The Lord Chancellor had called upon his noble Friend to prove his assertion.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he had asked the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Waterford) to explain a most serious charge, which should be justified if he believed it to be true.

The Duke of ABERCORN said, an illustration of the system which was adopted was to be found in the speeches made by Mr. Porter, now the highest legal exponent of the law in Ireland, during his canvass at Londonderry about 18 months ago. Mr. Porter, after referring to the advantages the Land Act had given to the tenants, mentioned cases in which 50 per cent had been taken off rents, and suggested that under Healy's Clause the tenant might hope to have one-half of his rent struck off. He went on to ask his hearers whether they would rather have a Representative who would do all he could to carry out the principles of the Land Act, or a man who would interfere with its development and would repeal it to-morrow if he could or dared? He (the Duke of Abercorn) thought this showed the partizan character which applied to this Act, and, with a knowledge of the political machinery into which the Land Act had been turned, he really could not be surprised at the removal of the Sub-Commissioners. The Lord President might shut his eyes to a disagreeable truth; but he could not controvert the fact which was patent to all—namely, that the Land Act had been converted into a political means of bribing the tenants at the expense of the landlords in anticipation of future Elections.

Earl GRANVILLE: It is not my intention to give advice to noble Lords opposite on this question. But I cannot help thinking that it would have been much better had those noble Lords left a question of this sort in the skilful hands of the noble and learned Earl who introduced it, instead of delivering several speeches which did not support his case. I do not know whether it was judicious for the noble and learned Earl to have made the charge he did, a charge which was admirably answered by the noble Lord behind me (Lord Carlingford), and by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Fitzgerald). I do not know either whether it was judicious for the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) to seize this opportunity, when the noble and learned Earl was complaining of an agitation calculated to influence the decision of the Land Commission and the Sub-Commissioners, for making a general attack on those two bodies. As to the statements made by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Waterford) and the noble Duke (the Duke of Abercorn), containing the most serious charges against the administration of this law in Ireland, I must observe that they were made without the slightest support of any fact, excepting the quotation from the speech in which the Attorney General for Ireland expressed his desire to carry out the Land Act in its full meaning.

Lord ORANMORE and BROWNE wished to draw attention to the fact that Mr. Justice O'Hagan was said to be the person who drew up a famous address from the Roman Catholic Bishops on the Land Question, which certainly advocated views very confiscatory of the property of the landlords. If that statement were uncontradicted, Mr. Justice O'Hagan was hardly the person likely to inspire confidence in landlords as Chief Commissioner.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—NON-ENFORCEMENT OF THE COMPULSORY CLAUSES—ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord ORANMORE and BROWNE said, he rose to call attention to a paragraph in the "Times" of the 3rd instant, relative to orders, stated to have been given by Her Majesty's Government to the police not to enforce the Contagious Diseases Acts at Chatham and other places; and to inquire whether such was the case; and, if so, on what grounds Her Majesty's Government had discontinued to carry out an Act of Parliament? The paragraph to which he referred stated that the intelligence that the Acts were not to be enforced had been received with dismay at Portsmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, and other stations. It appeared, in consequence of the recent Resolution of the House of Commons, that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to enforce the Acts in the same way as hitherto. The Government had also made the statement that they could not do so, because of the probability that the House of Commons, having passed a certain Resolution, would not, in all probability, agree to the Vote in Supply necessary for carrying out the Acts. For his own part, he thought it almost impossible that the other House of Parliament would not agree to grant the Supplies necessary for carrying out an Act of Parliament which was in existence. If, however, such a policy were to be adopted, what would be the result? It would, in fact, amount to this—that the House of Commons would be setting aside an Act of Parliament, and the whole Constitution of the country would come to an end. A policy of that kind would be most dangerous, and he, for one, would enter his protest against it.

The Earl of NORTHBROOK said, that the statement referred to by the noble Lord was substantially correct. As their Lordships were probably aware, the House of Commons, by a majority, had arrived at a conclusion against the compulsory examination of women under the Contagious Diseases Acts. Under these circumstances, the Government had considered which course it would be best to take. They found that the action necessary under the Acts was in the main permissive, and not obligatory. Therefore they thought that, under the circumstances, it was desirable no longer to employ the Metropolitan Police for the purpose of carrying out the compulsory clauses of the Acts, in regard to examination. Indeed, the carrying out of the Acts at all depended upon the monies provided by Parliament. The Vote for the year had not yet been introduced; and his noble Friend must see that, as a practical question, it was impossible to expect the other House of Parliament to vote any sums for the purpose of carrying out compulsory examination, seeing that they had deliberately come to the conclusion—not by a snatch vote, as had been said, but by a majority of 72—against the operation of that portion of the Act. It had accordingly been decided to withdraw the Metropolitan Police from the duty of carrying out that portion of the Act, and at a later period of the Session to introduce a Bill modifying the Acts, retaining only those portions which referred to voluntary submission, and leaving out the compulsory examination. He believed that the action the Government had decided on taking was almost the only practicable course under the circumstances.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE said, that the noble Earl laboured under some difficulty in answering the Question that had been put to him. He had told them that the Government intended to bring in a Bill to change the law; but, looking at the state of Public Business, it seemed improbable that any such Act of Parliament could be passed this Session. If that were so, the Government were practically surrendering the powers of the Executive into the hands of a body of gentlemen who were, no doubt, actuated by the most Christian-like feelings in wishing to alter an Act of Parliament, which, he ventured to say, was one of the most beneficial and charitable measures that ever had been passed. When these Acts were first introduced into Parliament, it was the most anxious desire of the then Executive Government that they should be passed in order to prevent the contamination of a large body of the people by men in the Naval and Military Services of the country. Those Acts had been most beneficial to the community at large, and he thought it most unwise, and, indeed, most illegal, for the Government, in obedience to a snatch vote in the other House of Parliament, to abrogate the most useful part of those Statutes. The question was one of a painful character, and one that had invariably been slurred over by Parliament when it happened to be brought under discussion. The illustrious Duke (the Duke of Cambridge) knew perfectly well how the Act of 1866 had worked. Wherever it had been in force, the advantage had been most marked. He ought to tell the noble Earl the First Lord of the Admiralty that he (the Earl of Hardwicke) had always thoroughly endorsed the operation of the Acts. His noble Friend the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington), when the question was brought forward by Mr. Stansfeld, had also endorsed the operation of the Acts. But what had been the course of Ministers since? Although the Prime Minister admitted that the question was one of great difficulty, and one over which Ministers themselves were divided, yet he had chosen a course of policy which, to his mind, ought to be resisted by their Lordships. He had letters in his pocket from a gentleman in the Naval Service, who was at present residing at Portsmouth. These letters had been given to him by Sir H. Drummond Wolff; and they had been slightly alluded to in the speech of that Gentleman made in the House of Commons 10 days ago. To him these letters seemed so intrinsically important that he would take the liberty of reading from them one or two extracts. The first letter—dated 5th March, said—

> "I think it is right you should know what a strong feeling exists in this place amongst men of all shades of political opinion in favour of retaining the Contagious Diseases Acts in their integrity. The abolition of compulsory examination will virtually annul the Acts, and will certainly deprive them of their efficiency. A strong remonstrance from the leading inhabitants has been prepared, and it is in course of signature."

The writer added—

> "The moral tone of this place is immensely improved since the Acts have been in operation. I allude to the moral tone, because those philanthropic gentlemen who have addressed Parliament argue that it is against the principles of morality, and the instincts of a Christian nation, that such Acts should exist. We anticipate the most disastrous results if the Acts are abolished, or so modified as to do away with compulsory examination."

Then the writer alluded to the number of unfortunate women who had been rescued by means of the Acts. That, he might say, represented the general feeling throughout the country—not only at Portsmouth, but at the whole of the towns brought under the operation of these Acts. He had, at the same time, to express grave doubts whether the Government was legally justified in the course it was pursuing. Their Lordships had nothing to do with the necessary payments for carrying out the Acts. If the question had been brought up when the Estimates were brought forward it would have been properly discussed. That would have been a proper opportunity for Members to take part in the debate, and the question would not have been disposed of in the manner of which they had cognizance. In conclusion, he would express a strong hope that Her Majesty's Government would, in the discharge of a great public duty, give earnest consideration to the question whether they should not further inquire into this matter before they attempted to repeal these Acts.

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, I do not desire to prolong the discussion upon this painful, though most important subject. I must, however, say that these Acts have done far more good than people out-of-doors suppose, and that the physical and moral benefits which they have conferred upon the community at large, as well as upon the Navy and the Army, are enormous. It is perfectly true, as has been stated, that public opinion, in all places where these Acts have been applied, is uniformly in favour of their continuance. That being the case, it appears to me to be an extraordinary thing that it should be proposed to sweep away these Acts at once without more full discussion of the subject. I frankly admit that the question is a most difficult one; but I pray your Lordships not to allow these most beneficial measures to be swept away, simply because there has been a discussion in the other House which has led to a vote which, it now appears, will do away with the compulsory powers of the Statutes, and thereby effect a change in them which will greatly modify their useful effect. I am aware that this is a very disagreeable subject to speak upon; but I must repeat that more good has resulted from these Acts than is generally supposed, and I trust, therefore, that they will not be repealed without the fullest further consideration. I can assure your Lordships that I do not advocate the continuance of these Acts merely on the ground that they are most beneficial to the Service with which I am connected, but because I conscientiously believe that they are of immense advantage to the community at large, and more especially to the unfortunate creatures who come under their operation, numbers of whom have been rescued from their unhappy life solely through the medium of these Statutes. I should wish it to be thoroughly understood that the moral effect of the Acts has been very great.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he did not rise to say one word on the question of the policy of the Acts, or of the alteration in regard to them in consequence of the vote in the House of Commons. But, as the noble Earl (the Earl of Hardwicke) had suggested that there was illegality in the course which the Government had taken since that vote was given, he would say a word in explanation. Undoubtedly, it was not in the power of the Government, without an Act of Parliament, to suspend the operation of any Act of Parliament enforced at the time being, and the Government had not taken upon themselves to do so. The only matters of obligation cast upon the Government by the Act of Parliament was that the Admiralty or the War Office should appoint medical officers for certain purposes, to act in certain hospitals; but he could not discover in the Acts any direct obligation laid on Government, either expressly or by necessary implication, to take active steps with the view of putting in force those powers of the Acts which had reference to the compulsory examination of certain persons taking place. The power of compulsory examination depended upon an order of a Justice of the Peace, which order might be made when information on oath was laid before him by a Superintendent of Police and supported by certain proofs. The Government had not, and could not, take upon themselves to prevent any Justice of the Peace from acting in the manner authorized by the Acts upon information laid by a Superintendent of Police; and there was nothing in the Acts which imposed upon the Government the duty of using any powers which they possessed to set in motion the police authorities for that purpose. Undoubtedly, so long as there was no vote passed by the House of Commons adverse to the operation of this part of the Acts, it was perfectly right that the Government should take measures, by the special employment of police, to see that the Acts were put in operation when they thought that public advantage would result from it; but when the House of Commons passed a vote expressing an opinion, by a large majority, that there should not be compulsory examination, the Government were, at all events, not transgressing any part of the enactments, nor were they neglecting any obligation directly laid on them by the Acts, if they abstained from taking active means contrary to the Resolution of the House of Commons.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he was a little surprised at the doctrine laid down by the Lord Chancellor. It seemed to him to lead rather further than he contemplated. He understood that the action of the Government would prevent the police from laying those informations which were necessary to carry these Acts into operation. If that was the case, it was obvious that by the vote of the House of Commons it was practicable to suspend the operation of the whole Criminal Law of the land, so far as it depended upon the action of the police setting the provisions in motion. He could hardly imagine that the noble and learned Earl would lay down so large a doctrine as that, and he hoped to listen to some qualification of it from him.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he did not lay down any such doctrine as that attributed to him. The Government had not power to prevent the police in those parts of the country from taking such measures as they might think fit to bring charges before the magistrates. What the Government had power to do, and certainly what they did, was to abstain from taking active measures on their own part to cause the police to make those charges.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE said, he thought the noble and learned Earl did not understand what the Government had done, because the result of their action was the withdrawal of the Metropolitan Police, who were the people appointed to investigate what was going on. That was the whole gist of the matter. The withdrawal of the money had nothing to do with the action of the magistrates, or with the unfortunate persons who were brought before them, but with the detective force.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE LAW ADVISER.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF LIMERICK (on behalf of the Earl of MILLTOWN) asked Her Majesty's Government, Why they have decided to refuse justices of the peace in Ireland the assistance of the advice of the law officers which has hitherto been always accorded them in cases of doubt or difficulty; whether they propose any substitute for the custom which has hitherto subsisted; or whether the magistrates, very few of whom have had a legal education, and none of whom have the assistance of a legal clerk, are to be left entirely to their own devices?

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL): The question really was whether the officer known by the name of the Law Adviser, with the special function of advising magistrates all over Ireland, should be maintained or not. That question had been decided in the negative, after it had had the most careful consideration of the Lord Lieutenant, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and the Law Officers; they came to the conclusion that the system need not longer be continued. The principle was objectionable, and it was no more desirable, if it could be avoided, that there should be a connection between the magistrates and a Legal Adviser in Dublin Castle than it was desirable in England. Among other considerations which had weighed with the Lord Lieutenant was the fact that the number of cases in which advice had been sought of late years had largely decreased; and, on the other hand, the Petty Sessions' clerks had, upon the whole, considerably improved. Though this change would put an end to the office which had existed, yet the Chief Secretary for Ireland had stated that if any serious inconvenience should follow for a time by the change, the Government would be prepared to meet it, and to give such assistance as they might think absolutely necessary to the magistrates; and this could be done, of course, without continuing the office of Law Adviser.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, he doubted the wisdom of the abolition of the office of Law Adviser. He did not think the noble Lord knew what the clerks of Petty Sessions in many cases were. The cases submitted to the magistrates were frequently very difficult to decide; and the Acts of Parliament in force were so numerous that the magistrates often required the assistance of a Legal Adviser in their construction.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, he hoped the result of the change would be that a higher class of men would be appointed to the office of Petty Session clerks.

LORD FITZGERALD said, that, as far as he was aware, the system which he now learned had been abolished had worked well, and he thought that this was not the time to make the changes proposed. There was no analogy between the two countries in reference to this matter, because in this country the magistrates had the advice and assistance of experienced solicitors as clerks, whereas in Ireland the clerks of Petty Sessions were not solicitors. The office of Law Adviser had originally been established by Mr. Drummond, when Under Secretary, in order to promote a uniform and homogeneous administration of the law at Petty Sessions. It was then proposed to be filled by a junior barrister at a very moderate salary. The office had grown to much larger dimensions, and he thought it ought to be brought back to its original position. It was an excrescence and an anomaly, and could not be defended as a permanent institution; but he had no doubt that, in the present period of crisis and difficulty, it was unwise to make the change. If it was a Treasury movement for economy, and if the Law Officers were to be substituted for the Advisers, he had no doubt that in place of a diminution there would be an increase of expenditure.

THE EARL OF BELMORE said, that the number of references to the Castle had decreased, probably owing to the increased number of Resident Magistrates. Gentlemen, however, were now being appointed as ordinary magistrates in all parts of Ireland, of a lower social status, and of less education, than that of the class to which formerly the magistracy was generally confined; and these would be, perhaps, even more in a difficulty sometimes than were the country gentleman Justices. He hoped that the magistrates in Ireland would be able to send to Dublin Castle for advice in cases in which they thought it necessary, notwithstanding the proposed changes.

The Earl of Longford

CATHEDRAL STATUTES BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to provide for the making or altering of Cathedral Statutes—Was *presented* by The Lord Bishop of CARLISLE; read 1ª. (No. 58.)

NAVAL DISCIPLINE AND ENLISTMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Naval Discipline Act, 1866, and the Naval Enlistment Act, 1866—Was *presented* by The Earl of NORTHBROOK; read 1ª. (No. 61.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, to Thursday the 24th instant, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 10*th May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Harbours of Refuge, *nominated.*

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Poor Law Conferences * [187]; Agricultural Holdings (England) [186]; Medals * [188]; Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) [190]; Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) * [191]; Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland) * [189].

Committee—Report—Customs and Inland Revenue [140].

Third Reading—Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders * [144], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—CASE OF JAMES M'GOWAN, JUNR., CONACLOON, CO. LEITRIM.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether James M'Gowan, junior, of Conacloon, county Leitrim, settled his rent up till the 1st of November, 1881, under the Arrears Act; and, whether the special bailiff of his landlord has threatened to seize the goods of M'Gowan for said arrears; and, if so, whether he is entitled to any redress?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have not thought it part of my duty to inquire whether or not Mr. James M'Gowan has paid his rent. In the latter paragraph of the Question the hon. Member asks me whether a private individual threatens to commit a breach of the law by seizing goods for a debt already paid. All I can say is, that if such a thing happens the person aggrieved has his legal remedy.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—NON-ENFORCEMENT OF COMPULSORY EXAMINATION — WITHDRAWAL OF THE POLICE FROM CHATHAM—ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

MR. J. G. TALBOT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is correct that a protest has been sent to him from the Medway Board of Guardians against the withdrawal of the Metropolitan Police from Chatham; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay a Copy of this document upon the Table of the House, and further to state what action he proposes to take in the matter?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have received the protest; but there is no object in laying the document on the Table of the House. I have already explained to the House the course that the Government have felt themselves bound to take in consequence of the vote to which the House has come. I suppose the House was fully aware that the local authorities in places where the Acts were in operation were in favour of them. I do not see that a protest of this kind alters the situation at all. The action the Government has taken is consequent upon the vote of the House. The police generally will be withdrawn; but a limited number of Inspectors will remain, so far as may be necessary for carrying out the Acts as to those who voluntarily submit themselves. This is almost a ministerial duty on the part of the Inspectors of Police.

MR. HOPWOOD asked if voluntary submission was to be revived with all its imperfections?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, it was not revived; it was in the Act of Parliament. It had already been stated that the action of the Government would be confined to that part of the Act which was condemned by the Resolution of the House — namely, compulsory examination.

MR. HOPWOOD gave Notice that he should challenge the employment of these police on the Estimates.

ARMY—MUSKETRY INSTRUCTORS.

MR. R. H. PAGET asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will be good enough to state whether it is intended at once to abolish the office of musketry instructors (Officers and Sergeants) in Militia Battalions as well as in those of the Line?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It is not intended to abolish the musketry instructors (either officers or sergeants) in the Militia Battalions; as Militia officers, from not being constantly on duty like officers of the Line, cannot be expected to be generally qualified to impart musketry instruction. Moreover, very few hold Hythe certificates.

WESTERN ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC—AUSTRALIAN COLONIES — ANNEXATION OF NEW GUINEA BY QUEENSLAND.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether his attention has been called to the following paragraph which has appeared in many London and provincial newspapers:—

> "The Exchange Telegraph Company learns that as long ago as June last Lord Kimberley had received an intimation as to the annexation of New Guinea. At that time the Governorship of Queensland had been promised definitely to Sir John Pope Hennessy, but as soon as the intention to annex became known to the Colonial Office, the appointment was not made, as it was well known that Sir John Pope Hennessy was opposed to any such annexation, and would offer the scheme of the planters to introduce the blacks of New Guinea into Queensland to work the plantations on the northern shore the most determined opposition;"

and, whether these statements are true?

MR. COURTNEY: In the unavoidable absence of my hon. Friend, I have to say that the statements in question are altogether incorrect. No intimation was received by Her Majesty's Government until February last that the question of the annexation of New Guinea was likely to be revived by any Australian Government.

METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING ACTS AMENDMENT ACT—THE "HOTEL METROPOLE."

MR. STORY-MASKELYNE asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether the design for the vast building in the Northumberland

Avenue, designated as the "Hôtel Métropole," has received the sanction of the Institute of British Architects, as required by the Act of Parliament?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: The design for the Hôtel Métropole was submitted to the Institute of British Architects, as required by the Act of Parliament; but, after due consideration, the Board did not think it necessary to put the tenant to the expense of carrying out the alterations suggested by the Institute, having regard to the fact that the plans for the building had already been amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Board's architect, who was himself then a member of the Council of the Institute.

IRELAND—STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION.

Mr. MAC IVER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the State-aided emigration to the United States which is conducted by Mr. Tuke's Committee consists entirely of persons who are likely to be able to support themselves; whether it is true that the United States authorities absolutely decline to take any others; and, by what arrangements Her Majesty's Government hope to relieve the burden of pauperism caused by a system of emigration which compels an ever-increasing proportion of persons who are infirm and ailing to remain behind?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The State-aided emigration conducted by Mr. Tuke's Committee consists entirely of persons who are likely to be able to support themselves and the members of their families who accompany them. I have before stated in the House that the proportion between workers and non-workers is carefully observed. The United States Government have made rules to prevent the introduction into the United States of persons likely to become a charge to the public. With regard to the third paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, the Government consider that the emigration of many of the occupiers of small farms, and the consequent enlargement of the holdings in the congested districts, must improve the position of the occupiers of land left behind. ["Oh!"] I think it is a well-founded opinion. I may observe, also, that one feature of the assisted emigration under the Arrears Act is that we assist no one to go who is a means of support to those whom he would leave behind. In the few exceptions of assisted emigration of single individuals this point is carefully observed. Those who remain are not in a worse, but in a better position than they were before.

Mr. O'KELLY: Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to the protest of the Governor of Massachusetts as to persons landing in that State who have no adequate means of support? I would ask, also, whether the exportation of these poor people takes place for the benefit of the ratepayers here at the expense of the American ratepayers?

Mr. MAYNE: I would also ask the right hon. Gentleman in what way he considers that the assisted emigration of people who are able to support themselves adds to the prosperity of the district they leave?

[No reply was given.]

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—CO. LONGFORD.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he can say why the Sub-Commissioners under the Land Law Act are not to hold a Court at Granard, county Longford, this time, as usual, but are to hear all the cases belonging to Granard Union in the town of Longford, thereby in some cases compelling suitors to come in from places more than 20 miles distant?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I can only repeat what I stated in reply to the hon. Member's former Question on the same subject a few days ago. The Land Commissioners fixed upon the town of Longford as the best place for opening the Court, and the Sub-Commissioners had power to adjourn for the hearing of cases to any other town in the county that may be more convenient to the parties interested, which it is understood they consult.

HALL-MARKING (GOLD AND SILVER PLATE)—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE (1878-9).

Mr. CALLAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, with a view to giving effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee on Hall-Marking (1878-9)—

> "That the duties upon gold and silver plate should be abolished, as soon as the state of the revenue may admit,"

Her Majesty's Government will take such steps as may be necessary to ascertain the probable amount of a fair and reasonable drawback upon stocks of new and unused plate in the hands of licensed manufacturers and dealers?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that although the Select Committee of 1878 and 1879 on Hall-Marking incidentally reported against the continuance of the duties on gold and silver plate, that question was not mentioned in the reference to them, and their Report contained no allusion to the drawbacks on stocks of unused plate, the only real difficulty in connection with the question of duty. I have already stated that I have no intention to propose to repeal the duty; and I may say that until some understanding is arrived at as to what would be a reasonable drawback it would be useless to endeavour to ascertain its amount. The claim of the majority of the trade is for the return of all the duty paid on unused plate, without limit of time, if the duty should be repealed.

ITALY—RENEWAL OF COMMERCIAL TREATY.

MR. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is in a position to give any assurance to the House that the Commercial Treaty between this Country and Italy will be renewed prior to the expiration of the existing Treaty on the 30th June next; and, if he cannot give that assurance, whether Her Majesty's Government will take measures to obtain the most favoured nation treatment for this country, so as to protect the British textile trades from the serious injury they would suffer from the new General Tariff of Italy?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Negotiations are now in progress for the renewal of the Commercial Treaty between this country and Italy; and I hope that I shall be in a position immediately after the Whitsuntide Recess to give a full reply to my hon. Friend.

LAW AND JUSTICE—DORMANT FUNDS IN CHANCERY.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON asked the Secretary the Treasury, If his attention has been called to the fact that the List of Dormant Funds in Chancery, issued in 1881, has long been out of print, so that suitors are unable to obtain copies; and, if he will take steps in future that copies shall always be available?

MR. COURTNEY: I learn that it is the fact that the Supplement of *The London Gazette* which contained the last list is out of print, owing to the demand for it having been greater than was expected. Care will be taken in future to print a sufficient number of copies. But I believe copies of the list are filed in the Report Office and exhibited in the several offices of the Court, so that suitors can have access to it. I may remind the hon. Member that a new and improved list will be published in six months.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—ROSSCLARE PIER AND HARBOUR.

COLONEL COLTHURST asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, with respect to the additional loan applied for to complete Rossclare Harbour, Whether he is aware that the said loan was recommended to the Treasury in November 1881 by the then Chief Secretary, on the grounds that the only way to make productive the large sums already spent on the Pier and on the Railway was for their Lordships to sanction such further loan as would enable the work to be completed; and, whether he will recommend a further inquiry?

MR. COURTNEY: Yes, Sir; the late Chief Secretary did make the statement quoted; but he did not give the grounds upon which he formed his opinion. Since that date the case has been further inquired into by the Public Works Loans Commissioners, who are responsible for the loan, with the result I stated on Monday. I fear the case is a very hopeless one, and that a further loan would only be throwing good money after bad.

COLONEL COLTHURST: Will the hon. Gentleman make further inquiry?

MR. COURTNEY: I have made inquiry.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—APPOINTMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICER TO THE CASHEL DISPENSARY DISTRICT.

Mr. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that no appointment of a medical officer has yet been made to the Cashel Dispensary district, though the vacancy has existed since December; whether, in obedience to the instructions of the Local Government Board ordering them to proceed without delay to the election of a medical officer, the Dispensary Committee met on the 1st of May, but again postponed the election till the 14th of July; and, what steps the Local Government Board now intend to take?

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, it was a fact that no appointment had yet been made. The Local Government Board wrote to the Dispensary Committee, on the 19th of last month, expressing a hope that the necessary steps would be taken at once to make the appointment. The Committee, on the 1st of May, considered the subject, and postponed the election until the 14th of July. The Local Government Board had no power to override this decision of the Committee.

Mr. MOORE: Am I to understand that the Irish Local Government Board have no power to appoint a medical officer for the district, by sealed order or otherwise, when the Guardians persist in keeping open the vacancy?

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he presumed such a case as this had probably never occurred before; and he could assure the hon. Member that when the appointment was made the Local Government Board would carefully consider the qualifications of the candidate, with a view of ascertaining whether there was any connection between his appointment and the keeping open of the vacancy for so long a period.

Mr. MOORE asked how long, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, was this large district to be left without a medical officer in order to allow an unqualified practitioner to become qualified for the vacancy?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I thought the hon. Member would have understood that what I said a moment ago had reference to that phase of the question.

NAVY (THE BLUE RIBBON).

Mr. STEWART MACLIVER asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If his attention has been called to the case of Frederick Graham, a warrant officer's servant on board H.M.S. "Royal Adelaide," lying at Devonport, who had on 30th April fourteen days' leave stopped by Commander Dugdale, for wearing on shore what was called an unauthorized decoration, generally known as the blue ribbon; and, whether such interference with men in the Navy wearing temperance badges while off duty meets with the sanction of the Admiralty?

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is the fact that Frederick William Graham, warrant officer's servant, belonging to the *Royal Adelaide*, was arrested by the patrol on the 29th ultimo, while on shore on leave, for being improperly dressed, as he was wearing a blue ribbon on his uniform jacket, which ribbon is only authorized to be worn by persons who have been awarded the Victoria Cross, Egyptian Bronze Star, or Royal Humane Society's Medal, none of which decorations have been received by him. For this offence his leave was stopped for 14 days by the commanding officer. Directly upon the circumstances being brought to the notice of the Commander-in-Chief he remitted the punishment as unnecessarily severe, in which opinion the Admiralty concur. The House will, however, see how much inconvenience would arise if it were allowed that badges, however innocent and even laudable their significance, should be worn by men when in uniform. Besides the danger of their being mistaken for authorized decorations such as those I have named, badges might come to be worn indicative of different opinions on social, political, and religious questions; and it is, therefore, undesirable that any additions should be permitted to the regulated uniform of Her Majesty's Service.

BALLOT ACT CONTINUANCE AND AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. RYLANDS asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether, in Committee on the Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill, he will give favourable consideration to the proposal to extend the provisions of the Bill to the election of Local Boards, Town Improvement Commissioners, and Boards of Guardians?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: As the addition of any further provisions to the Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill might delay its progress through Parliament, I regret that I cannot consent to my hon. Friend's proposal to extend its provisions to the election of Local Boards, Town Improvement Commissioners, and Boards of Guardians, which have never before been included in legislation having reference to Parliamentary and municipal elections. Her Majesty's Government is, however, favourable to the application of the ballot to such elections, and hope to deal with the matter at a future date.

Mr. RYLANDS said, that, in consequence of the reply which he had received, he would not press the matter further in regard to this Bill; but on an early day he would submit a Resolution to the House on the subject.

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—WESTMINSTER HALL (WESTERN SIDE).

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the First Commissioner of Works, If it is true that he has employed an architect to devise a plan for the restoration of the western side of Westminster Hall; and, if he will come to the House for a Vote before any considerable work is undertaken?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I have appointed the eminent architect, Mr. Pearson, to advise and superintend the restoration of the west front of Westminster Hall. It is certainly not contemplated to erect any buildings there. The hon. Member will find an item of £2,000 for this purpose in the first Vote which will be taken in Supply to-night.

HALL MARKING (GOLD AND SILVER PLATE) (INDIA).

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether any communication has been made to Her Majesty's Government, on the part of the Government of India, with reference to the taxation of gold and silver plate, and the practice of compulsory hall marking of gold and silver wares; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will lay upon the Table of the House any Correspondence relating thereto?

Mr. J. K. CROSS, in reply, said, that the Treasury had been corresponding with the Indian Government on this subject. If the hon. Member chose to move for the Correspondence he would lay it on the Table of the House.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—MARTIN NASH.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Martin Nash, aged 19, a native of Queen's County, Ireland, was, on the 23rd ult., brought up before the Penzance Borough Bench, charged on remand with wandering abroad, and having no visible means of subsistence, and whether he made the following statement to the magistrates:—

> "I have been from home 17 months. I have worked in coal pits near Newcastle. Last Tuesday I went into Newcastle to buy a pair of boots intending to return, having 15*s.* in my possession at the time, but I met two sailors who took charge of me and said they would take me to America, I having said I would like to go there. I gave them six shillings, and we spent the rest of the money I had in drink. They put me down where the coals were, and I was there from Tuesday evening to Thursday morning. I had some bread in my pocket while in the coal place. On Thursday morning I came before the captain, who kept me on deck till Friday, when he put me on shore at a place called Mousehole. I then had three pence in my pocket. I had no luggage. I came on to Penzance, and went into a public house and had a glass of beer. I did not go to see any person;"

whether this account was confirmed by the police, so far as regarded the putting ashore of the prisoner from the steamer, and whether the magistrates sent him to Bodmin Gaol for a fortnight as a vagrant; and, whether he will cause any compensation to be given to Martin Nash?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that he had been informed of this case. Nash, who had been a stowaway on board a vessel going to America—in itself an offence—was found as a vagrant at Penzance, and for that offence was imprisoned. The hon. Member had asked him if compensation would be given to Martin Nash. He was afraid a practice of giving compensation to persons under these circumstances would tend to make the grants very large.

Mr. SEXTON asked whether a person who practised an honest industry, who went to a locality where that industry was carried on, and who did not loiter or ask any alms, which was the case with Nash, could be sent to prison as a vagrant?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT replied, that an erroneous view of the facts appeared to have been communicated to the hon. Member.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST WORKHOUSE—IRREGULARITIES IN BOOK-KEEPING.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he is aware that the Belfast Guardians agreed on the 24th of April 1883 to accept as "satisfactory" a written explanation from the workhouse master respecting the tampering with the books in his charge; if the Local Government Board have censured the guardians, by implication, by declining to confirm their resolution respecting the falsification of the books; if it be true that the Local Government Board have stated in a communication to the guardians that food has been charged in the master's books, as having been supplied to paupers, who were not inmates of the workhouse on the particular dates shown in said books; if it be correct that, by this system of book-keeping, large surpluses of certain articles of food were created which were not credited on the provision book; and, whether, after considering the letter of the Local Government Board, he will continue in office the officials so acting?

Mr. TREVELYAN: It is the case that on the 24th of April the Belfast Guardians received an explanation from the workhouse master respecting the manner in which the diet books had been kept, and that they unanimously resolved that they considered it satisfactory. The Local Government Board, on learning this, informed the Guardians that they did not consider it altogether satisfactory, as it was the duty of the master to report to the Guardians any departure from the approved scale of dietary, and they requested that the matter should be further inquired into, which was done by the Visiting Committee, who made a Report on the subject, and gave directions as to the manner in which the books should be kept in future. The imperfect manner in which the books were formerly kept has met with the necessary attention. The Local Government Board inform me that there is no ground for supposing that fraud was intended or committed, and there is no reason why the officers concerned should not be retained in office.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—CONDUCT OF THE POLICE.

Mr. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a paragraph in the "Westmeath Examiner" of Saturday, which states that on Tuesday last a detective and head constable visited a man who resided at Collinstown, in the county of Westmeath, and questioned him as to his knowledge of the murder of Mrs. Smythe; that they stated to him that they did not suspect him of the murder, but that he must know all about it; and that before leaving, one of them addressed him with clenched fist, called him a ruffian and puppy, and said the day would come when he would be glad to give information, but would not get the opportunity; and, whether the statements in this paragraph are true?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I have seen the paragraph referred to; and, having made inquiry on the subject, I am able to state that it contains a very garbled and incorrect account of what occurred. The allegations of misconduct on the part of the police are without foundation.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EMPLOYMENT IN CULTIVATING FARMS OF EVICTED TENANTS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If sub-constables Kilvehan and Murphy have been employed in ploughing a farm on the estate of Mr. Desmond Fitzgerald, at Ballyculhane, county Limerick, from which a tenant had been evicted; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's advisers in Ireland are prepared to employ the Constabulary in cultivating the evicted farms, so as to render eviction profitable to the landlords?

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, he had called for a Report; but it had not come to hand, owing to telegraphic communication having broken down, he believed, in consequence of a snowstorm.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—DUNFANAGHY WORKHOUSE.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the report in the "Derry Journal" of May 2nd, of an investigation held by Dr. Woodhouse with respect to gross abuses in the administration of the Dunfanaghy Workhouse; whether he is aware that it was sworn that an imbecile pauper inmate named Annie Haigney, daughter of a broken-down tenant, was delivered of an illegitimate child in the workhouse; whether he is also aware that the girl's sister, who had also been an inmate of the workhouse, swore that the Master, Mr. Greer, had misconducted himself towards her during her residence in the workhouse, and that her imbecile sister had complained to her of similar misconduct on his part; whether the Rev. Father Kelly swore that Jane Easton, a nurse in the infirmary, had reported to him certain irregularities in the house, and whether this statement, though disavowed by Jane Easton, was confirmed by the evidence of another nurse, Frances O'Donnell, who swore that Jane Easton had reported to her that the Master was looking after all the women in the house; whether the Master denied that he was the father of Anne Haigney's child; what steps the Local Government Board have taken to purify the administration of the Dunfanaghy Workhouse; and, whether the workhouse in which an idiot girl was subject to outrages of the character disclosed in the evidence is the only refuge, except emigration, offered by the Government or by the Board of Guardians to the thousands of distressed persons in the Dunfanaghy Union?

Mr. TREVELYAN: With regard to this very serious question the Local Government Board inform me that they have under consideration at present the Report of their Inspector, and that when they come to a conclusion they will inform me as to the result. At present the Local Government Board cannot say whether all the evidence produced is reliable; but the matter will receive attention.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—OUTDOOR RELIEF—DUNFANAGHY BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to his statement that complaint was not made of any neglect by the Dunfanaghy Board of Guardians, in the administration of outdoor relief, Whether the Rev. James M'Fadden, P.P., Gweedore, has repeatedly complained since January last that the guardians were systematically refusing out-door relief in all cases, and that the communications No. 359 and No. 37,617 from the Local Government Board, are acknowledgments of representations to this effect; whether, as stated to the Rev. Father M'Fadden by the relieving officer, that that official has received strict directions from the Board of Guardians to "offer nothing but the workhouse;" whether out-door relief was in fact refused in all cases, including a number of cases represented by Father M'Fadden as those of persons qualified by law to receive it; whether the Dunfanaghy Board of Guardians is under the control of landlords who are liable for the entire poor rates of large numbers of holdings under £4 valuation; and, what expenditure was actually made by the Guardians or the Government to assist private charity in aiding people during the last three months?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am informed that in December last the Rev. Mr. M'Fadden wrote to the Local Government Board saying that distress was impending, and, in many cases, existing, in certain town lands, and urging some scheme of remunerative employment. This is the letter referred to as numbered 39,617. In January Mr. M'Fadden wrote again to the Board, forwarding a copy of a letter which he had written to the Guardians mentioning several cases of distress. The Board sent an Inspector to the Union, and there did not appear to be any default on the part of the Guardians or their officers in regard to the administration of relief. This is the communication numbered 359. The Guardians deny having ever given the relieving officer instructions to refuse all outdoor relief; but they did direct him to be very cautious about it in places where they believed the reports of distress were exaggerated. It is evident that the

Guardians of Dunfanaghy Union have given indoor, in preference to outdoor relief, to destitute poor persons requiring it. In doing so, they exercised a discretion expressly vested in them by the Poor Relief Acts. There is no doubt that a large proportion of the holdings in Dunfanaghy Union are valued at and under £4. I am unable to say to what extent the Board of Guardians is under "landlord influence." I am not aware that any expenditure was incurred in this Union during the past three months to aid private charity in assisting poor people beyond that involved in the administration of the Poor Law.

IRELAND—HUNTING IN CARLOW CO.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to a report of a case tried before a Dublin Special Jury on February 13th last, in which Mr. Patrick Fenlon, a tenant farmer of county Carlow, brought an action against one John M'Clintock Bunbury for assault and battery; if it is a fact that Mr. Bunbury and others attempted to ride over the lands of Patrick Fenlon, although a notice was served on the Master of the Carlow Hounds prohibiting hunting over said lands; if Fenlon warned off the trespassers, but Mr. Bunbury refused to turn aside, and struck Mr. Fenlon on the head with a whip; if Mr. Beauchamp Bagenal, who was examined as a witness for the defence, gave in evidence that he was a justice of the peace for Carlow county, and that he would have acted as Mr. Bunbury did under similar circumstances; if it is a fact that the jury found for the plaintiff, with damages; if, since then, one W. B. Pearse, J.P., who was also a party to the assault on Mr. Fenlon, has tendered in damages a sum equal in amount to that recovered in the action; and, if the facts are as stated, and if the three persons mentioned are justices of the peace for Carlow county, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland intends removing them from the list of magistrates?

Mr. TREVELYAN: My attention has been drawn to this case, which has also been under the consideration of the Lord Chancellor, and I have received a Report from his Lordship's Secretary, from which it appears that the facts are not correctly set forth in this Question, but are as follows:—A number of farmers of the county of Carlow had served a notice on the Master of the Hounds prohibiting hunting over their lands; but many of the persons whose names were attached to that notice informed the Master that they had signed under pressure and were in favour of the hunt being carried on as usual, and accordingly hunting was carried on until the day of the occurrence which became the subject of the action referred to. On that day a number of persons who were following the hunt crossed Fenlon's land without objection from him, and even caused a gap to be broken to allow a lady to pass. It was not until Mr. Bunbury came on the farm that Fenlon make any objection. He did not refuse to go when warned off. On the contrary, he said he would leave if Fenlon would show him the boundary of the farm, and that he would pay any damage caused by the trespass. The assault was occasioned by Fenlon catching Mr. Bunbury's horse by the bridle and forcing him back on his haunches. The Lord Chancellor has accepted Mr. Bunbury's assurance that he will in future use every means in his power to avoid going on the lands of those persons who object to his doing so, and he does not consider it necessary to take any further action in the matter. With regard to the other gentlemen named, the Lord Chancellor is not aware that anything transpired at the trial to warrant his withdrawing the Commission of the Peace from either of them. I gather that the Lord Chancellor's letter to Mr. Bunbury was more stiff than was mentioned in the letter of his Lordship's Secretary. I wish to say that people who follow the hounds ought to be careful not to go over farms on which a farmer has posted a legal notice against it. However, this matter does not rest with me, but with the Lord Chancellor.

Mr. KENNY said, the right hon. Gentleman had not answered that part of the Question which inquired what justification there was for the assault upon Mr. Fenlon.

Mr. TREVELYAN replied, that this was the first time the matter had been brought under the notice of the Lord Chancellor, and his Lordship had written that he was inquiring into the case.

MR. O'KELLY: Can the right hon. Gentleman state what would have happened to Mr. Fenlon if he had attacked Mr. Bunbury under similar circumstances?

MR. TREVELYAN: I would do exactly the same.

MR. O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that some young men who were convicted of preventing a hunt at Loughrea, county Galway, were sentenced to seven years' penal servitude?

MR. HARRINGTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman state whether he considers that Mr. Bunbury's own assurance is sufficient, considering the high securities required from others for keeping the peace?

MR. TREVELYAN said, he hoped the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien) would put his Question formally, and he would make inquiries.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 14—POLICE SEARCHES.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to an article in the "Kerry Sentinel" of Friday last, which complains of the midnight raids now repeatedly made by the police at a time when the county has settled down, and when outrage has almost disappeared; whether it is true, as stated in that article, that peaceable and respectable people are suffering as much now from police raids by night as they did a year ago from the terror of the moonlight gang; and, whether it is true, as stated there, that the police recently entered at night the house of Mr. Leahy, P.L.G., and, although his wife was dangerously ill, persisted in entering and searching the room where she lay ill?

MR. TREVELYAN: The police had very good reasons to search Mr. Leahy's house. Papers of a compromising character were found there. The search was conducted with as little as possible inconvenience to the inmates of the house. Respectable people have not complained of the searches which it has been necessary to make.

MR. HARRINGTON asked whether Mrs. Leahy was not ill when the search was made?

MR. TREVELYAN said, she was; but the police had very good reasons for going to the house. The case was a very serious one.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that Sub-Inspector Hamilton, stationed at Crossmolina, county Mayo, while prosecuting one of two searches for arms and treasonable documents in the house of Mr. T. A. Macaulay in November last, seized and still retains an empty powder horn and shot bag, and a photograph; if this seizure was not illegal; and, if he will make an order to have these articles returned to the owner; if it is true that two police inquire for Mr. Macaulay every day at his house, and are ordered to report where he is, and how occupied; and, if it is true that Sub-Inspector Hamilton has, on two occasions, entered his house with a party of armed police at an unseasonable hour of the night without a warrant, and without stating his business?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have to state that, for reasons of an urgent character, it has been deemed necessary to keep a close watch on one of the inhabitants of the house referred to, and to seize certain articles therein. I have no reason to believe that the action of the Constabulary has been in any respect illegal. With reference to this, and some other Questions that have been sometimes asked, I cannot believe that hon. Members are always aware of the motives which must actuate those who originally suggested the Questions. Between hon. Members and the persons in whose interest these Questions are asked I have no doubt there are intermediaries, and hon. Members are probably quite ignorant of the bearing of some of these Questions. But knowing what I know about several of them, including this one, I am positively appalled at finding the House of Commons used for such a purpose as that to which it is now put.

MR. HARRINGTON: Perhaps, after the observations of the right hon. Gentleman, the House will permit me to explain that my object in asking this and other Questions is to bring under the notice of hon. Members a state of facts in Ireland which is simply a scandal to civilization. With regard to this Question and the other Questions which I may have asked——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to enter into an explanation.

Mr. PARNELL: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether this search, in reference to which the hon. Member for Westmeath has asked a Question, was made under the provisions of a section of the Prevention of Crime Act which the Government stated in the House of Commons Lord Spencer did not require, and the insertion of which in the Prevention of Crime Act was forced upon them by the Conservative Opposition?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is out of Order in making those statements.

Mr. PARNELL: I wish to ask under which section of the Prevention of Crime Act this search was made? I ask the Chief Secretary in the absence of the Attorney General for Ireland.

Mr. HARRINGTON: In consequence of the answer which I have received, I beg to give Notice that on an early day I will call attention to the gross inaccuracy and untruthfulness of the information supplied to this House in the answers to Irish Questions.

Mr. TREVELYAN: I will give the House a specimen of what I mean. I was asked if a photograph had been seized. You might imagine from that that it was the photograph of the man's sweetheart. It was the photograph of a man in character, representing an assassin in ambush, with a revolver in his hand.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I beg to give Notice that I will ask the Home Secretary if his attention has been called to the issue in England every week of portraits of assassins with various kinds of weapons in their hands?

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SUB-INSPECTOR SMITH.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If any complaints have reached the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary with regard to the conduct of Sub-Inspector Smith, of Moville, county Donegal; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay Copies of such Reports upon the Table of the House?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Complaints have been made against the officer named, and the Inspector General ordered a Court of Inquiry to investigate them. The inquiry has not yet been completed, and I cannot undertake to lay Copies of the Reports upon the Table of the House.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—JURY PANEL—TRIAL OF JOSEPH BRADY.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If one of the special jurors engaged on the trial of Joseph Brady, in April last, named Thomas Bowers, and described as "gentleman," is the same Thomas Bowers employed as messenger at the office of the Board of Works Custom House, Dublin; whether it is customary to apply the term gentleman as accurately describing the occupation of those discharging humble functions at a small salary in Irish Departmental Offices; if the services of persons in the employment of the Crown are usually taken advantage of at such trials; and, if it is proposed in future to select such persons to perform the responsible duties of jurymen at Dublin Special Commissions?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Mr. Bowers was a qualified juryman, and I must decline making any other statement about him. Quite enough mischief has come from the names of individual jurymen having been brought before the public; and I am not going to be a party to giving those names the prominence that results from discussion in the House of Commons.

Mr. KENNY: May I ask if this Mr. Thomas Bowers, who was described as being a qualified juryman, was qualified by reason of the fact that he was a messenger at the Custom House? I beg to give Notice that I will ask further Questions with regard to this Mr. Thomas Bowers.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE TELEGRAPH OFFICE, DUNDALK.

Mr. KENNY asked the Postmaster General, If it is a fact that the female telegraph clerks attached to the Dundalk Office are required to perform the entire of the telegraph Sunday duty of that office in addition to the limit of forty-eight hours per week, as laid down by his late revision; and, if this be so, has any compensation been allowed for this extra duty, and if not, will some now be made; is it also a fact that they are required to enter on duty as early as seven a.m. all the year round, and has not the surveyor and his senior clerk frequently surveyed the office without taking any notice of this irregularity, and what notice will be taken of their remissness; and, would the fact of the surveyor and the postmaster coming from the same district have anything to do with the ignoring of those grievances from which these females suffer?

MR. FAWCETT: In reply to the hon. Member, I have ascertained that the two female telegraphists employed at the Dundalk office work during the six week days the usual time of 48 hours. In addition to this, each of them works two hours on each alternate Sunday. They are entitled to extra pay to the extent of two hours a fortnight, and I have given instructions that the amount due to them shall be paid. The night work is done entirely by the male staff.

THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—NON-ENFORCEMENT OF COMPULSORY EXAMINATION — WITHDRAWAL OF THE POLICE—ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will delay the withdrawal of the Metropolitan Police from the districts protected under the Contagious Diseases Acts until Parliament has been enabled to decide on the Bill for the protection of young girls announced to be brought forward by the Government?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he was afraid that the course suggested by the hon. Gentleman would not be consistent with the view which the Government had taken. The Government wanted to carry out strictly the recommendations of the Lords' Committee. A Bill would be introduced into the House of Lords, the effect of which, it was hoped, would be to diminish the serious evils of juvenile prostitution. That was not the direct or immediate object of the Contagious Diseases Acts, though the administration of those Acts have tended indirectly to that object.

In answer to further Questions from Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF and Mr. PULESTON,

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that, in order not to terminate the operation of the Acts too abruptly, the withdrawal of some of the Inspectors would be postponed.

MR. PULESTON asked whether orders to that effect had been given?

[No reply was given.]

TURKEY (ASIATIC PROVINCES)—GOVERNORSHIP OF THE LEBANON.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government will support the re-appointment of Rustem Pasha, who has maintained order and peace in the Lebanon during his tenure of Office?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: In a Protocol, signed at Constantinople on the 8th instant, the Representatives of the Powers have agreed, on behalf of their respective Governments, to accept Wassa Effendi, who, it is believed, is eminently qualified to continue the able and successful administration of his Predecessor, Rustem Pasha, from which the Lebanon has derived so much benefit.

MR. O'DONNELL: Is the noble Lord aware that the organs of the French Government admit that the object was to get rid of Rustem Pasha?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: That is a Question of which I should have Notice.

POST OFFICE—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON asked the Postmaster General, What arrangements he has made for carrying on the Irish Mail Service after October 1st?

MR. FAWCETT: No decision has yet been arrived at with regard to the arrangements to be adopted for carrying on the Irish Mail Service after the 1st of October next. I can, however, assure the noble Lord that the importance of the subject is fully recognized.

ARMY—THE ROYAL ENGINEERS.

MR. GREER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has yet arrived at any decision as to the advisability of accelerating the promotion of the Subalterns in the Royal Engineers; and, if so, whether he will communicate such decision?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply of the 5th of April; and I can only repeat that I do not contemplate adopting any exceptional measures as regards the Royal Engineers unless greater necessity should arise than now appears.

ARMY—CAVALRY REGIMENTS IN IRELAND.

Colonel O'BEIRNE asked the Secretary of State for War, What regulation or custom guides Military authorities in Ireland when fixing the annual moves of Cavalry Regiments; and, in keeping the roster, whether no consideration is given to the fact that some stations are more healthy and popular with officers and men than others; and, if he will explain why the 5th Lancers have been quartered at Newbridge since March 1881, the Royal Dragoons in Dublin since May 1881, and the 21st Hussars in Dublin since September 1881?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: There is no unvarying rule or custom as regards the movements of Cavalry regiments. Subject to public requirements, regiments are retained at one station for two years, more frequent moves being inconvenient to both officers and men. Consideration is given to the strength of a regiment, and whether it arrives from, or is going to, a good and popular station. The only Cavalry station in Ireland lately reported unhealthy is Dublin; and of all Irish stations this is the most in favour with the troops.

MOROCCO—SLAVERY.

Mr. MACFARLANE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If his attention has been called to the following paragraph in the "Daily Chronicle:"—

> "Gibraltar, May 7.
>
> "The following is a list of slaves sold during a recent week in Tangiers, and some of the prices which they realised: Three female slaves were sold on as many successive days, one for 55 dollars, equal to £11 sterling; a negro boy, aged eight years, sold for 35 dollars, equal to £7 sterling; a woman, aged twenty, sold for 54 dollars, equal to £10 16*s*. All these slaves were sold in the public streets by an auctioneer, who assigned them to the highest bidder;"

and, if it is true, what steps he proposes to take to put a stop to such a condition of affairs?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The Report from Her Majesty's Minister at Tangiers, to which I referred in my reply to the hon. Member for Drogheda (Mr. Whitworth) on the 17th ultimo, has now been received, and states that it is the fact that slaves are occasionally sold in Tangiers, but that the annual number does not exceed 30 or 40. The status of slavery in Morocco at the present time is said to be still as it was described at page 112 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Fugitive Slaves, which was laid before Parliament in 1876. Sir John Hay adds that he has called for Reports from Her Majesty's Consular Officers at the Western Ports, and his attention will be called to the paragraph to which the hon. Member refers.

PORTUGAL—INTERNATIONAL SAILING CODE—THE "CITY OF MECCA."

Mr. ANDERSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the Portuguese Government has finally refused to submit to arbitration the dispute regarding the "City of Mecca" collision case, in which the Portuguese Courts had given a decision in violation of the International Sailing Code, and as to which Her Majesty's Government Despatch states that there has been a "grave miscarriage of justice;" if he is aware that that grave miscarriage of justice has caused heavy pecuniary loss to British subjects; and, what steps Her Majesty's Government are now prepared to take to compel the Portuguese Government either to arbitrate or to redress?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I am glad to have been privately informed by my hon. Friend that the course hitherto adopted by Her Majesty's Government with regard to this case meets with his full approval. They are now awaiting a reply to the Note which, by Lord Granville's direction, Her Majesty's Minister at Lisbon addressed to the Portuguese Government on the 18th ultimo, and which will be found at page 14 of the Papers recently presented to Parliament.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS — HYDE PARK CORNER — REBUILDING OF THE WELLINGTON ARCH.

Mr. A. PEASE asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether the progress of the works at Hyde Park Corner has shown that it would be a mistake to re-erect the arch at the west end of Constitution Hill?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The rebuilding of the Wellington Arch at the new entrance to the Green Park was part of the arrangements explained to the House when the improvement of Hyde Park Corner was determined on, and I see no reason for departing from that arrangement.

In reply to Mr. GERARD NOEL,

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he would consider the advisability of cutting a little more from the Green Park in order to relieve the traffic from Grosvenor Place to Piccadilly.

NAVY—VICTUALLING ACCOUNTS.

MR. RYLANDS asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of Mr. Martin and Mr. Laycock on the Victualling Accounts of Her Majesty's Ships, together with a Copy of the Admiralty Order, dated October 4th, 1882, and any other Papers relative to recent frauds and irregularities connected with the victualling of Her Majesty's Ships?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir, in consequence of the state of things disclosed by the proceedings of certain courts martial held last summer, the Admiralty, on the 4th of October, issued an Order directing an inquiry to be made into the system under which the books of the ships in the Home ports are kept. The inquiry was conducted by Mr. Martin and Mr. Laycock, and their Report is dated 21st February. That Report is a confidential Paper, for the information of the Board, and cannot be laid upon the Table. I may add that this important subject is still engaging our attention, with a view to an improvement of the system.

FACTORY ACTS (INSPECTORS)—MR. WILLIAM PATERSON.

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is the fact that Mr. William Paterson has been appointed an Assistant Inspector of Factories; whether Mr. Paterson has been recently general secretary of an important association of artizans in Scotland; and, if he can state the qualifications of Mr. Paterson for the office conferred upon him?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The first two Questions of the hon. Member I have to answer in the affirmative. With reference to the last part of the hon. Member's Question, I must refer him to an answer which I gave on February 21, 1881. I then explained that I desired to introduce into the body of Factory Inspectors an element which was thought likely to prove very valuable. That element consists of persons accurately acquainted with the business which, as Inspectors, they have to superintend. I have taken considerable pains to find such persons, and no appointment has been made except upon the highest recommendation.

MR. O'DONNELL wished to know whether Mr. Paterson was not for many years the Secretary to the Carpenters' and Joiners' Union; and whether he could in that position have obtained any experience in factory work?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I could only act upon the recommendation of persons who knew Mr. Paterson, and he was recommended by persons who had a knowledge of him extending over many years.

MR. O'DONNELL gave Notice that on a future day he would ask further Questions for the purpose of eliciting from the Government their views on the subject of the appointment of trades union officials to Factory Inspectorships.

SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR—COLONEL MACEO.

MR. O'KELLY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can assure the House that the Spanish Government has carried out its promise to treat Colonel Maceo as a prisoner of war, and with the consideration due to his rank; and, if not, whether he will communicate at once by telegraph with the British Minister in Madrid to urge on the Spanish Government the necessity of carrying out immediately their promise in reference to Colonel Maceo?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's Minister at Madrid, in a despatch, dated May 6, has informed Her Majesty's Government that, in reply to inquiries on his part, he has received definite assurances from the

Spanish Government that the treatment of Maceo is in conformity with the promises made on that subject, and alluded to by the hon. Member.

CIVIL SERVICE (RE-ORGANIZATION)—PROMOTION.

Mr. PULESTON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is true that, under the Playfair Scheme now in operation in the Civil Service, the clerks of the Lower Division are ineligible, except under very exceptional circumstances, for promotion to the Higher Division; if it is a fact that the majority of these clerks have entered the Service with the same qualifications as the clerks who now satisfactorily discharge the duties of the Higher Division; and, if so, whether he would modify the rules which appear to preclude duly qualified persons from rising in the Public Service?

Mr. COURTNEY: It is the fact that the Order in Council forbids promotion from the Lower to the Higher Division of the Civil Service except after 10 years' service, and on the ground of special merit; but there are a number of staff or superintending appointments throughout the Service which it is intended to fill up from the ranks of the Lower Division; and, personally, I hope to see the ranks of the Upper Division in many of the offices largely recruited hereafter from among Lower Division clerks. I am not sure what the hon. Member means by the word "qualifications" in the second paragraph of the Question. If he refers to the standard of examination, I cannot admit the accuracy of his allegation. There is no intention of disturbing the present organization of the Civil Service.

EXPLOSIVE ACTS—ORDERS IN COUNCIL, APRIL 20, 1883—EXPLOSIVES.

Mr. DONALDSON-HUDSON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will state what will be the charge (if any) for the granting of certificates to keep explosives under the provisions of the Orders in Council of April 20th, 1883?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: There is no authority to make any charge of this kind under the Orders in Council.

PARLIAMENT—RULES AND ORDERS—PETITIONS—PARLIAMENTARY OATHS ACT (1866) AMENDMENT BILL—PROXY SIGNATURES.

Mr. LEWIS asked the honourable Member for Walsall, Whether, in consequence of the last Report of the Committee on Public Petitions stating that in the Petition in favour of the Affirmation Bill, presented by Mr. Labouchere on the 23rd of April last, from a place called Suay, the Committee were of opinion that many of the names are in the same handwriting, and that the Orders of the House relating to the signatures to Petitions have not been complied with, it is the intention of the honourable Member to take any and what further steps in the matter?

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Perhaps the hon. Baronet will also be able to state whether it is a fact that one person may sign Petitions for others with their consent; and, whether he has any reason to suppose that these inhabitants of Suay did not give their consent to the persons who, it appears, signed more than once?

Sir CHARLES FORSTER, in reply, said, that the Petition referred to in the Question was a very small one. It had only 87 names appended to it. Of that number some 17 or 18 were undoubtedly in the handwriting of the same person. No doubt, this was an infraction of the Rules of the House, which the Committee, in accordance with their usual practice, noticed in their Report, and the names were not counted among the signatures. With regard to the Question of the hon. Member for Northampton, in accordance with the Standing Orders, if a person signed for others the fact ought to be notified at the bottom of the sheet. He was not instructed by the Committee to whom Petitions were referred to take any action in the matter to which the attention of the House had been drawn, and therefore it was not his intention to take action.

PARLIAMENT — PUBLIC BUSINESS — MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, having regard to the pledges given by the Government, to the state of Public Business, and to the fact that three months of the Session have already elapsed, he will give an assurance to the

House, and to the Country, that the present Sitting of Parliament will be continued until the measures named in the Speech from the Throne shall have been considered and disposed of by this House?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Might I be permitted also to ask the Prime Minister whether, with a view to expedite Government Business in general, and the progress of the Grand Committee on Law in particular, he will instruct the Attorney General not to delay the progress of the Committee by talking against time, for the purpose of preventing the Committee from arriving at a decision; and if he will also use his influence with the hon. Members for Stockton (Mr. Dodds) and Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) to the same effect.

MR. GLADSTONE: I will leave it to my hon. and learned Friend to answer for himself what the noble Lord has now alleged; and, for my own part, I distinctly decline to give any instructions, even if I were entitled or qualified to give instructions, to my hon. and learned Friend with regard to any portion of his Parliamentary conduct, because I know no man who needs them less. I am hardly in a position to answer the general question of my hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich, inasmuch as I have said that for three, if not four, nights after the Recess we must proceed with Business in Supply, and until we have disposed of some of those nights it is not intended to refer to any of the important measures of the Session. When we reach that point of time I will endeavour to give such information as I can.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS gave Notice that he should repeat the Question on a future day.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES): If I did not take any notice of the Question it might be supposed that there was some foundation for it. I must appeal to any Member of the Committee, except the noble Lord, as to whether there is any foundation for that statement? The noble Lord introduced an Amendment of the gravest importance in the Committee, and I felt that we ought not to arrive at any hasty conclusion. I therefore took upon myself the whole burden of bringing that important Amendment before the Committee; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) asked me personally to put down my views in the form of a Proviso, so that they might be considered before the next meeting. I did not ask any Member of the Committee to speak against time, and the Committee acquiesced in the course which I took.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: As the hon. and learned Gentleman has referred to me, perhaps I may say that I do not think that the noble Lord intended to imply that the hon. and learned Gentleman himself spoke against time. But as he has appealed to me to say whether there was any delay of that kind in the proceedings, I am bound to say that if the action of the hon. Members for Stockton and Stockport did not amount to talking against time, I have never seen anything that did.

MR. HOPWOOD rose to speak, but——

MR. SPEAKER ruled that the observations which had been made with regard to the proceedings of a Committee of the House had been, from the very commencement, altogether irrelevant and irregular.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—EXECUTION OF MYLES JOYCE, CONVICTED OF MURDER.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to the facts connected with the execution of Myles Joyce, in Galway Gaol, on the 15th December; whether he has read the declaration made, in reference to this man, by Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey, who were executed on the same day; whether there is any foundation for the belief that the man was unjustly executed; and, if so, whether he will cause a provision to be made for this man's wife and famliy?

MR. GLADSTONE: In reply to this Question, my attention has been called to the incident mentioned in the first part of it. But with regard to the question whether there is any foundation for the belief that the man Myles Joyce was unjustly executed, I must say that I distinctly decline to enter, in an answer to any Question, into the discussion of any matter relating to the execution of the capital sentence. It is for the hon. Member to consider whether he will make any charge against the Government in that respect. I do not part, however, from the subject without stating what is only due, I think, to my noble Friend the Viceroy of Ireland—that, in common with all my Colleagues, I repose the most entire confidence in the judgment, the care, and the humanity with which he endeavours to exercise one of the most delicate and important duties of his high Office.

Mr. HARRINGTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will afford me an opportunity of raising this question, and I promise him that if he does, I will convince the House—or at least a large portion of it—that not alone has Myles Joyce been unjustly executed, but that certain others have been also unjustly executed in Ireland?

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL CONVENTION.

Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What steps are being taken to secure the future observance of the Convention in the Transvaal; and, whether he can state if any arrangements have yet been made in the interests of any Chiefs or others who may have just claims upon the Home Government?

Mr. GLADSTONE: The mode of procedure with regard to any actual or supposed infraction of the Convention with the Transvaal is by a remonstrance, conveyed through the Resident; and from time to time a correspondence of that character has taken place upon what appears to us to be a neglect of duty on the part of the Transvaal Government. The first part of the Question of the right hon. Gentleman is general, and does not suggest any further answer. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I can only repeat what I said the other day, in reply to the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), to the effect that no facts have yet been laid before us in such a form or of such a nature as to afford any plan for arrangement.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked whether any further remonstrances or despatches had been addressed through the Resident of the Transvaal on the subject of any infraction of the Convention since the last issue of Papers; and whether they would be laid before the House?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that a further Correspondence was in progress; but he could not give any answer to the right hon. Gentleman's last Question until the Government had had an opportunity of communicating with Sir Hercules Robinson, whose arrival in this country was expected almost immediately.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he would repeat the Question after Whitsuntide.

Mr. GORST asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would undertake not to submit the Vote for the Resident's salary before the question of presenting the Correspondence had been decided?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that care would be taken not to bring on the Vote until all information had been given to the House that would enable it to be properly discussed.

THE VICEROY OF INDIA — CRIMINAL CODE (PROCEDURE) AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT having given Notice of the following Question—To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in view of the widespread agitation in India caused by the proposed alteration in the Criminal Law, and of the fact that the Viceroy is constantly slighted in public, Her Majesty's Government will recall Lord Ripon from India?

Mr. GLADSTONE said: I received just now a Notice from the hon. Member for Eye politely informing me that it was not his intention to put his Question; but, Sir, this Question has appeared on the Notice Paper, and, therefore, I cannot entirely avoid a reference to it, because it conveys a statement that the noble Marquess the Viceroy of India is constantly slighted in public. It mentions this as a fact. What may be the information of the hon. Gentleman I do not know; but no information of that kind, or tending in that direction, has reached Her Majesty's Government, and they deem it to be in the highest degree improbable. With respect to the Question whether the Government intend to advise the recall of the Marquess of Ripon from India, all I can say is that I wish that we or any future Government may, for the benefit of India, at all times when a vacancy in the Viceroyalty occurs, be able to secure for that post the services of a person so admirably qualified as the Marquess of Ripon for the discharge of every duty connected with it.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT subsequently said, he would take an early opportunity of proving in that House the correctness of every statement contained in his Question.

TRADE AND COMMERCE—THE SUGAR DUTIES.

MR. SAMUEL MORLEY asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether Her Majesty's Government have been in communication with the German Government upon the subject of the large bounties now given upon the export of sugar from Germany; and, if so, what is likely to be the result; and, whether, considering that the French sugar growers are pressing their Government (in consequence of the large export from Germany under bounty) to raise the surtax upon all sugar imported into France to a rate that will be prohibitory to British as well as to German sugar, Her Majesty's Government will now carry out the recommendation of the Select Committee on Sugar Industries, and obtain a Conference of the Powers interested, or take other steps to bring about a settlement of the question?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Her Majesty's Government have been in communication with the British Ambassador at Berlin, and have unofficially communicated to the German authorities the representations of the West India Committee with regard to the German sugar bounties. Her Majesty's Ambassador is of opinion that a proposal for a Conference would not be entertained. I would remind the hon. Member that in 1881 inquiries were made of the Governments of France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, and Austria as to whether they would agree to take part in an International Conference for the removal of bounties on the export of sugar; that the German and Dutch Governments then declined to participate in such a Conference, and that the French Government would only accept the suggestion conditionally. As regards the pressure which the hon. Member states the French sugar growers are bringing to bear upon the French Government to induce them to raise the surtax upon all sugar imported, I have no information which would lead me to suppose that such an agitation is likely to be successful.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND)—GRANTS TO TRAINING COLLEGES.

MR. BUCHANAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, What changes the Government had made with regard to the training of teachers in Ireland?

MR. TREVELYAN replied, that if the hon. Member asked this Question in consequence of letters he had received from Scotland—and he (Mr. Trevelyan) had received similar letters from Scotland—he could not help thinking that some people in that country were under a grave misconception as to what the Government had done. The action of the Government consisted simply in extending to Ireland the system of grants to Training Colleges which at present is in force in England and in Scotland. They thought the whole of the United Kingdom should be on the same footing in this respect. There was no intention of interfering with the Marlborough Street College, which, in the opinion of the Government and people who understood education, was doing very good work indeed.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked whether a Supplementary Estimate would be laid before the House to meet the proposed changes, as no provision was made for them in the Estimates now before the House?

MR. TREVELYAN said, he was unwilling to answer a financial question of this kind; but he was inclined to think that sufficient money for this year would be found out of the existing Estimates. If there was any feeling in the House as to the step that had been taken, the Government would introduce a Supplementary Estimate, if only for the purpose of enabling the House to express an opinion upon it.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 16—SECRET EXAMINATIONS.

MR. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in the secret inquiries which have been held or are being held under the provisions of the sixteenth section of the Crimes Act, witnesses are examined only concerning the offence named in the summons, or whether the questions range over a much wider field, in some cases extending to occurrences which happened several years ago; whether Mr. John O'Connor has been twice summoned before Mr. Horne at Cork to give evidence in the inquiry proceeding into an alleged conspiracy there to murder public officials and to damage and destroy public buildings; whether Mr. O'Connor has offered to answer any question put to him with reference to such alleged conspiracy, but was informed that he would be compelled to answer every question on any subject put to him by the magistrate, and has consequently refused to be sworn and been committed to prison; whether he can inform the House if any guarantee exists that the magistrates entrusted with these secret inquiries do not take advantage of their secrecy to exceed the powers conferred upon them by the Statute; and what way is open for a person who considers he has been unjustly committed for contempt of court, under the provisions of the sixteenth section, to challenge the action of the magistrate committing him; whether any guarantee exists against the falsification, intentional or otherwise, by the officials employed for the purpose of taking down evidence at these inquiries of the evidence so taken down; and, whether, for the protection of witnesses at these inquiries, the Irish Government will consider the desirability of permitting to a witness the presence of his legal adviser during his secret examination?

Mr. TREVELYAN: In reply to the Question of the hon. Member, I have to state that I have no reason to believe that at the inquiries held under the 16th section of the Prevention of Crime Act witnesses have been examined as to other matters than the offences named in the summons. Some of these offences —such as the murder conspiracies in Dublin and elsewhere—were of a character necessarily involving a large field of inquiry; but in these, as in other cases, the questions put were relevant to the matters inquired into. As regards the case of Mr. O'Connor, I find that he demanded, as a preliminary to being sworn, that an undertaking should be given to him as to the line of examination to be pursued. He was not entitled to such an undertaking, and, having refused to be sworn, was committed to prison accordingly. As regards the guarantee referred to by the hon. Member, I can only repeat that the character and integrity of the responsible magistrates appointed to conduct these inquiries will prove a sufficient guarantee for the upright discharge of their duties. If a witness be unjustly committed he can challenge the action of the committing magistrate in the High Court of Justice. As regards the concluding paragraph of this Question, I have to point out that the main object of the inquiries instituted under the Act has been to break up murder societies. For this purpose, it is essential to examine persons believed to belong to those societies. In the case of the Dublin "Invincibles," it was the examination of the man Farrell which originally led to the discovery and bringing to justice of the assassins of Mr. Burke and Lord Frederick Cavendish. If at that inquiry a legal adviser appointed for Farrell—as would most probably have been done by his confederates—had been present, he would never have spoken out, or, if he had spoken out, he would have been murdered within 24 hours, just as Bailey was murdered in Skipper's Alley, Dublin, in an earlier part of the year. Bearing these matters in mind, I do not intend to propose any alteration in the existing law.

Mr. PARNELL: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman, arising out of his reply to my Question, whether, in the first place, the guarantee that Mr. John O'Connor demanded previous to his examination was that questions should be confined to the offence named in the summons, and whether that was the guarantee refused by the examining magistrate; and, in the second place, whether the evidence upon which the "Invincibles" were discovered was not evidence voluntarily tendered by the man Farrell to a policeman in the street, who subsequently brought him before Superintendent Mallon, at Dublin Castle; whether Farrell, in examination at the secret inquiry, did not positively deny all knowledge of the conspiracy in question; and whether, subsequently, on the Phœnix Park trials, he did not declare that he committed perjury at those private examinations in order to save himself and his friends?

Mr. TREVELYAN said, that Mr. O'Connor's stipulation was very much, if not exactly, that mentioned by the hon. Member. Considering, however, the fact of the immense number of witnesses that had to be called to throw light upon the enormous mass of undetected crime, it was quite impossible to make any difference between witnesses, who ought, as good citizens, to come forward to give evidence. If Mr. O'Connor had been allowed to make that stipulation, other witnesses must have been permitted to do the same; and magistrates could not be bound in that manner. He could not answer the Question about Farrell without Notice, and he doubted, from their nature, if he would answer them at all.

MR. PARNELL: I wish to say that I put the Question about Farrell because I was challenged about him in the answer of the right hon. Gentleman; and when he challenged me on the subject I naturally concluded that he knew all about the man of whom he was speaking.

MR. TREVELYAN said, that he had inquired very carefully into the bearings of Farrell's evidence with reference to the Dublin murder convictions, and he had likewise inquired very carefully into the connection between the other evidence and the secret inquiry, and he was quite satisfied that without the secret inquiry they would never have had Farrell's evidence or the convictions.

MR. O'BRIEN: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman——

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY here rose.

MR. SPEAKER called on Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

MR. O'BRIEN: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether Mr. O'Connor—[*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. O'Shaughnessy.

INLAND NAVIGATION (IRELAND)—THE UPPER SHANNON.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, What decision had been come to upon the question of the tolls on the Upper Shannon, of which he had given private Notice?

MR. COURTNEY: After much consideration we have come to the conclusion that it is best, on the whole, not to attempt to increase these tolls pending further legislative action with respect to the navigation. The tariff will, therefore, be restored to the point at which it stood prior to 1882.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he would undertake that the National Debt Bill should be put down as a first Order of the Day?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that he could give no such undertaking. He hoped to proceed with the Bill after the Recess.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD asked if the Bill would be delivered to Members before the rising for the Whitsuntide Recess, or whether it would be accompanied with a Financial Statement, which was indispensable in connection with the Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) replied, that the second reading of the Bill would not be taken until after the Whitsuntide Recess, and before it was read a second time the information asked by his right hon. Friend should be given.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE inquired the order of Business for the night? He wished to call special attention to the circumstance that it was understood to be the intention of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to bring in that night the Bill which he presumed was the same as that mentioned in the Queen's Speech for amending the Agricultural Holdings Act. No Notice had, however, been given for allowing the Bill to be taken out of its order, and it only stood fourth among the Notices of Motion. Therefore he presumed that the intention must have been abandoned. He should be glad to know what were the intentions of the Government with regard to the Business generally, and especially with regard to the Agricultural Holdings Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE said, that it was proposed not to keep the House till an extreme hour in Supply that night, and then to take the questions that would be raised on the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster would ask leave to introduce the Bill relating to agricultural holdings at whatever time of the night his Motion might be reached. ["Oh, oh!"] It was very desirable that he should make a statement to the House. In the view of Her Majesty's Government it was for the interest of all concerned that the Bill should be in the hands of Members as soon as possible.

In reply to Mr. Ritchie,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, that most undoubtedly the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill would be taken that night. It would be brought on before 12, and as soon after 11 as possible.

Mr. W. H. SMITH observed, that the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill contained provisions to which personally he had great objection. He could not help feeling that there would be a great deal of discussion upon it; and he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman as to whether it was reasonable that such a discussion should be brought on after 11 or 12?

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I rise to a point of order. I wish to know from you, Sir, whether I should be in Order in moving that the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Dodson) in reference to the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: Motions in reference to the order of Business are taken at this hour only when they are made by a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. GLADSTONE: We shall make an effort to close Supply between 11 and half-past 11.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he would appeal to the Prime Minister, and ask him whether it was fair to Members who had been sitting on a Grand Committee since 12 o'clock that, after taking Supply and the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, they should be asked to wait for this Bill, which was one of the gravest importance? Was it right, also, that it should be laid on the Table without remark?

Mr. CHAPLIN said, he wished to support the appeal.

Mr. GLADSTONE wished to point out to the House the position in which the Government was placed. They were desirous of making every effort to forward Supply, and the Customs and Inland Revanue Bill had already been postponed for various reasons for some time, and it was necessary for the Public Service that it should now be brought forward. In deference to what had been said by the right hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), they would endeavour to break off Supply somewhat earlier than he originally stated. With regard to the Agricultural Holdings Bill, the Government had every desire to take it earlier, and if there were co-operation on the part of the House it might be done. The statement of his right hon. Friend on the Bill would not be lengthy, and would, if possible, be made at an hour to suit the convenience of Members. Of course, there was no absolute guarantee as to the hour, because the Notices of other Members intervened. He might be asked why, under those circumstances, he did not move the postponement of the Orders of the Day, and his reason was that, although such Motions were extremely convenient to the House at a time when they were passed by the general consent of the House, and without discussion, that would interfere with the Business of the day. Of late the practice had sprung up of debating those Motions, and therefore he could not run the risk of such an interference with the regular Business of the House.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON asked what would be the Business taken at the Morning Sitting on Friday?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that the Motion for the Adjournment of the House would take precedence, and after that they intended to proceed with Supply.

INLAND REVENUE—CULTIVATION OF TOBACCO.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he would cause inquiry to be made during the Recess into the practicability of protecting the Revenue, and, at the same time, repealing the 3rd chapter of 1 & 2 *Will.* IV., which prohibits the growth of tobacco in Ireland?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): I have already stated that the whole subject of the home growth of tobacco is one which I shall have to consider, not only in reference to Ireland, but to the whole United Kingdom. The matter will receive my best attention.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £28,220, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Buildings of the Houses of Parliament."

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, there was one matter in connection with this Vote to which he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works. He wished to point out to that right hon. Gentleman the smallness of the accommodation provided in the House as compared with the requirements of modern times, in so far as the accommodation for the general body of Members was concerned. With regard to Ministers a great improvement had been made. His experience of Parliament extended over a great many years, and he had not been displeased to see that in recent times, and particularly since the present Government came into Office, greater facilities for carrying on their work had been provided for the several Members of the Administration. He believed there was scarcely a Member of the Government who had not a suitable apartment at his disposal. As far as private Members were concerned they were without any accommodation of the kind to which he referred, with the exception of what was called the Conference Room. That, he ventured to say, was one of the most uncomfortable apartments in the whole House. In summer it was insufferably hot; in the colder months of the Parliamentary year —that was to say, in the first two months of the normal Session—it was cold and dirty, and, moreover, the chimnies were so ill-constructed that it was only necessary to light a fire in the grate in order to fill the room with dense smoke. Only as lately as the day preceding that on which he was speaking that had occurred. He really thought it was time that something should be done in regard to this matter, and suggested that if no other course was open in order to give further accommodation to private Members, the Committee Room now appropriated to public Petitions might be placed at their disposal. The smoking accommodation was also another point of no inconsiderable importance. The right hon. Gentleman promised last year to give greater facilities to Members who wished to smoke, and he had done so to some extent; but the facilities in this direction were not what they ought to be. When the late Mr. Adam was First Commissioner of Works, it was suggested to him—and the suggestion came from a considerable number of Members—that the interior square in St. Stephen's Cloisters should be covered over with glass, so as to afford a sheltered promenade for Members who wished to enjoy a cigar or a pipe. Mr. Adam promised that inquiries should be made, in order to ascertain the cost of making the necessary structural alterations; but, as far as he knew, nothing had been done, or, at any rate, decided upon. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman who succeeded Mr. Adam, and now filled the Office of First Commissioner of Works, had had the subject under his consideration, and had stated either publicly or privately—he did not know which—that the estimated cost of making the alterations was so excessive that he did not think the Treasury would assent to it. As far as he was personally concerned, he did not think the cost would be so large as that it could be reasonably objected to. Leaving this point, and passing to another, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he remembered that last year he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) applauded his resolution to hang three valuable pictures belonging to the nation in the new Smoking Room? Among these was one of the best works that had been produced in this country in modern times—he alluded to the picture illustrating a passage in the life of King Alfred, which was painted by Mr. Watts, R.A. Last year he called attention to the neglected condition of these pictures; and he now regretted to find that nothing had been done towards placing the pictures in a proper condition. They only required washing and varnishing, and all that was necessary could be done at a comparatively small cost. If the right hon. Gentleman had no official in his own Department who was equal to the task, there could be no doubt that he would have no difficulty in securing the services of some one of the officials in the National Gallery, who would do all that was necessary. Whether the pictures were or were not fine examples of Art was a matter of taste; but in any case it could not be denied that they had been left in a sadly neglected condition.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, in the progress of the Questions that afternoon the right hon. Gentleman had been asked what he intended to do with regard to the exterior of Westminster Hall. He had noticed that a portion of the house occupied by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, which was part of the buildings intended to be taken away, still remained. It was very difficult to form an estimate of what would be the effect of any changes made as long as that portion to which he referred remained standing. He quite admitted that, for many reasons, the Deputy Sergeant at Arms should reside within the precincts of the Palace; but he should imagine that there would be some mode of providing him with rooms without allowing the building to which he referred to stand. That, of course, would involve some expenditure; but he did not think the House would begrudge it, in view of the fact that, as the buildings now stood, it was not possible to form a fair and accurate idea of what would be the effect of any alterations that might be made. There was another point to which he wished to refer, and concerning which some hon. Members might be surprised that he was going to suggest a little extra expenditure. The amount would not be more than about £50; but he thought it would lead to an increase, perhaps to a doubling, of the working power of the Session. When hon. Members got up in their places, and said they were only going to detain the House for a few minutes, he always trembled; because he almost invariably found they were so carried away by their own eloquence that they did not perceive the lapse of time, and their few minutes sometimes spun themselves out to half-an-hour or an hour. That was because they did not look at the clock, which was behind them, when they were addressing the Chair; and he would, therefore, suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should cause a clock to be placed at the Speaker's end of the House, in order that hon. Members might see how the time was going, in which case he believed the speeches would be reduced in length by an average of one-half. Hon. Members would be ashamed of themselves when they saw how the time was going, and would put a curb on their eloquence. It had, therefore, occurred to him that much good would be done by a small but useful increase in the expenditure of public money.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, his right hon. and learned Friend who opened the debate had suggested a large and somewhat vague expenditure for the additional comfort of Members. He hoped the Committee would be slow to sanction such expenditure. Now that they were all anxious, as far as possible, to promote economy; now that the Estimates were criticized with great care, and that a considerable amount of criticism had been passed upon the amount of money spent even upon the maintenance of Royal Palaces, it certainly would not become them to incur a serious expenditure for no other purpose than that of securing their own comfort. He was not sure that promoting their comfort would materially increase their efficiency. The more comfortable they made the Smoking and other Rooms for the accommodation of Members the smaller would be the attendance in the House itself of Members who listened to arguments concerning measures under discussion before voting upon them. And so they would help to perpetuate that great scandal which had been so often commented on, of Gentlemen coming in to vote upon a question respecting which they had heard nothing. He hoped the ardour for economy which all Parties professed would prevent the expenditure of money for the making of more comfortable Smoking and other Rooms, in which Members might engage in more pleasant but not equally profitable occupations than that of listening to the debates within the House.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was bound to admit, with regard to the Conference Room, that his attention had been called to it more than once.

Everything had been done to cure the defects which were complained of; but there seemed to be some radical defect in the chimnies and flues, which defied all attempts at cure. With regard to what could be done to increase the accommodation for Members in other parts of the building, he had, since he had had the honour of filling the position of First Commissioner of Works, been able to do something. He had provided an additional Smoking Room, and he had contemplated providing another Tea Room; but further demands of a more pressing character came upon him, and the room which he intended to utilize for this purpose had to be taken for another. He had been enabled to do much of what he had accomplished by reason of the liberalty of the House of Lords; and while the necessary works were being carried forward he had considered the possibility of covering over the interior square in St. Stephen's Cloisters; but he found that to do that would cost not less than £5,000, and, at the same time, the surveyor of the House did not at all recommend the operation as a mere matter of construction. There were very weighty reasons against it in that point of view, and also on account of the difficulty of ventilating that part of the House. Unfortunately, therefore, he could not hold out any prospect of the Treasury entertaining a proposal to cover the interior yard at the cost which he had mentioned, and in face of the structural difficulties to which he had alluded. Whether it would be possible hereafter to increase the accommodation for Members he could not at present say; but no doubt the shape which such increased accommodation would take would be a limiting of the number of private residences under the roof of the Palace. In that case, he thought the limitation would apply to the residences now occupied by officials employed in the other House of Parliament, whose duties were not nearly so laborious or onerous as those of officials employed in the House of Commons. Whether they would have the sanction of the House of Lords in so obtaining extra accommodation he did not know; but, at all events, that seemed to him to be the direction in which they must look for the purpose. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had alluded to a part of the block of buildings which remained standing after the removal of the old Law Courts. That was at present a source of difficulty to his Department. The house of the Deputy Serjeant at Arms extended out into that block of buildings to the extent of two or three of his rooms, without which his residence would be comparatively useless. It would be, no doubt, necessary to pull the block down; but he was unwilling to disturb the Deputy Serjeant, at all events until after the end of the present Session, and he hoped before then to be able to make some accommodation of the matter. If the Deputy Serjeant was to remain resident under the roof of the Palace, and it should be necessary to remodel his house for the purpose of obtaining further accommodation, this would be a rather costly operation. It would involve an expenditure of some £2,000 or £3,000, and it would, moreover, be an exceedingly difficult operation to remodel the interior of the house. Whether that might be the better mode of dealing with the question, or whether it might not be found advisable to give to the Deputy Serjeant an allowance wherewith to provide himself with a residence elsewhere, was a question which had not yet been determined; but before the end of the Session he would fully consider it. In the meantime, he did not think the House would wish that its official should be deprived of his residence. His hon. Friend had also made a suggestion that an additional clock should be placed in the House, in order that Members might, without turning their backs upon Mr. Speaker, note the passing of time, and the length at which they had been occupying the time of the House. His hon. Friend must be aware of the fact that not infrequently Members looked at the clock with a view not of limiting but of continuing their speeches; and he did not think that, on the whole, anything would be gained by adding a second clock to the furniture of the House. As far as the pictures in the Smoking Room were concerned, he had done last year all that he then thought necessary.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works a question in regard to Westminster Hall. He understood that the whole question of the western front had been committed to an eminent architect; and what he wanted to know was, whether the northern front had also been placed under the supervision of the same gentleman? A considerable expense seemed lately to have been incurred in repairing the architectural or ornamental work outside, mainly, he supposed, because the stone was in a rotten state; but that had no reference to the two Towers, which had been allowed to remain standing, and which were most inconsistent, in an architectural point of view, with the rest of the building.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had not entered upon the question raised by the right hon. Gentleman with the architect; but he thought it probable that he should take that gentleman's advice upon the question and submit it again to the House. At present, he only asked for money for the restoration of the west front of the Hall. The total cost of this was estimated at about £6,000; and in the present year he asked for a third of that sum, as the works at present undertaken were of a tentative character.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he presumed the greatest care would be taken, in removing the foundations, to see what buildings had existed on the site in former times. This was the more important, because no one had the smallest idea as to the character of the ancient foundations.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, as far as he knew of the buildings comprising the Palace of Westminster, the two Towers to which his right hon. Friend (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had referred were built in the year 1822 from the designs of an architect of evanescent fame. He would suggest that it would be well to suspend the work of reparation at the north end, and leave the whole business in the hands of the distinguished architect who now had charge of the restoration of the western front.

Mr. BROGDEN suggested the advisability of giving a speaking communication by telephone or speaking-tube from the Lobby of the House to the Attendants' Room adjoining the Ladies' Gallery.

Mr. RYLANDS, while agreeing that it was necessary to clear away the whole block of buildings, of which the old Law Courts formed by far the largest part, hoped that satisfactory arrangements would be made for the accommodation of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms. He desired to direct the attention of his right hon. Friend (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) to the charge for the maintenance of buildings. He found that, including the £2,500 for external repairs to stone work, they were paying no less than upwards of £10,000 a-year. It struck him that was a very large sum for the purpose. Allowing for the £2,500, which he presumed was expended in consequence of the stone work giving way, then he should have thought there was sufficient left out of which the ingenuity and ability of his right hon. Friend would have enabled him to provide the necessary convenience for the Deputy Sergeant at Arms. Under the Sub-head C he intended to move a reduction, and he should do so in conformity with a principle which had been already recognized in Committee. The Sub-head C provided for the maintenance of the approaches to the House, and of the Gardens in the immediate neighbourhood of the House. The maintenance and repair of Abingdon Street, St. Margaret Street, Old and New Palace Yards, Parliament Square Gardens, St. Margaret Square Gardens, and Victoria Tower Gardens, was put down at £870; and he wished to point out to the Committee that the greatest part of this expenditure was of a character which ought to be borne by the parochial authorities. It so happened that a portion of the space which was covered by the Vote—the Victoria Tower Gardens—was formerly covered by a low description of buildings, and was purchased by the Government some years ago, in order that there might be for the Houses of Parliament greater protection from fire. Viscount Sherbrooke, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed to erect on this plot of ground a very extensive series of public buildings; and he (Mr. Rylands) raised an objection to the Vote, on the ground that the Government had only put down a sum on account—he believed £10,000, or £20,000—and did not state what was the entire sum they contemplated expending upon the buildings. The result was the Government had to give way, the idea of erecting the buildings was abandoned, and a very large and useless expenditure was prevented. When the right hon. Gentlemen opposite came into power it occurred to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster

(Mr. W. H. Smith) that he could secure a great boon for the inhabitants of Westminister. The right hon. Gentleman proposed that the plot of land in question should be left as an open free space for the benefit and advantage of the people of Westminster, and said he would give £1,000 towards the expense of the suggested conversion. He (Mr. Rylands) had the best autbority for saying that if the Government, instead of making this plot of land into an open space and devoting it to the purposes of the people of Westminster, had thought it right to sell the land, they could have got as much as £70,000 for it. He had no wish to complain of what the late Government did; he did not desire to raise any objection to the course which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster thought it right and proper to pursue; but what he did contend was that, practically, the people of the Kingdom had made a present to the inhabitants of Westminster of property of the value of £70,000. If any locality or Corporation in the country had wished to possess itself of a similar plot of land for the purpose of a garden or park, they would have been obliged to lay a rate upon the property of the ratepayers of the borough in order to raise the necessary funds. Certainly, the argument was a very strong one, indeed, that the ratepayers of Westminister ought to pay their fair share, at all events, of the maintainance of the open spaces which were intended for their special benefit. Old Palace Yard might be said to be of special service to Members of Parliament; that it ought to be maintained at the national expense; but clearly, in the case of Abingdon Street and St. Margaret Street, Parliament ought not to be called upon to pay anything. Those streets ought to be kept up by the local authorities; and therefore he objected to their becoming a charge upon the general taxpayer. The last item was a most singular one, and he hoped his right hon. Friend would afford the Committee some information respecting it. The item was—"Horticultural works for ditto, £550," and if they looked at the Estimate they saw immediately above the word "ditto," the words "lamps and supply of gas." He did not understand what the "horticultural works for ditto" were. They could not belong to any of the streets; and, therefore, he supposed they were connected with the Victoria Tower Gardens. Now, the item of £550 for horticultural works actually included the pay and emoluments of a constable. It was a most extraordinary thing to include the pay of a constable in horticultural works. It appeared the Vote altogether was one that ought to be recast. He considered more money was spent than there ought to be; and, therefore, he should move to reduce the Sub-head by £500.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: £1,800.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he would not do that. He did not wish to run the thing too close, and he considered that Palace Yard must be kept up for the convenience of Members.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £27,720, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Buildings of the Houses of Parliament."—(*Mr. Rylands.*)

Mr. BROADHURST said, it would be wise to consider the advisability of facing the exposed part of Westminster Hall with Portland stone, instead of with the freestone from the West of England. He hoped the work would not be delayed until, as it was suggested, some suitable architect could be found who understood the work. Any ordinary intelligent stone mason——

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that a proposition has been made to reduce the Vote by £500 in respect to Sub-head C, which relates to the maintenance of the approaches to the House, and Gardens. The hon. Member is discussing a former question.

Mr. BROADHURST asked if he was to understand that the subject could not be further discussed?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman will be able to refer to it later.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON wished to say a word or two in answer to the observations made by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands). The Committee should not lose sight of one thing, and that was of the almost paramount necessity there was of retaining in their own hands the approaches to the Houses of Parliament. The amount that was put down for horticultural works he supposed related to the bedding-out which took place in Parliament Square Gardens, and in New Palace Yard, in the immediate precincts of the House. Parliament Square Gardens formed, he imagined, that portion of the ground in front of the Houses of Parliament on which the statues were erected. His hon. Friend had evidently lost sight of the advantage it was to them to retain in their hands the maintenance of the order and beauty of this particular piece of ground. That remark would apply also to the Victoria Tower Gardens. Now the space was laid out as a garden, he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) hoped it would not meet the views of the Committee that they should be handed over to a body which changed from day to day. He trusted the hon. Gentleman would not press his Amendment.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he entirely agreed with what the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had said with respect to the maintenance of the streets. The subject had not escaped the attention of the Government, and it was one of the matters they proposed to deal with whenever the Bill respecting London Municipal Government was brought in. It was, however, very undesirable that the Government should give up the custody and care of the open spaces in the precincts of the House.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER could not support his hon. Friend (Mr. Rylands) in the Motion he had made. It was only on Tuesday last they had a very long debate, at the time of Private Business, on the desirability of preserving open spaces, and a very large minority of the House opposed a Bill which was to do away with an open space. This seemed to be a similar case. The hon. Member for Burnley advocated building on the space he referred to; he told them they might have saved £70,000 by doing so. It was very important, on many grounds, that open spaces should be maintained. He could not agree with the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour), when he said they ought to deny themselves comforts. Hon. Members of the House gave up a great deal of time in the performance of their public duties, and the public ought not to begrudge them any of the conveniences they required.

Mr. SALT said, he had no wish to prolong the discussion; but he considered some further explanation was required. In the first place, there was the item of £870 for the maintenance and repair of the streets and gardens, and then there was the mysterious sum of £550, which was said to be for horticultural works. The latter item had not yet been explained. If it was for bedding-out, what was meant by the Vote for the maintenance of the Gardens? And, besides, a charge of £83 for a constable appeared to be mixed up with the cost of geraniums and other bedding-out plants. The Vote appeared excessive, and, at any rate, should be more clearly explained.

Mr. BIGGAR said, there appeared to be a little misapprehension with regard to the Motion of the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands). The hon. Gentleman the Member for the City (Mr. R. N. Fowler) said the hon. Gentleman wished to abolish the open spaces around the Houses of Parliament; but it did not appear to him (Mr. Biggar) that that was the object of the Motion. He imagined that the object of the hon. Member for Burnley was to secure that the cost of repairing the streets in question should be defrayed by the proper authorities—namely, the parochial authorities of Westminster. Such an object was perfectly legitimate and reasonable. He was clearly of opinion that the ratepayers of Westminster should pay for the repair of the streets in their parish; and he did not see that the contention of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works was of any value. He did not think there was any occasion to defer the settlement of the question until the London Municipal Reform Bill was brought in. That Bill might not be introduced for 10 years; and yet, in the meantime, the Committee would have to vote a sum annually towards defraying a charge which properly belonged to the locality. The Government ought to submit to the reduction which had been proposed, and allow the custody of the streets in question to pass into the hands of the proper authorities.

Mr. LABOUCHERE quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Rylands) in the remarks he had made in favour of a reduction of the Vote. At the same time, they had received some sort of assurance from the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, that the subject would form part of the new Municipal Bill for London, which, no doubt, would be brought in some time this Session. Under the circumstances, it would, perhaps, be well to rest satisfied with the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. RYLANDS asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

MR. O'DONNELL objected to the withdrawal of the Motion. Even admitting that a constable was a horticultural growth of a rare order, there were items in the Vote which required explanation; £870 was set down for the maintenance of the approaches and Gardens. Of course, some hundreds of that must go to the Gardens. In addition, there was £550 directly charged for horticultural works for ditto. Considering the limited extent of the garden space, and the limited amount of horticultural display that was ever perceptible, he would like to know would any private gentleman be able to expend £800 a-year upon a similar amount of garden space for a similar amount of horticultural return? It seemed to him they ought to get some explanation, or otherwise the country would be justified in considering that it was being charged at least twice as much as any private person would be charged for the same return. He certainly would not push his opposition to a division if he could get anything at all like an estimate of what were the works for which they were asked to pay so highly.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the £870 went towards the repair of the roads, repairing the railings, and so forth. The actual gardens were provided for out of the £550.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN asked who was the responsible architect in the case of alterations and improvements of the Parliament buildings?

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON observed, that under Sub-head E there was a charge of £2,500 for police. The charge was a large one, although he did not suppose too large. All he desired to ask was, why the charge was placed on the taxes, and not on the rates? He had the authority of the Home Secretary for saying that the protection of persons and buildings all over the country was absolutely, by law, laid on the rates. Why the inhabitants of London should be exempted from such a charge he could not understand. When any public servants went into the country they were protected out of the rates. Why were they not protected out of the rates when in Westminster?

MR. GORST said, he wished to ask a question with regard to the electric light in the Library and Dining and Smoking Rooms of the House. No doubt, the lighting of rooms in the Houses of Parliament was very valuable to the Lighting Company, because it was a splendid advertisement. He understood that it was the Edison Company who were lighting these rooms; but, without wishing to throw any discredit upon that Company, he must say that the lighting was not at present extremely well done. Those who used the Library knew that the light was excessively unsteady, and was very embarrassing; and nothing was more irritating to anyone who was reading or writing than a perpetual change in a bright light. He had been told that the contract for this lighting had been given to the Edison Company without anything like public competition. The Swan Company had lighted the new Law Courts extremely well, and nothing could be more satisfactory than that light. It was very good and very steady, and seemed to be free from all the evils of the light in the rooms of the House; and he should like to know whether the Swan Company were invited to tender for lighting these rooms, and if not, why not? Were any other Companies than this American Company invited—such as the Brush Company, which lighted the City, or any other of the many Companies in London, any one of which would have been only too glad to have the contract for lighting the rooms of the House of Commons? There was another reason why he thought great care should be taken in connection with the electric light. In no business in modern times had there been more corruption and gambling and intriguing on the Stock Exchange than in electric lighting; and if the same feeling was to be brought into the House of Commons it would be a great misfortune. He wished for an explanation as to why this contract had been given to the Edison

Company without any communication with, or invitation to, other Companies to tender, if that was so; and also for a pledge that if the other parts of the House were to be lighted by electricity, the First Commissioner of Works would undertake, before any further arrangement was entered into, that there should be the usual invitations issued for tenders from the public, and that the work should be given to the Company which would do it most satisfactorily and at the least cost.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he understood the Committee were now upon the main Vote, and he wished to say that if any more money was spent on the ornamentation of Westminster Hall until something was decided as to what was to be done with it; it would be wasted. The Hall was now deserted and forlorn; the time would soon come when owls would hoot in the Palace, since the step of the lawyer no longer echoed there. The Hall would never be of any use again until it was made what it ought to be, the centre of the Houses of Parliament. It was wholly deserted, while the passages of the House were crowded in a most disgusting manner. It was scarcely possible for a Member to get to a Committee Room without going through an unseemly crowd for the want of accommodation. Matters would not be put in a proper condition until Westminster Hall was restored to its proper position as the centre of the House of Commons, and Committee Rooms were made by the side of it for the use of people concerned in Public and Private Bills. Money spent in ornamenting the outer side of the Hall would simply be wasted.

Mr. MAYNE said, that, as a Director of an Electric Lighting Company, he was able to say that the introduction into that House of a foreign system of incandescent lighting had given a most serious blow to one of the most meritorious systems in the world—that of Joseph Swan, of Newcastle. His beautiful lamp had made itself a name in almost every capital in Europe, and the most serious check it had received was the fact that its most pressing rival had been apparently chosen for lighting the most important building in the United Kingdom. Certainly, if this foreign system, which was known to be not better than the Swan system, had been introduced into the House of Commons without such notice as would have enabled the Swan Company, or whatever Company was working their patent in London, to compete, it was a most unfair arrangement, and one which, if it was possible, should be gone back upon, so that a grievous wrong might be remedied.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, with reference to the observations of the hon. Member for Hythe (Sir Edward Watkin), he understood that Mr. Pearce had been appointed architect for a special object. That being so, and the right hon. Gentleman having said that the first work was to be only tentative, was it intended to case-in the buttressess, in order to protect them from the weather? The observations of the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had come a little too late; his arguments ought to have been put forward earlier in the year. He would suggest that smokers should be transferred to the Conference Room, and the Smoking Room given up for he general use of Members.

Mr. WARTON said, that what was greatly wanted in the Smoking Room was an electric communication with the House, to tell those who were there what was going on in the House. At present they were more distant than the Clubs; and it was absolutely necessary that they should have some means of knowing what Business was proceeding in the House.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, with respect to the question of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), he had answered that a few nights ago.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: You did not answer it at all.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, his answer was this. A proposal was made to him, some time ago, by the Edison Company to light the Library and other rooms experimentally, till the end of the Session, for a small sum. He thought it desirable that Members should have an opportunity of seeing what the effect would be, and he therefore accepted the offer. At that time the Company had a working station within easy reach of the House, and it appeared to him reasonable to employ them. Subsequently, they ceased to supply the light from their own depôt, and made use of an engine in the House. He did not invite competition—first, because the lighting was only to last for a few months; and, secondly, because it did not appear to him that, in the present state of electric lighting, it was a proper subject for competition. When, some months ago, he had to consider the question of lighting the Law Courts, he came to the conclusion that it was a matter upon which he could not invite competition. There was considerable difference between the systems; and it appeared to him better to select that which he thought most satisfactory, and invite the Company to tender. After careful consideration, and the exhibition of the various systems at Paris and at Sydenham, he decided that the Swan Light was the best adapted for the Law Courts, and he invited the Swan Company to tender for the work. He gave them the work; and if there was any Company which ought not to raise objections to his having followed the same course with regard to the House of Commons, it was the Swan Company, because he had given them the preference in the Law Courts. Between the two systems he saw very little difference. [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Oh, oh!] Perhaps the noble Lord was connected with the Swan Electric Lighting Company? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHIL: Not even a shareholder; I wish I was.] He saw very little difference between the two lights. He gave the work at the Law Courts to the Swan Company, and he thought it only reasonable to give the work at the House to the Edison Company. He should consult hon. Members as to whether, on the whole, they wished the lighting to be continued; and if they did, then it would be a question whether it should be extended to the Chamber or not.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, the right hon. Gentleman, in replying to his hon. Friend, had thought fit to insinuate that he was a Director of the Swan Company. He thought that was as improper as it was inaccurate. As, however, the right hon. Gentleman had ventured on that ground, he would follow him, and tell the Committee what information he had as to the Edison Company getting the work in the House. The Swan Company had lighted the Law Courts in a manner which had satisfied everybody; and not only had they done that, but they had made superhuman efforts to get ready for the opening of the Law Courts; so that if anybody ought to be taken into consideration in regard to lighting that House, it was the Company who had thus acted so well towards the public. But what they complained of, and what other Companies complained of—and he was no more interested in one than the other—was, that without a word to any of them the right hon. Gentleman concluded an arrangement with this Yankee adventurer, who was suspected of having stolen the Swan patent, and had let him into the House of Commons. That was no small matter, for it was without question the greatest advertisement that could possibly be given to an Electric Lighting Company. It was now known all over the world, wherever there was a Parliamentary Assembly, that the Edison Company were lighting the English House of Commons. The First Commissioner of Works knew that these Electric Lighting Companies had been the subject of most disreputable cheating and gambling on the Stock Exchange; and he ought, therefore, to have exercised particular care in the matter; and, at all events, he knew that the Swan Company had done good work, and he had no right, without letting them know, to let the Edison Company in. He was not connected with the Edison Company; but the hon. Baronet the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) was a Director, and the Right Hon. Mr. Bouverie, a faithful supporter of the Whig Party, was a principal proprietor in that Company. It was also a notorious fact that Mr. Preece, the Electrician to the Post Office, was a very large shareholder in the Edison Company. He stated that on very good authority; but, if it was not true, the sooner the statement was contradicted the better. Was it not, above all things, desirable, in a matter of this kind, which had been the subject of so much gambling, that when a Government official thought it right to introduce the electric light into a public building, there should be no unfair advantage of the least kind given to one Company over another? But the case was stronger still. The right hon. Gentleman had given the House to understand that he wanted the Edison Company to be allowed to have a trial, in order to let the House and the public see what they could do; but he had not stated that the Edison Company had been lighting the Post Office for some time; and, therefore, so far as a trial was concerned, that Company had had all they could desire. The right hon. Gentleman had no right to give to an American adventurer, whose patent was obtained in a most extraordinary way, and not until after the Swan patent had been disclosed, all the advantage, and so send up the value of the Edison Company, and become unwittingly the victim of great Stock Exchange speculation. He hoped, before the right hon. Gentleman concluded any further arrangement with this adventurer's Company, he would put everything out to tender with respect to this House, or any other public building—of course reserving to himself the right to choose any tender he thought best—and so let everything in connection with this lighting be fair and above board.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was sorry if he had done the noble Lord an injustice by supposing that he was connected with an Electric Lighting Company. Certainly, the noble Lord's speeches and questions appeared to him to be directed, not to the interest of the public, but to the interest of some rival Company to that which had been lighting the House. But there was not a word in the argument which the noble Lord had used against the action he had taken which did not equally apply to the lighting of the Law Courts. If he had done wrong in giving the Edison Company the right provisionally to light the House of Commons rooms at a cost of £100, how much worse must his conduct have been in permitting the Swan Company to light the Law Courts at a cost of £7,000 or £8,000, without inviting any other Company to tender? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: They did tender.] He had told the noble Lord the other day that he invited a tender merely from the Swan Company after the most careful consideration, and after satisfying himself that theirs was the best system for the Law Courts. There were a great many different Companies with various systems, and he thought it better to choose the light which he considered the best, and invite a tender for the work. He thought that in that respect he had done some service to the Swan Company; but when it became a question with regard to this House, he had other matters to consider. The Edison Company laid before him reasons which led him to think, as he still thought, that, on the whole, their system was best adapted for that House—namely, that they had noiseless dynamo-engines, and he thought they were the only Company that had them. As to Mr. Edison being an American adventurer, he thought that was a misrepresentation. He was one of the most respected and distinguished scientific men of the day, and the Company which was working this patent was one of the most respectable character. The noble Lord had insinuated that the contract was given to the Edison Company on account of Mr. Bouverie's political support; but there was no ground for such a suggestion. He had already given one great work to the Swan Company; and, under the circumstances, he thought it well to try the Edison Company for a short time. Whether that Company's light would ultimately be adopted was not yet decided, and he would consult Members upon the subject.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he felt sure that the right hon. Gentleman's exposition of the economic principles which had guided him would be instructive. He had told the Committee that, as between the foreigner and the Englishman, the Liberal Government would always give the foreigner a fair chance; but as the right hon. Gentleman proceeded he thought he cut the ground from under his feet, because he said he had chosen the Swan Company to light the Palace of Justice because he considered their light the best. [Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: At that time.] And having given that proof of his conviction as to the excellence of the Swan Company's light, it was very strange that he did not, at any rate, let the Swan Company know that he intended also to try the electric light in the House of Commons. When public works had been well done by a particular contractor or body, one would fancy that it would be only reasonable to give those who had served the State well once, at least a chance a second time. He was quite aware that the right hon. Gentleman was only actuated by a desire to give fair play all round; but, at the same time, it was to be observed that in his reply to the noble Lord, he entirely passed over all notice of the fact that besides Mr. Bouverie, a much more trusted and more influential Liberal was connected with the Edison Company, which had got this preference in so remarkable a way in the House. It was hardly meeting the case to refer to Mr Bouverie, when a much stronger argument was left untouched. He was sure that the impression that would be left in the minds of independent Members who were neither Directors nor shareholders, by the cropping up of this question from time to time, would lead to a strong conviction that the more care they could expend in watching the influence of Directors in that House, the better it would be for the country at large; and from that point of view he was extremely sorry, without casting any slur upon the hon. Members concerned, but simply in view of the public interest, that the House had recently not shown enough jealousy of the interference of Directors of powerful Companies in the legislation of Parliament—legislation which might mean good to the public, but which certainly meant a large pecuniary profit to the Companies in which those Directors were interested. Like every other Member he, of course, accepted the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman; but he hoped that an opportunity would be given to hon. Members to try the effect of the rival system of electric lighting in the House before any long time had elapsed. He could bear his own personal testimony to the discomfort experienced in trying to read by the hard and crude light now in the Library.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE stated, in reply to an earlier question, that the buildings of the Palace of Westminster were in charge of the principal clerk in the Office of Works.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN said, the salary of that officer was £250 a-year, rising by £5 per annum to £300. Could it be the fact that that House, with all its important buildings, was in charge of a clerk of the Works at a salary of £5 a week. If that was not so, in whose charge were the buildings? In order to have the matter thoroughly explained, he should move the reduction of the Vote by the amount of the clerk's salary.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £27,880, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Buildings of the Houses of Parliament."—(*Sir Edward Watkin.*)

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the building was in the charge of Mr. Taylor, the principal surveyor to the Board of Works, who was a most competent man. He had, of course, a clerk of the Works under him. The salaries being paid by the Board of Works Department, they did not appear in the present Vote.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN expressed his surprise at the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that this important building was under the supervision of no architect whatever. It was, he thought, well that the public should know that the entire responsibility rested upon a surveyor and a clerk of the Works.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the right hon. Gentleman had not replied to the question of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) as to whether the Government had any definite design or destination in view for Westminster Hall? He asked whether the works there were intended to carry out any special purpose for the convenience of hon. Members, or for the convenience of persons having business at the Houses of Parliament? It appeared to him that at present Westminster Hall was simply a huge annex, for which there was no particular use, except so far as it might be preserved under the designation of an ancient monument.

MR. MAYNE said, it would be well to receive some assurance from the First Commissioner of Works that some arrangement would be made with regard to the stone used in public buildings in future, so that they might not again witness the extraordinary spectacle, presented by the exterior of the Houses of Parliament, of the stone crumbling away almost immediately after the work was finished. The hon. Member opposite suggested that a competent architect should be employed, and that Portland stone should be used as being more durable; but he would point out that it was not a question of architects, either competent or incompetent. An architect would not be able or willing probably to give that attention to the selection of the stone which was required. It was the opinion of some persons that the stone selected for the Houses of Parliament was more durable than Portland stone, and that the fact of its not wearing well was due to some remissness in its selection; and he had heard it stated that, owing to false economy, when the building was half completed, several competent officers had been dismissed whose business it was to select the blocks of stone at the quarries before they were carved. It was a well-known scientific fact that both very good and very bad stone would come out of the same quarry of Magnesian limestone; and if there was not some competent officer charged with the selection of the stone before carving, it was only to be expected that it would wear badly. With the lesson afforded by the Houses of Parliament before them, he thought it would be a satisfaction to the Committee to be assured that there was to be some official, either the surveyor of the Board of Trade, or his clerk of works, charged with the selection of the stone to be used in future, or someone who was capable, at all events, of distinguishing good Magnesian limestone from inferior qualities of the same material.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it was not the intention of the Government to erect any building on the west front of Westminster Hall, the restoration of which had been undertaken by the eminent architect, Mr. Pearson. With regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Hythe (Sir Edward Watkin), he would repeat that the principal surveyor to the Board of Works (Mr. Taylor) was a thoroughly competent architect, who had already for the Government executed some most important works, and was capable of doing everything demanded from him in connection with the Houses of Parliament. He could assure the hon. Member for Tipperary (Mr. Mayne) that every possible care was taken to select the best stone for the purpose of the repairs to the Houses of Parliament.

Mr. DILLWYN said, it was a great satisfaction to him that the First Commissioner of Works had not employed a permanent architect on the building. So long as they had permanent architects they would have permanent expenses, and new buildings in continual course of erection. On the other hand, he hoped his right hon. Friend would always continue his policy of having a thoroughly practical man to look after works of the kind in question.

Sir EDWARD WATKIN said, with the permission of the House, he would, having received an explanation from the First Commissioner of Works, withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. TOMLINSON asked whether, in the case of the charge for the restoration of the west front of Westminster Hall, the sum they would be ultimately asked for was the difference between the sum of £7,900, the whole sum stated to be spent, and the amount to be realized by the sale of the old materials of the Law Courts?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the sum estimated as the value of the old materials had been more than realized, the total sum received being over £3,000. The cost of the restoration of the west front of the Hall would be, approximately, £6,000.

Mr. MOLLOY asked for information on what appeared to be the extraordinary item of £3,650 for the Supply and Repairs of Furniture. He found that £10,000 had already been charged for repairs to the Houses of Parliament. So that this was purely a question of chairs and tables—not of building. He would like to know the position occupied in the building by this large amount of furniture that required to be repaired. The whole thing appeared to him to be very much in the nature of a serious overcharge.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the charge referred to did at first sight appear to be a large one; but he thought if the hon. Member were to see the details of it, he would admit that it was not unreasonable. It included a vast number of items—amongst others, the sum of £800 for supplies of glass, plate, linen, &c., for the Refreshment Rooms. This was a charge that passed through the Refreshment Committee of the House, and it must, therefore, be regarded as having met with their approval. The charge also related to the Refreshment Department of the House of Lords, and other rooms in the building—especially the Speaker's house—some of the fittings of which were very costly. The silk curtains in that house had last year to be replaced, and the charge under this head was thereby increased.

MR. MOLLOY pointed out that the plate could not be included in this Estimate, because there was a separate charge for it of £830. He repeated that this charge of £3,650 was purely and simply for the supply and repair of chairs and tables. He gathered, from the statement of the First Commissioner of Works, that the curtains for the Speaker's house were in the Estimates of last year; that point had, therefore, no bearing upon his argument.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that under the head of Furniture was included plate, linen, and glass for the Refreshment Rooms. No doubt the other item was a further sum required in consequence of the addition to the Refreshment Rooms.

MR. MOLLOY asked if he was to understand that £830 was necessary for the plate in one Refreshment Room?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that was the sum asked for by the contractor. As it had passed through the Refreshment Committee, he concluded that the item had met with their approval.

MR. CALLAN said, he hoped that something would be done to make the seats in the Library of the House more comfortable for Members. Some of them were as hard as boards; and as he had drawn attention last year to the condition they were in, he trusted the Whitsuntide Recess would be made use of to render them more comfortable.

MR. HARRINGTON said, that the item of £3,650 was for two years. If the £850 for plate was in addition to that referred to by the right hon. Gentleman as for last year, it would seem that the Government were asking for double the sum required.

MR. O'DONNELL said, while they were upon this subject he thought it only fair to call attention to the deficiency of accommodation supplied to persons who had business at the House. The arrangements for dining, for instance, were very imperfect. He did not wish to press the point at that moment, as an opportunity would doubtless present itself later on; but he thought an early opportunity ought to be taken for reviewing the whole question as to that which fell under the domain of the Kitchen Committee. Certainly, in view of the amount set down for providing utensils and accommodation of all kinds for the Kitchen department, he did not think Members had any reason to congratulate themselves on the result, either in respect of comfort or the excellence of the arrangements.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £550, to complete the sum for the Monument to the Earl of Beaconsfield.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he had heard it stated, and seen it in the newspapers, that a very large sum of money would be necessary for the purpose of putting Westminster Abbey in an efficient state of repair. As the statue to the Earl of Beaconsfield was to be placed in the Abbey, he trusted the Secretary to the Treasury would be able to state that no sort of arrangement would be made for charging the country with the money required without the distinct understanding that the consent of Parliament should be previously obtained.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £117,762, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Maintenance and Repair of Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, including various special Works; for providing the necessary supply of Water; for Rents of Houses hired for the accommodation of Public Departments, and Charges attendant thereon."

MR. GORST said, he intended to move the reduction of this Vote by the sum of £5,000, and he believed that the proposed reduction was one to which the Government would be willing to agree. The Charge was stated as follows:—"£5,000, National Gallery; improvement and accommodation; on account; total cost uncertain." He wished to point out that the first business of those who came to the House for money was to state the works for which the money was wanted, and to present an account of the cost. On a former occasion some sanitary alterations were requisite with reference to a Public Office, and the same proceeding took place as that which he now complained of. The First Commissioner came down and asked for a Vote on Account for certain alterations, without letting the House know what was the amount that would be required. On that occasion strong objection was made on both sides of the House, and he believed a Motion was made to reduce the Vote by the amount asked for. It was only on the representations of the right hon. Gentleman that the proposed sanitary arrangements were most urgently required, that the lives of public servants were in danger, and that unless the money were granted it would be impossible to set about the alterations which were indispensably necessary, that the House was very reluctantly induced to consent to the Government taking the Vote in the objectionable form in which it was presented. He (Mr. Gorst) well remembered the protestations of the Secretary to the Treasury on that occasion, that the proceeding should never occur again; and that credit should be taken in the Estimates of the future in such a manner as would show the nature of the work, and the total expenditure that would be incurred. He was astonished to see that a Government who valued their pledges should have forgotten their protestations, and again committed the same financial sin as that for which, on the occasion he had mentioned, they had expressed so much contrition. Here was a Vote proposed for the improvement of the accommodation of the National Gallery; the large sum of £5,000 was asked for on account, no information being given to the Committee, and no information apparently being in the possession of the Government as to the total cost which would have to be voted by the House after the sum of £5,000 now asked for was granted. It could not be pleaded, as it was on the last occasion, that the matter was of the greatest possible urgency; the requirements of the National Gallery were not so pressing that they could not wait another year; and, therefore, he thought that as soon as the Government recognized the mistake they had made in putting this sum on the Estimates, they would consent to the reduction he was about to move, and postpone the improvements until, in the Supplementary Estimates, proper information could be given to the Committee. He did not know whether he should be in Order in moving to strike out this sum of £5,000; his wish was not to stand in the way of any Gentleman who might wish to move the reduction of the Vote by a larger sum.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER asked if it would be afterwards competent to him to move the reduction of the Vote by the larger sum of £7,000?

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member would be in Order in moving that reduction after the Amendment proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham was disposed of.

Mr. GORST said, he would then move the reduction of the Vote by the specific item of £5,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £5,000, being the sum required for the National Gallery (Improvement of Accommodation), be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Gorst.*)

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he should certainly be open to the observations of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham if he were to ask for a Vote of £5,000 on account for improvements and alterations in the National Gallery, without giving the Committee full information as to what was to be done with the money. In this case, when the Estimates were framed, no actual arrangement had been made as to the nature of the contemplated improvements; and it was, therefore, impossible to put the whole cost in the present Estimates. A few days ago he had placed in the Library of the House a plan showing, in detail, the work intended to be executed at the National Gallery. He thought the hon. and learned Member would have been aware, from the statements in the public Press, what the nature of the work was; but, at all events, he would inform him what was contemplated by the Government in this matter. Before doing so, however, he might be permitted to remind the hon. and learned Member and the Committee of the demands which had been made, from time to time, in connection with the National Gallery for further accommodation than at present existed there. Every Member of the House would know that these had been extremely pressing. In 1881 the Trustees brought the subject before the Government, and said that the pictures there were increasing so rapidly in number that the space at their disposal was totally inadequate for the purpose of hanging them. Last year the Trustees again memorialized the Government on the subject, saying that the larger Galleries were so blocked as to cause great inconvenience. Many of the pictures had to be hung on screens; and at length these screens, owing to the increase in the number of pictures acquired by purchase or donation, had caused a block in the Galleries. He might also remind the Committee that that question had been raised from time to time in the House, and that considerable pressure had been brought to bear upon the Government in connection with it. So long as the Government had in progress the important works of the National History Museum and the Law Courts, they were unwilling to take the work of the National Gallery in hand; but when these were finished, they came to the conclusion that they could no longer refuse the demands of the Trustees; and, accordingly, a plan was prepared with the view of affording the increased accommodation that was required. Hon. Members would see, by the plans placed in the Library, that they proposed the addition of two long Galleries—one 90 feet by 40 feet, and the other 70 feet by 40 feet, and two smaller rooms, each 30 feet by 20 feet. The accommodation asked for by the Trustees was a hanging-room of 700 lineal feet; at the same time, they pointed out that this was absolutely required for the pictures they then had, and that by the time this addition was made they would probably have further pictures to place; and that, therefore, the number of feet stated did not represent quite the limit of their demand. The proposed alteration would give 958 lineal feet, equal to two-thirds of the last addition made by Mr. Barry, and about one-third of the existing space in the building. The total cost of the two Galleries and the two smaller Rooms would be about £50,000. They would be erected immediately behind the Gallery, and would extend in the direction of the Barrack Yard, a small portion of which would be taken; and he thought hon. Members would see that they would be extremely well placed in view of the circulation of the visitors to the Gallery. He had stated to the Committee the actual cost of the additional Galleries; but it was further contemplated, when these were completed, to convert the present Turner Gallery, now objected to on account of the deficient light there, into a grand staircase, and to convert the present staircases into two rooms for pictures. This would cost an additional sum of £15,000; but that expense was not at present to be incurred, because it was not thought advisable to proceed with the last-mentioned alterations until the two new Galleries were completed. It was not desirable that the Turner Gallery should be undertaken at once, because it would involve the displacement of the pictures which were hung there, and accordingly it would be postponed. All that the Committee would pledge itself to now was the sum of £50,000 for the erection of the two Galleries and Rooms he had described. The application for £15,000 for the conversion of the Turner Gallery into a grand staircase would form the subject of a separate application some two or three years hence. The completion of the works to be proceeded with at once would probably require a period of three years. The whole work would probably be completed in about four or five years. He trusted the Committee would be of opinion that, on the whole, the proposed addition was the best that could be made to the National Gallery. It had received the entire approval of the Trustees, and he hoped it would supply their wants for some time to come. In concluding the remarks he had to make, he would also express the hope that, having gone over all the points of objection which the hon. and learned Member for Chatham had stated with so much moderation, the hon. and learned Member would be willing to withdraw his Amendment, and allow the sum of £5,000 now asked for on account to be taken.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND said, he did not think the First Commissioner of Works had met the objection which the hon. and learned Member for Chatham had brought forward. The right hon. Gentleman had explained, it was true, that the total cost of the alterations, described in the Estimates as uncertain, was £50,000. But what he and other hon. Members found fault with was that the Estimate should have been put forward when the cost was uncertain. It was admitted that at the time the Estimates were framed the total cost was unknown. While he approved fully of the alterations to be made at the National

Gallery, he thought the right hon. Gentleman, in view of the fact that no work had to be done there on a sudden, might have left out this item to which they objected from the Estimates, and then, when the cost had been ascertained, come forward with it on a Supplementary Estimate. The objection which the right hon. Gentleman had, in his opinion, not met was, that he was infringing a very important financial principle, by asking for a sum on account of an undertaking the total cost of which was uncertain. He hoped it was clearly understood that they approved the alteration to be made at the National Gallery, their objection being to the mode of putting it in the Estimates.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not consider the course adopted in this case was unusual. If he had not been able to give full details of the cost and the works to be undertaken, he would not have thought it right to ask for the money. He trusted, however, that the Committee would forgive him if he had infringed any financial rule in not putting the total cost in the Estimates.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he thought his right hon. Friend was mistaken in supposing that it had been customary for Ministers to place amounts upon the Estimates on account of works the cost of which was unknown. It was possible to find bad precedents for everything. He had known cases, year after year, in which attempts of the kind had been made, but which had been objected to by the Committee. When Mr. Lowe was Chancellor of the Exchequer, it was proposed to place a number of buildings for public purposes on the space near the Victoria Tower, and a small sum of money —£10,000 or £20,000—was entered on the Estimates without any statement of the total cost, the effect of agreeing to which would have been that the House, without any sufficient explanation, would have committed itself to an altogether unknown cost. He (Mr. Rylands) opposed that Vote from the seat he now occupied, and he remembered that when the Prime Minister came down next day the Vote was not proceeded with; it was, in point of fact, practically withdrawn. Again, there had been cases where the Government had come down with an Estimate without giving the full cost, and where, objection having been taken to the proceeding, the Votes had been postponed, with the view of placing on the Table of the House at a future time the full particulars which were demanded. Therefore, although he could not dispute that demands of the kind in question had been made, yet the practice of the Committee had been to look with great jealousy upon the House being committed to an unknown amount by a Vote on Account being placed on the Estimates. He was by no means opposed to the extension of the National Gallery, and he should be sorry if it were imagined that he was raising any objection to that proposal; but he hoped, before the Committee passed the Vote, they would receive a definite statement from the First Commissioner as to the amount to be expended, so that if that amount were exceeded they would be able to call the right hon. Gentleman to account. His recommendation was, therefore, that the Vote for this £5,000 should be withdrawn; that the exact plans should be settled, and the total expenditure stated; and when these were laid upon the Table of the House he felt sure the Committee would support his right hon. Friend in supplying what was, no doubt, a public requirement.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he was, no doubt, responsible for the form in which this Estimate was presented. Originally, it was not known what sum would be required for the completion of the work; but the sum was ascertained before the Estimate was presented to the House. It was desirable that, as far as possible, the total expenditure to be incurred in works of the kind under consideration should be stated; but it frequently happened that, although they knew that money would be required for certain purposes, they were unable to say what would be the total sum required for the completion of the work to be done, although they were sure that before the matter came on for discussion they would be able to give the Committee all the information required. That was what had occurred in the present case. Some days ago his right hon. Friend placed in the Library plans of the proposed alterations, and during the last half hour his right hon. Friend had made a statement, of which the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had not heard a word, showing the total amount of expenditure involved, and the probable time that would be occupied in the completion of the alterations.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he thought the Committee would do well to accept the explanation of the hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury. They were indebted to the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) for having called attention to what was, undoubtedly, an unsatisfactory point in the Estimates. After the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that £50,000, and possibly a further sum of £15,000, would be required for alterations at the National Gallery, he thought the Committee would agree that they had before them all the information which, in regard to Votes of the kind, they were bound to require. Under the circumstances, he trusted his hon. and learned Friend would not press his Amendment.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he could not imagine there would be any objection, on the part of the Committee, to agree to this sum. There was nothing he desired more than that there should be an adequate national expenditure upon Art and kindred objects. So far as he was concerned, he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would take the opportunity of withdrawing the Vote, for the purpose of doubling or even trebling it. He would be glad to know if the right hon. Gentleman saw his way to removing or modifying those objectionable structures on the top of the National Gallery which were known as the "pepper boxes." The Committee must know that, in its present form, the inhabitants of London had no cause to be altogether proud of the National Gallery as a building.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked if, in the event of the Motion before the Committee being withdrawn, the First Commissioner of Works would undertake to place upon the Table before the end of the Session an Estimate of the total cost of the alterations. [Mr. Shaw Lefevre assented.] In that case, he thought, on behalf of his hon. and learned Friend, he should be justified in asking leave to withdraw the Motion for the reduction of the Vote.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not competent to the noble Lord to withdraw the Motion before the Committee.

Question put, and *negatived*.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, there were several points in the Estimates on which he wished to obtain information before he made his Motion for the reduction of the Vote; and whether that Motion would be for a reduction of £5,000, £7,000, or £10,000 would depend upon the answer given to one of the questions to which he was about to call attention. In the first place, there was the item—probably the most extraordinary in the whole of the Estimates—of £5,000, for "Sanitary Improvements in the Public Offices (Further on Account); probable total cost, £30,000; probable expenditure up to 31st of March, 1883, £10,550." Now, these sanitary improvements meant the communications between the lavatories and water closets of the Public Offices with the main drains. Those Offices were erected at an enormous cost, and if there had been proper supervision on the part of the Architect, and on the part of the Board of Works, the sanitary arrangements would have been properly carried out when the buildings were being erected. It had, however, been stated, with regard to the drainage at the Home Office, that "instead of going into the main sewer it drained back into the Home Office," which showed an amount of ignorance on the part of those which were responsible that would disgrace any builder. But, admitting the necessity for improvements, he could not conceive how £30,000 could possibly be spent in connecting the lavatories and other offices of the buildings with the main sewer at Whitehall. It seemed evident to him that the persons who had this matter in charge would derive a very comfortable annuity from the work of restoring the communications between the Offices and the sewer. This was the first question upon which he desired to have information. The next question related to the Royal Courts of Justice—"Works and Alterations that may become necessary" (they had not become necessary yet) "and other Alterations in the Refreshment Department." Now, if the Committee would turn to page 38 of the Estimates they would find a separate Vote for the Royal Courts of Justice, the House being asked to vote this year the sum of £51,013 under that head. He thought that if the £30,000 for alterations which might become necessary at the Royal Courts of Justice was to be voted at all, it should have been included under the Vote to which he had just directed the attention of the Committee. But it was in this way that these expenses were increased; they were put down partly under one Vote and partly under another, and, in the present instance, two items were taken out of the Vote for the Law Courts and included in the Vote for Public Buildings. Again, he wished to know why the Consolidated Fund had to bear the expense of £60 for the Maintenance and Repair of the Chapter House of the Dean of Westminster? He thought the Chapter at Westminster was sufficiently wealthy to pay for their own repairs. Then there was a charge of £50, the cost of repairing Whitehall Chapel, which he would like to be explained, as also the item of £400 for "Rent, &c., Bridge Street, Westminster Palace Chambers; Ecclesiastical Courts Commission." This latter sum, for the rent of the room in which the Commission met, appeared to him to be far in excess of the necessities of the case. Then there were items for rents in connection with the Law Courts—"Rent in Lincoln's Inn, Appellate Court, including Land Tax redeemed £99; rent of Mr. Justice Fry's Retiring Room, £50." He wished to know why these items were still to be paid, and with regard to them he had no doubt an explanation would be forthcoming. Finally, there was the item on which he had not only to make a Motion, but also to divide the Committee, whatever explanation his right hon. Friend might give. This was the sum of £4,700 under letter G—"Westminster Bridge; maintaining, watering, cleaning, and lighting the Bridge, and for Police and periodical painting." He anticipated the answer that would be given. There were a certain number of houses belonging to the Bridge Trust, the rents of which were received by the Government, and went in reduction of cost to the country. But he ventured to say that those rents did not represent to the country 2 per cent of the amount spent in building the Bridge; and, therefore, if they were to enter into accounts with the City of Westminster, the Government would have to claim from the City of Westminster a very large sum for the cost of the Bridge. But the Government had no more right to put upon the Consolidated Fund the cost of repairing, cleaning, and painting the Bridge than they had to charge that fund with similar expenses on account of bridges in Manchester, Liverpool, and other cities. His contention was that matters of this kind, relating to the Metropolis, should be paid for in the same manner and to the same extent by the ratepayers of London, as the ratepayers of other cities had to pay in respect of their bridges. Whatever promises were made about the Municipal Government (London) Bill, he intended to take a division on the question as to whether an expense, which ought to be borne by the London ratepayers, should be thrown in this unjustifiable manner upon the Consolidated Fund.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, before the right hon. Gentleman replied to the questions of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton, he wished to ask for some information upon the item in respect of the Royal Mint. He observed that for this year the total cost of the operations at that Establishment was £12,750, of which £9,000 was voted last year. His object was simply to ascertain from the right hon. Gentleman in what position the building was at that time, and what was proposed to be done with it this year?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he observed that the Government took exactly the same sum last year; and, no doubt, if he looked at the Estimate for 1881-2, he would find another similar sum. It was clear the Office of Works had got into the way of putting down the round sum of £5,000 a-year, not for any particular work, but in case they might want to spend so much on little improvements of their own. He was also told that the Government Departments had lately acquired an extremely objectionable practice. The rule was that they did not specify works costing less than £100, but only those costing more. He was told, by an hon. and learned Friend who had been on the Committee of Public Accounts, and had watched the accounts very carefully, that the Government had a way of getting a number of works, really of an important character, executed without spending large sums on them at a time

—by putting against them sums of under £100 every year. By this means works could be undertaken without the House of Commons becoming at all enlightened as to their cost. In order to get the money from the House of Commons, a number of small beginnings were made on various works, the individual amounts of which did not come to £100, and then they lumped them together, and put the total down at £5,000. That, he thought, was probably the secret of the £5,000, and he could not conceive anything more objectionable. They had no right to let the Committee vote sums of £100 for works that they knew were going to cost much more. That was not the way to ask money from the Committee of Supply; and if he should not be interposing between the Committee and the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), he would move to reduce the Vote by leaving out the item at the end of Sub-head A—"New Works and Alterations of a minor character not particularly specified above." He wished to draw attention to another matter which raised a question to which he had attracted notice the other night in Committee of Supply, and that was the item for Maintenance and Repairs of Public Buildings. He wished the Committee to give attention to this item, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works would be able to give them some explanation with regard to it; but, before he proceeded to deal with it, he desired to say that they allowed the right hon. Gentleman to take the Vote for Maintenance and Repairs six weeks ago, on condition that he laid on the Table the detailed accounts of three separate items. The right hon. Gentleman would correct him if he was wrong; but he believed that as yet no such statement had been produced. [MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: It will be produced.] He was glad to hear it. £37,000 was charged for bricks and mortar—surely there was a great deal of extravagance there. There was a large item for Burlington House, and for the London University there was an increase of £230. If they went to Chelsea Hospital they would find an increase of £810; and he should like to know why this place was not treated like Greenwich Hospital, which was repaired out of its own funds? This £810 did not include new works, as he was always endeavouring to impress on the Committee. Then they went to the Tower of London and the Royal Military Asylum, and there were other items making £1,695 increase. He could not think the Office of Works were exercising a proper control over these Estimates unless they kept down this item for Maintenance and Repairs. It was clear that these payments, instead of decreasing every year, went on increasing, and that the items were enormous and beyond all reason, and far beyond what an ordinary private individual would pay. There was no reason why the Department should not exercise economy, as a private individual would; and he would, therefore, press on the right hon. Gentleman to give them some explanation, and to promise that these matters would receive his personal supervision and attention, which, there could be no doubt, they had not done hitherto. He moved the omission of the last item under Sub-head A.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he wished to call attention to the Vote for Works and Restorations of the Tower of London. He desired to move the omission of the item of £3,500.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an earlier part of the Vote. The Committee is about to consider the Motion of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock, and if we go on to that, we shall not be able to go back afterwards to the item for the Tower of London.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had put a number of questions to the First Commissioner of Works, and, pending the answer he received to them, he had reserved his right to move the reduction of the Vote. Also pending the answer given to a question, he (Captain Aylmer) reserved his right of moving a reduction. If they could not go back after moving a reduction, he wished to ask what they were going to do? He was waiting to hear the right hon. Gentleman's answer.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he would move to leave out the whole of the item for Works and Restorations at the Tower of London.

THE CHAIRMAN: My duty will be to put the Questions as they arise.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: It will be more to the convenience of the

Committee if I do not propose my reduction now.

The CHAIRMAN: The noble Lord has not moved it. The hon. Member (Mr. Percy Wyndham) moves a reduction.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM: I move the reduction of the Vote by £3,500 for Works and Restorations at the Tower of London.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £3,500 for the Tower of London (Works of Restoration) be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Percy Wyndham.*)

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would give them some assurance as to how far these restorations had gone on? The subject was of considerable interest to people out-of-doors, who had been considerably alarmed by a statement made last night, to the effect that a portion of the Tower was to be restored to the condition it was in in the time of Henry III. It was difficult to tell what its condition in the time of Henry III. was, and even if it was known it would not be possible to reproduce it. There had been several unfortunate restorations during the last 25 years, one of them having been to entirely scrape away the plaster from the walls, so as to show the rubble-work, which was never intended to be shown since mediæval times. The effect was quite ridiculous. He did not mean to say that there had not been a great deal of improvement effected at the Tower. Some 25 or 30 years ago an addition had been made, which resulted in hiding the main Tower from the River. This addition had been taken away, which was a great advantage; but there were a large number of people out-of-doors who were anxious that these restorations should not be carried any further, and especially that the Record Keeper's Office, which had existed since the time of Edward III., and which was mentioned in Strype's *History of the Tower*, should be preserved. The building had been twice restored, no doubt; but it was a lineal descendant of the old mediæval office. Would the right hon. Gentleman assure them that in any new building put up there would be no attempt to masquerade the architecture of previous periods traceable in the Tower; but that the building would be constructed solely with a view to the purposes for which they are required?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he would deal with this Question before he went to the wider one to which his attention had been directed. The item alluded to was part of one agreed to last year. Last Session he informed the House that it was the intention of the Government to effect considerable alteration in the Tower of London. They had determined to pull down some enormous warehouses which hid the Tower from the River—they proposed to demolish them altogether and rebuild the old ballium wall. Exception had been taken to a restoration of that character; but he might inform the Committee that he had obtained the sanction of the War Office to the demolition of the warehouses, on the express understanding that accommodation would be found elsewhere for some of the officers of the garrison who would be displaced. Then arose the question, in what particular style should the buildings they would have to put up be erected? Were they to be modern buildings? Should they pull down these ugly old buildings in order to put up, in their place, ugly modern buildings, which would be equally objectionable? He did not think so. It had appeared to the Department with which he was connected that it would be desirable to build on the plans of the old ballium wall. This could be done at very little expense—at an expenditure of not more than £6,000, for which sum, they believed, they would get an exact counterpart of the old building. In doing this they would really be continuing the restorations they had now been carrying on for some years. As to the Record Building, he must altogether dispute its claim to antiquity. The general opinion was that it was no older than the time of Sir Christopher Wren.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM: You can see it in a print of the Tower of 1598.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he disputed that. He had examined the print referred to, and had come to a totally different conclusion. He believed the building was no older than the time of Sir Christopher Wren. It was proposed to build in the stones of the old wall—they did not intend to destroy the stones of the building, but to replace them in the wall they would rebuild. The hon. Member need not be under any alarm in regard to the works of restoration, for the Department were contenting themselves with the demolition of the warehouses and the rebuilding of the ballium wall. They would see, from the old foundations, whether the walls should be continued through the Record Keeper's House, or whether it would be possible to save that building. He hoped the hon. Member would not press his Motion, but would allow the work to be completed.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he was interested in that miserable failure, the Land Registry; and he wished to ask his right hon. Friend how it happened this year, apparently for the first time, there was a charge of £1,000 in regard to the Registry in Staple's Inn? It seemed to him that this year, of all years, when the failure of the Office was most complete, only 14 estates having been registered in the whole year, it was most remarkable that there should be this charge.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, that one question had been asked by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) and another by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill); and he (Captain Aylmer) had intended, before they rose, to ask the two together, because they appeared to bear on each other. They were the last two items under Sub-head A, and the first was—"New Works and Alterations of a minor kind not particularly specified above, £5,000." That had been referred to by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock, and then there was the other item—"Works and Alterations which may become necessary." It seemed to him that about "works not specified above," and "works which may become necessary," there was much of a muchness. He wished to have some explanation of these items, or he should be inclined to move that one or the other of them be reduced. He wished, also, to ask a question on Sub-head "F," "Supply of Water to the Houses of Parliament." The right hon. Gentleman would, perhaps, explain how it was that there was an extraordinary charge for this supply of water this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: To what Vote does the hon. and gallant Member refer —Vote 7?

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, he was alluding to Sub-head "F." He had asked some questions on the point last year; but this year, no doubt, the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give more certain information than he was last. With regard to new works, they were going to have a new War Office and other buildings erected at great cost on land which it would require a great deal of money to purchase. He wanted to know what the right hon. Gentleman intended to do with the land belonging to the Government adjoining the new Government Offices and facing Parliament Street, which he believed he was correct in saying had cost £2,000,000. This question would, perhaps, more properly arise under the head of Public Offices, and not Public Buildings. There was a house, now occupied by Lady Clifton, belonging to the Government by the side of the Horse Guards, the lease of which would fall in this year. What did the Government intend to do with it?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the House referred to—Dover House—was not under his Department. It was under the charge of the Department of Woods and Forests; and he believed the hon. Member was right in saying that the lease would fall in this year. It would be in the discretion of the Government to hire the house from the Department of Woods and Forests, and in some future arrangement of the Public Offices it might be desirable that the Government should become possessed of the house, as it might be found a convenient site for the official residence of the First Lord of the Treasury. As to the Mint, about which the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had put a question, the hon. Baronet would be glad to hear that the works had been completed at a total cost of £14,000, £9,000 of which was spent last year; therefore no item occurred this year. It was, no doubt, most satisfactory that this work, which would cause a great saving to the public, should have been carried out. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) asked a question as to an item of £5,000 for minor works. That sum was always put in the Estimates for small works which unexpectedly became necessary, and it was due to the great extent of the Public Offices. To this sum was charged small works, which amounted each to less than £100, and which they would not be justified in putting in the Estimates—works which were, for the most part, unforeseen. At one time the item was always included in "Works and Maintenance;" but for the last three or four years it had been shown separately, as it was, in fact, an item for new works. It was considered better to lump all these small works in one large item. As to the £2,000 for the New Courts of Justice, for financial reasons it had been necessary, as soon as the work of constructing the Courts was completed, that all expenditure under the Vote for Construction should cease, and that all expenditure for alterations, or on account of fresh additions found necessary in the practical working of the Courts, should fall under the general Vote for Public Buildings. The item of £2,000 had, therefore, been inserted to meet these possible claims; and he was sorry to say that already many claims had come in which had had to be met out of this money. For instance, no sooner were the Courts completed and the Judges in occupation of them than it was discovered that innumerable small works were required in them. Many complained of draughts, and it was found necessary to put up screens and doors in all directions. He had now before him demands from the Judges and the Bar which would involve an expenditure of at least £1,800. It was always found, when a new building was erected, that a great many little things wanted doing which were not originally foreseen and provided for; and, no doubt, hon. Members had experienced that when themselves building new houses. Unexpected demands were made for small alterations and for fittings in the building which had not been allowed for in the contract. Some alterations demanded were almost fanciful; still, it was not possible for the Department he represented to altogether disregard them. The persons who made the demands for additions and alterations had been persuaded that some of the things they wanted doing were unnecessary, but other things had to be carried out; and he should be thoroughly satisfied if, in connection with such an extensive new building, no more than £2,000 was required to meet works of this kind. As to repairs and maintenance, the noble Lord had referred to several buildings, in regard to which it must be observed that in some years a larger expenditure was required on some of them than in other years. As an illustration, let them take the case of Chelsea Hospital. The Vote for the Repairs and Maintenance of that Building was £2,600, as against £1,800 last year; but the increase had been brought about by the necessity for painting the building, which was of considerable extent. Again, there was Burlington House, the expenditure on which had been £1,600, as against £1,400 last year, in consequence of its being necessary to effect certain alterations in the sanitary condition of the interior. He could only say he had gone carefully over the items of this large sum for repairs, and believed that if hon. Members had a specific account rendered, and knew the work done, they would agree with him that the item was not a large one. No doubt, in the aggregate, it was large; but the number of buildings over which it was spread was very great. The item was increasing; but in regard to that no fault was to be found with those who were concerned, as several buildings had been thrown on the Department during the past two or three years which had nothing to do with it previously. The whole of the costs of the repairs of the Admiralty were now paid out of this Vote; whereas, two or three years ago, they were paid out of the Admiralty Vote. He now came to the item mentioned by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler). The hon. Member had specially dilated on the largeness of the Vote for Sanitary Works. No doubt, the total sum of £30,000, including what had already been spent, was very large. £14,000, or nearly half the amount, had been expended up to the end of the present financial year. He regretted the expenditure; but the demands made by the Public Departments in this matter were so serious, and the responsibility of leaving the Public Offices without proper attention, and neglecting to do the utmost to improve their sanitary condition was so great, that he would not have felt himself justified in asking for a smaller sum. The hon. Member appeared to think it a large item; but if he knew what the cost of making these changes in any one Department was, he would not consider the aggregate a large one. Let them take the case of the new Public Offices. It had there been found necessary to replace every one of the iron pipes with lead pipes. Every soil pipe had been of iron, and had had to be replaced with lead, and the alteration had been one which necessarily occupied a long time to carry out, and occasioned considerable expenditure of money. It was, no doubt, too bad that a large expenditure should be necessary in respect of a building recently erected. The architect who designed them was, he believed, President of the Society of Architects when the work was carried out. [An hon. MEMBER: Who was he?] The architect was Sir Gilbert Scott, and at the time the building was in course of construction the Office of Works had for one of its principal officers a gentleman — namely, Mr. Galton—than whom there was not a higher sanitary authority in England. But if this was the case with the newest of our Public Buildings, what must be the state of the older buildings? Many of them were in such a defective state that the only question was whether he should not have included a larger sum to carry out these important works on a larger scale than they were being carried out or would be carried out. He might say that if it had been possible to proceed with the work quicker, even if the expense had been much greater, he should have done so, and have incurred the larger expense. But he could not proceed with a greater rapidity; it was not possible to do all the works at the same time, as it was necessary to avoid interfering with the work of the Departments. He should not have inserted the large item in the Vote if he had not had the fullest conviction that it was necessary for the Public Service, and the health and safety of the public servants. The hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had alluded to the question of Westminster Bridge. That was only one of the many questions affecting Metropolitan rather than Imperial Expenditure which had been raised. The question of Westminster Bridge had been complicated by a fact alluded to by the hon. Member—namely, that the Government had had to take possession of an estate commonly called the Westminster Bridge Estate—which represented a considerable rental of £5,000 or £6,000 a-year, or more than enough to pay the cost of painting, repairing, and otherwise maintaining the Bridge. But, as the hon. Member had pointed out, this estate might be said to represent the capital spent on the Bridge itself. The Government had spent a larger sum than was represented by the value of the estate; it might be said, therefore, that the income of this property represented the interest on the capital already expended, and ought not to be set against the repairs of the Bridge. As to who should bear the expense of the maintenance, that was a question upon which the Government might take a different view to that they held now, when the scheme for the Municipal Government of London was carried into effect. He could only say to the hon. Member that this was one of the questions which must be dealt with, and would be dealt with, whenever the Bill for reforming the Municipal Government of the Metropolis was brought in. With regard to Whitehall Chapter House, it was the property of the Government, and did not belong to the Dean and Chapter. The Chapel Royal, which was not a consecrated place of worship, but really the old Banqueting Hall of Whitehall, also belonged to the Government. As to the increase in the item for the supply of water to the Houses of Parliament, the explanation was this. The water supplied was from an artesian well, which belonged to the Government; and he was sorry to say that a portion of it had broken in, rendering necessary repairs which had been carried out at a cost of about £400. As to the Land Registry, it was intended this year to amalgamate it with the Middlesex Registry of Deeds, and for that purpose larger premises had been required, to enable the two Departments to be worked together comfortably. The Ecclesiastical Courts Commission—one of the largest Commissions ever appointed—were not occupying the whole of the house appointed for their use. It was necessary to hire for them a house at a rather larger rate than usual, owing to the size of the Commission; and endeavours would be made to devote that part of the building which they did not use to the service of some other Commission.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he rose not for the purpose of opposing the

Vote, or of moving an Amendment, but in order to urge on the First Commissioners of Works the desirability and propriety of pushing on these sanitary works in the Government Offices as rapidly as possible. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware of it; but at the beginning of the last decade there was an enormous amount of low fever and sickness amongst the clerks at the War Office. An enormous amount of suffering and loss of life was occasioned by the bad sanitary condition of the Offices in Pall Mall. That state of things went on for years; and it was not until two General Officers were affected, and His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was taken ill, that any serious attempt was made to deal with this state of things. When a proper investigation took place it was found that Marlborough House, and the principal buildings outside of Pall Mall, drained not into the main drains, but partly into cesspools, and partly into the ornamental water in St. James's Park. Something was done at once; but it was done in an imperfect and insufficient manner, and for a long time there was a great deal of illness in Pall Mall. The state of things now, however, was more satisfactory there; but in many other public buildings there was a great amount of illness and suffering on account of their bad sanitary condition. The Government at last recognized the fact that it was necessary to deal with the matter on a large scale, and proposed to spend £30,000; but he could not understand why they proposed to go leisurely to work. Do not let them do the work piecemeal—let them spend the whole of the £30,000 at once, if necessary, and remedy the evils, and get rid of the complaints at once. The Government might say that they had a plan of proceeding drawn up; but if, in following that plan, they were obliged to proceed at a leisurely rate, it might be an unfortunate thing for the clerks concerned, some of whom might lose their lives through the delay. Many of these clerks occupied over-crowded premises, where the ventilation was as bad as it could be. If the Government had a plan drawn up, the best thing they could do would be to throw it overboard, and adopt a new one founded on the suggestion he was now making, which was to get all the sanitary work they had to do carried out without delay during the present financial year.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR complained of the defective manner in which the Civil Service Estimates were prepared. When he contrasted the way in which the Civil Service Estimates were made up with the exactitude in which the Treasury required the Army and Navy Estimates to be introduced, he could not help thinking that the result was discreditable to the Treasury. The set of Treasury Minutes, presented to the House in 1856, ought to be applicable to the Estimates of the Civil Service, as well as to those of the Army and Navy. The excuse made for not putting forward correct Estimates was that they were liable to be altered. That was no valid excuse at all. These Votes on Account were a great evil, and he objected to funds being so obtained, because he knew them to be the cause of great abuse in delaying the public discussion of the Votes. Then the mode of mixing up Votes for rents, insurance tithes, &c., set down at £34,363, was calculated to prevent that knowledge of the separate items so necessary to facilitate proper check. In many instances, rent was put down without any explanation, without even any indication as to the Office for which it was charged. These rents, necessarily large in amount, required that a strict inquiry should be made as to whether the Offices were properly rented, and whether the accommodation was more or less sufficient for the duties transacted in the rooms; and also whether buildings belonging to the Government could be made available. He was sorry to say he did not believe the Financial Secretary to the Treasury had leisure to enable him to so make such very requisite inquiries.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL moved the omission of the item Sub-head A—namely, "£5,000, for New Works and Alterations of a minor character not particularly specified above." The explanation given by the First Commissioner of Works ought not to satisfy the Committee. When £24,900 was taken for the maintenance and repair generally of Public Offices, the Committee of Supply ought to make a protest against a lump sum of £5,000 being put down, and no genuine account being rendered of what the purposes were for which it was required.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £5,000, for New Works and alterations of a minor character, be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Lord Randolph Churchill.*)

Mr. GORST said, he thought Her Majesty's Government ought to make some observations upon the present occasion.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had already made the fullest explanation. The noble Lord made a strong attack, and then left the House to refresh himself. He did not think it necessary to remain while he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) made his explanation, but came back afterwards and moved to omit the item.

Mr. GORST said, he was present when the right hon. Gentleman made his explanation, and he thought he never heard a more unsatisfactory explanation. The only explanation afforded was that the sum was put in the Vote because it always had been. He understand this was an economical Government, a Government which was going to make great reductions in the Public Expenditure. Where were they going to begin? What item could, with more propriety, be cut out than the one now under consideration? It was only put in the Estimates in order that the Office of Works might have a sum of money in hand to play with, and that they might be able to gratify the demands for money made by all sorts of people. The right hon. Gentleman told them that, as regarded the Courts of Justice, he was open to all sorts of demands from the Bench and the Bar. He knew they would ask for alterations and improvements, and therefore he thought he would ask Parliament for £2,000, in order to meet the demands. And so he now said he knew that, in the case of other Public Buildings and Offices, there would be a number of people who would ask for all kinds of alterations and improvements, and if he had not this sum of money he would not be able to gratify their laudable desires. He (Mr. Gorst) did not think Parliament could do a more useful thing than to refuse the Office of Works power to give way to all the applications made upon it. If they had not got the money the people would have to go without their alterations until next year. This was a most dangerous item. In the Appropriation Account there was no indication of what the item was. If they now voted this sum of money it would be gone, and they would hear no more of it. How it was spent or squandered Parliament would never know. Next year the right hon. Gentleman would come down to the Committee, and say—"This sum has always been put in the Estimates, and let me have it again." The Committee knew well enough that the Office of Works was surrounded by architects, and surveyors, and valuers, and all kinds of people, who liked to make something out of the work of a Public Department. The only way in which Parliament could check this extravagant expenditure of public money was by refusing to give the Office of Works any money to play with.

Captain AYLMER said, the right hon. Gentleman had stated that £5,000 was necessary to have in hand to carry out anything that might occur or might be required during the year. It appeared, however, that since the New Law Courts had been completed it had been found necessary to increase the sum to £7,000. If an increase was to be made for every new building there was no knowing where the Vote would stop. Although he should support his noble Friend, he was sorry he had not proposed to reduce the Vote by £2,000, the amount taken for the New Law Courts.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the item of £2,000 was totally different to the one of £5,000. It was an item provided in anticipation of demands which were certain to be made in the Courts of Law. Those demands had been made on the Government, and were being carried out. They were of a nature that, in ordinary years, they would be specified in the Votes; but, inasmuch as these Votes were prepared before the Courts were occupied, it was totally impossible to say what they would be.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 29; Noes 79: Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 90.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, he now intended to move a reduction of the Vote and to take a division. The question he was about to ask the Committee to decide was—Are the ratepayers of London to pay for their own bridges and their own roads in the same manner, and to the same extent, as the ratepayers of Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham, and other places? He would not repeat the arguments he used at an earlier period of the evening, but simply move that the Vote be reduced by £4,700, which was the cost of painting and repairing Westminster Bridge, a charge which, in his opinion, ought to be borne by the ratepayers of Westminster and the Metropolis, and not by the Consolidated Fund.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £113,062, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Maintenance and Repair of Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, including various special Works; for providing the necessary supply of Water; for Rents of Houses hired for the accommodation of Public Departments, and Charges attendant thereon."—(*Mr. Henry H. Fowler.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 40; Noes 69: Majority 29.—(Div. List, No. 91.)

Original Question again proposed.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he wished to ask his right hon. Friend for some information as to the item of £4,200 for additional alterations at Southampton connected with the Ordnance Survey. The Ordnance Survey was a subject in which the public took a very considerable interest, and he would, therefore, inquire in what position the Survey was at the present moment? A considerably increased expenditure was estimated for under this head; and it would be satisfactory if the First Commissioner would inform the Committee what progress had been made, and to what purposes it was proposed to apply the additional amount proposed in the Estimates for the work of the coming year?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he hoped the hon. Baronet would defer his question until they reached the Ordnance Vote.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he had to call attention to three items in this Vote which involved three most pernicious principles—namely, £3,300 for Ordinary Repairs and Maintenance of Public Ecclesiastical and Collegiate Buildings, Scotland; £200 for Aberdeen University, Marischal College, Improvements in Heating Arrangements; and £370 for persons in charge of premises taken for Public Offices, occasional caretakers, including wages to Warders of Glasgow Cathedral. These were the first items on which he desired information. He was quite unable to understand why the Consolidated Fund should have to pay for the maintenance and care of Ecclesiastical edifices in Scotland. The next item that required explanation was Gwydyr House, Whitehall, Offices of the Charity Commission, £1,350. Surely that ought to be paid for by the Charity Commissioners, and not charged upon the Consolidated Fund. Then there was a charge of £1,000 for the Chambers of the Land Registry in Staple's Inn. He understood the General Land Registry was about to be amalgamated with the Middlesex Registry; but was the Committee aware that a noble Lord received £5,000 or £6,000 a-year for the latter sinecure? He thought that a gentleman receiving that amount yearly ought to keep out of the way of everything connected with the Land Registry.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that no amalgamation between the two Land Registries was intended, although there was a proposal to that effect. Next, Glasgow Cathedral was a national edifice. It did not belong to the Church of Scotland, and ought, therefore, to be paid for out of the Consolidated Fund. This and the other Ecclesiastical Buildings referred to might be regarded as ancient monuments, which it was a national obligation to preserve. The third question of the hon. Member involved the larger question of the Charity Commission generally, and upon that he could not then enter.

Mr. GORST said, he wished for information as to three items on page 24. First, there was the charge under Sub-head M for Ordinary Repairs and Maintenance of the Survey Buildings at Southampton, &c., £2,120. Upon this he had only to remark that the amount was £200 more than for last year; but as all the Estimates were bloated and increased, he should not have asked for an explanation simply on that ground. The next item was for Additions and Alterations to Buildings at Southampton, £4,200; and then there was the charge of £1,500 for the Erection of New Buildings at Southampton, containing the Engraving Department and other works, total Estimate £3,000. He wished to learn what were these extraordinary additions to the buildings at Southampton, and why it was that, having already paid £3,000 for new buildings, they were now called upon to meet the additional charge of £3,000 in the present year?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, there had been a general increase in the cost of the Ordnance Survey in order to accelerate the work, which it was supposed would be finished in 1890. The staff had been raised from 170 to 240 persons for this year, and that, of course, necessitated larger buildings; hence the increased charge under that head.

MR. MOLLOY said, he wished to call attention to the charge for salary of the Surveyor for the Royal Court House, Douglas, Isle of Man. He believed the Isle of Man was in the enjoyment of Home Rule, and it was only reasonable that a country so situated should pay for the cost of surveying its public buildings. That would certainly be the case when Ireland obtained Home Rule, an event that he thought was not so far in the future as some hon. Members supposed. Unless he was told that the money in question, after being paid out of the Consolidated Fund, was repaid by the authorities of the Isle of Man, he should be bound to object to the item.

MR. COURTNEY said, this amount was paid on account of property belonging to the Crown in the Isle of Man.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*,)—put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Committee to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE BILL.—[BILL 140.]

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 30th April.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

PART I.—CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.

Clause 7 (Extension of term carriage in provision (6) of s. 19 of 32 & 33 Vict. c. 14 to carriage moved by mechanical power).

Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. BUXTON said, it was not his intention to move the omission of this clause, Notice of which Motion stood in his name upon the Paper. He wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if this clause did not, for the first time, place tramways in a separate category as distinguished from railways, and thus propose to extend taxation of the traffic facilities of the public? He also asked whether the clause applied to tramways with carriages propelled by steam or electricity, and to bicycles?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he was glad to reply to the hon. Member who had just spoken, and to remove the doubt which appeared to exist in the minds of some as to the object of this clause. As every carriage drawn by horses or mules paid an annual tax of two guineas, it had been suggested that if an ordinary carriage was propelled by electricity or steam on a road it might escape the tax. To avoid all possible misconception, it had been thought better to put into the Bill a clause imposing a tax upon such carriages. A bicycle would not be included in the clause; it would be propelled by manual or pedal, and not by mechanical power.

Clause *agreed to.*

PART II.—INCOME TAX.

Clause 8 (Grant of duties of income tax).

MR. MACFARLANE said, that last year a discussion had taken place upon a question somewhat similar to that raised by the Amendment he was about to move; but it referred to a different branch of the subject, and dealt only with the case of Companies which, trading in foreign countries, had their headquarters in London. The law was that they were liable for Income Tax, even upon income which never came into the United Kingdom. A case, in which this question was involved, came before one of the Courts a short time ago; and the Judge who tried it had expressed his opinion that, although the law was as he had stated, it was a very undesirable and very unjust law. Although the Income Tax was 40 years old, no Chancellor of the Exchequer had ever attempted to do what was now being tried. He expected, and hoped, the right hon. Gentleman would repudiate the action of some of his lieutenants, who had been going about town calling upon persons to make returns of income received not in England, but left abroad, for the purpose of assessment, and telling them that they were liable if they did not immediately make a compromise with the Commissioners to three times the ordinary tax. He believed there was no authority for that in the Act; but it was a form of intimidation used by the Commissioners to obtain information. It was well known that many persons had a great objection to come into collision with the Commissioners and undergo an examination in public on the subject of their incomes. He held that the Rules issued by the Commissioners for the guidance of persons filling up returns conceded the point for which he was contending. Then there was another objectionable regulation, which related to the receipt of profits from abroad in the shape of imports. It was provided that those imports should be recorded in several different towns—Glasgow, Liverpool, and one or two others. But if the persons who made the importations were liable for the whole of their incomes arising abroad he could not see upon what ground the Government kept a watch upon their imports. It was stated that if a person invested money in foreign securities he was only liable for Income Tax on that part of the interest of those securities which came into the United Kingdom. If that were so, on what principle was it that a person who invested some of his money in trade in India, for instance, was liable to pay on the whole of his profits? The Government claimed to tax a person so placed for the amount which he was employing in the development of the resources of India. He did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would contend that this was right, or that it should be done. Supposing an Australian gentleman came over to this country, leaving property behind him of the value of £50,000 a-year, and that, for his own private use, he had £10,000 a-year remitted to him here. Did the Chancellor of the Exchequer think that, in a case of that kind, Income Tax should be paid on the £40,000 as well as on the £10,000? Then, supposing the Chancellor of the Exchequer made good his claim to charge 20 years' Income Tax on this £40,000, but the Australian died here, leaving an accumulation of £1,000,000 in Australia, and that he willed this money away to a local stranger. In that case, would the Chancellor of the Exchequer claim Probate Duty on the £1,000,000 of accumulation? If not, what right had he to make the Australian pay Income Tax on the money which had gone to make up the £1,000,000? He (Mr. Macfarlane) would be very much surprised if the right hon. Gentleman defended the question at all; but, if he did, he should be very glad to hear on what ground he made the one charge and did not attempt to make the other. He would take one other imaginary case. Supposing an American came over to live in this country. Supposing, for instance, Mackay, the Silver King, came to England, and became subject to the Income Tax. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer claim Income Tax on his $1,000,000 a-week in America? He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would ever make such a claim; and, if he did, he was quite sure he would not realize it, because the American Minister would probably intervene, and would place himself between the Silver King and the Income Tax Commissioners, who would be acting for, and under the direction of, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. As he had said before, the Income Tax was so vague that there was no possession in the world in respect of which a claim might not be made under it; and the only method there was of testing its real meaning was by observing how it had been put in force for the last 30 years. There was one other point he wished to mention. He should like the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say what amount of income would be chargeable if he was able to charge Income Tax on money that never came into this country. It would certainly be a very high estimate if he put it at about £4,000,000. Taking it, however, at that sum, the amount realized from this demand, which caused so much annoyance and irritation, would be something considerably under £100,000. He asked the right hon. Gentleman, even if the letter of the law was on his side, whether it was wise, or expedient, or reasonable, to tax visitors to this country in this way, especially when the amount obtained by the tax was so comparatively small? A great many of those who would be subject to this tax were visitors, strictly speaking; and probably large numbers of them would return to their own country if the right hon. Gentleman attempted to enforce this charge. They would leave England, not entirely on account of the actual amount they would have to pay, but because they would feel a sense of wrong and injustice. Everyone would admit that whatever money came into this country, from wherever it came, was justly liable to be taxed; but the money which a visitor left behind him was liable to the taxation of the country in which it remained. He would give the Chancellor of the Exchequer another illustration of how this system would work. The Australian he had spoken of came over to England, leaving a large amount of money behind him. He took a house in London, and purchased a couple of carriages. Of course, he would have to pay the duty on those carriages. But he left a dozen carriages at home in Australia. Would the right hon. Gentleman claim Carriage Duty on the 12 carriages in Australia as well as upon the two in London? The same thing would apply to dogs. The man might have two dogs here and 20 in Australia. He (Mr. Macfarlane) could see no difference whatever between the cases of the Dog and the Carriage Tax and the Income Tax in this matter, except that the amount to be obtained by the last-named tax would be much better worth having than that which would be realized by either of the others; and this might influence the Chancellor of the Exchequer to some extent. The right hon. Gentleman said that if a man came into this country he must pay not only for what he brought with him, but also for what he left behind. That reminded him of the old story of the showman, who was in the habit of informing visitors to his booth—"You cannot go in without paying; but you can pay without going in." But the right hon. Gentleman went really much further than this, for the right hon. Gentleman said—"You must pay whether you come in or not; and if you do come in yourself, you must pay for everything belonging to you which you leave behind." With these remarks, he begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 41, after the words "five pence," to insert the words—"Provided, That the tax payable under Schedule D in the case of persons residing in the United Kingdom, but having no place of business therein, and not carrying on any trade therein, but deriving their income from the profit upon trade in places outside of the United Kingdom, shall be upon the amount of such profits transmitted to and received by them within the United Kingdom."—(*Mr. Macfarlane.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, the question raised by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carlow was an exceedingly important one. It was important not only in its bearing on English interests, but also in its bearing on international rights. Going back some distance, he should like to call the attention of the Committee to the principle which was adopted by the establishment of the Income Tax. It superseded the principle of indirect taxation; and the consequence was that the principle was laid down that all property which arose in this country under the protection of the law, and all money which was expended in the country, were liable to be taxed. If they taxed all the property created in this country, thay taxed everything which really constituted the income of the people, and they need not, also, tax the expenditure. If the other countries of Europe and the world followed the rule of England, and taxed all the property created in their several jurisdictions, it was plain that, supposing we taxed foreign property on its arrival here, it was taxed twice over. He did not pretend that this was always an evil to be avoided, because many people who resided in this country, and had property created abroad, had in England the advantage of expending it under the protection and shelter of the English Government, and, therefore, might fairly be said to be under an obligation to contribute to the expenses of the English Government. Looking at it in that light, the whole subject divided itself under four heads. The Government might tax incomes created in this country and expended in this country; they might tax incomes which were created abroad and expended in this country; they might tax properties created abroad and introduced into this country for expenditure; and, lastly, they might—and this was the point now at issue—attempt to tax incomes created abroad and not brought into this country. He admitted that, with regard to the three first of these categories, it was reasonable to place them within the grasp of the tax-collector; but he held, most clearly and distinctly, that neither in law nor in equity had they the slightest claim to tax property created abroad and not brought into this country. The Government claimed to call upon everybody who came to this country on pleasure, or who resided here, to make a return of all the income they possessed in any part of the world. As the hon. Member for Carlow had just pointed out, people might spend their thousands a-year here, and have tens of thousands accumulated in some other country, and the Government could ask them to make a return of all the property they possessed, both here and elsewhere, for the purpose of taxation. He looked upon this as a monstrous injustice, as an infraction of International Law and right, and he said it was a process for which the Government could find no justification in the Statute Book. He called the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to this last fact as one which might, perhaps, weigh more with him than any other. If the right hon. Gentleman would examine the Statutes on this subject, he would find that in describing property, whether it arose from securities, trade, or manufactures, or insurance, it was always brought to this test—that it was to be charged at the place of entry. Not a single exception to that rule was to be found. He had some extracts from the Statutes bearing on the subject; and he found that in Section 108 of the original Income Tax Act it was provided that profits or gains arising from foreign sources were chargeable at the place where they had been first entered. Section 29 of the same Act was to a similar effect. Again, in the 16 & 19 *Vict.*, it was provided that nothing in the first-named Act was to except any person resident in any part of the United Kingdom with reference to the profits or gains received from or out of any possessions or securities in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions. These were the ruling enactments, and there was not a single word in them which gave the slightest authority for the action now attempted by the Inland Revenue Commissioners—namely, that of taxing properties which did not come to this country at all. The authorities, by this "fad" of administration, called on men to do something which under the law they had no right to do, and which was an infraction of the law. It had never been the practice, until recently, to charge with Income Tax profits of this kind. The other day he put a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether the Inland Revenue Commissioners were justified in calling on people to themselves assess properties which they did not bring into this country, and the right hon. Gentleman's reply was that they were. Then, if they considered themselves justified in doing that, the Committee would be justified in affirming the principle of the hon. Member for Carlow's Amendment, and in saying that such a gross infringement of international rights and of the law of justice to individuals ought no longer to be tolerated. He had very great confidence, indeed, in supporting the proposition of the hon. Member.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that a few nights ago he had to defend the existing arrangements with respect to Free Trade against the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Ecroyd). One of that hon. Member's great complaints was that there was a tendency to make large investments in foreign countries rather than at home, and the answer was that the persons making those investments abroad were liable to pay Income Tax on them. To-night he had to meet the opposite charge, for the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Macfarlane), and his right hon. Friend (Mr. Hubbard), complained that persons carrying on trade here were not allowed to make foreign investments, in cases where the proceeds of those investments did not come home, but were re-invested in foreign countries, without paying a tax upon them. He (Mr. Childers) differed equally from the hon. Member for Preston, who condemned these investments, and his right hon. Friend, who would have them untaxed. The right hon. Gentleman had used very hard words about this law, both with respect to its principle and its administration, and had quoted rather copiously from a Paper referring to various Statutes on the subject. He would respectfully state that he was acquainted with the extracts from the Statutes to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred; but they had no bearing whatever on the law as it had been laid down during the whole of the present century. Since the Income Tax was introduced during the French War, the principle had always been that annual profits or gains coming to persons residing in the United Kingdom, and accruing from trade, whether the same should be carried on in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, were subject to the Income Tax. Two cases which had been decided in this century proved that this was the state of the law. Of these, one was settled in 1808, and was the case of a man living at Hemel Hempsted, in Hertfordshire; and the other, which related to a merchant in the town of Hull, was settled in 1810. In both these cases the contention was that the profits made out of the Kingdom, if they did not come into the Kingdom, were not, and should not be, subject to Income Tax. In both cases, also, the decisions of the authorities were to the effect that those profits were subject to Income Tax, and this had been the universal decision of the authorities ever since. All subsequent decisions had followed these decisions, as forming a distinct rule; and such a rule had been universally observed and acted upon ever since as the law. If persons making profits in business carried on abroad had not returned them, we might be sorry they had not observed the law; but the law was very plain, and, as a rule, such profits were returned, and the taxes were paid upon them. He wished to say a few words as to one contention of his right hon. Friend and his hon. Friend the Member for Carlow. They said that the question of expenditure ought to be considered in connection with the subject when one came to deal with the equity of the case; and they urged that money derived from investments abroad, and which was not brought into this country, did not represent any expenditure in this country, and therefore should not be subject to Income Tax. He would, however, remind the Committee that the Income Tax had not anything to do with expenditure. It was levied upon income, and not upon expenditure; and if they laid down such a rule as that which the right hon. Gentleman suggested, people who might have large incomes, but who spent very little, would claim exemption from a tax levied in such a way. The principle of the Income Tax was that a certain tax should be levied on income, and he was not now going to question whether that principle was good or bad. They had to deal with it as they found it; and if they introduced this element of expenditure they would land themselves in endless trouble. There was one other point to whether he would call the attention of the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that it would be perfectly fair for a man trading abroad to pay Income Tax on the profits thus made if those profits were remitted to this country; but he had contended that if they were not so remitted, and were re-invested abroad, he should not pay Income Tax on them. Well, what would be the result of adopting a system of this kind? They would have, undoubtedly, one law for the rich and another for the poor. The merchant of small means, who brought home for his own benefit the profits he made abroad, would be subject to the payment of Income Tax on them; but the more wealthy merchant, who re-invested abroad, would escape Income Tax on such re-investments. Thus, the wealthy houses would escape a large amount of Income Tax; whereas the poorer houses would be compelled to pay the tax upon the whole amount of their profits. The plain and simple rule which now existed was the best—namely, that the Income Tax was payable on the profits made by persons who resided in this country, wherever those profits were made. If they once made any exception to this rule they landed themselves in inconsistency and difficulty; and he hoped the Committee would not approve of the principle of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Carlow.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had dealt with a case which was not touched by his Amendment at all—namely, the case of persons trading in England. His Amendment referred to persons residing in this country, and not trading at all. Again, the Amendment did not touch upon the question of expenditure. He admitted that the Income Tax was chargeable on income.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): That is quite true; but I had to answer both the hon. Gentleman and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hubbard), who did not follow the same line of argument.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, the Amendment under discussion did not stand on the ground of levying the tax on expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had referred to the case of a merchant trading in Hull in 1810, who was declared liable to be taxed on the income he made from trading in other countries. But that was not the kind of case he proposed to except from the payment of Income Tax. The case his Amendment referred to was that of persons not trading in this country, or doing any business in this country. The right hon. Gentleman had not really touched the point of the Amendment at all.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) remarked, that one of the cases he had quoted had been that of a person carrying on business in Hull; but the other had been that of a person who was not carrying on business in this country.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, he should be glad to know if the second case to which the right hon. Gentleman referred had been a ruling case; and if persons in a similar position had been charged with Income Tax from that day to this?

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD said, that when the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer accused him of introducing a new element into the question, he begged to observe that he was making a concession to the Inland Revenue Commissioners, by placing under their grasp properties coming from abroad and expended in this country. He would draw the attention of the Committee to an imaginary case. He would assume that there was a wine merchant here with large establishments in Oporto. He had a house in London and one in Portugal, and made £20,000 a-year by his business. Whether he spent all this or not, and whether he was an individual or the representative of a Company, he was bound to make a return of the whole of the £20,000 for taxation. But supposing the same individual had a share in a mine in Mexico, and was called on to return the profits of that mine, which had not brought a farthing into this country for years, he was under no obligation to do so. It was not at all a question of rich or poor, large or small houses. Every person established in business here, with a foreign trade, was bound to make a return of every farthing he made by that business at home and abroad; but in the case of a foreign business in which he had a share, or of a foreign property, and the profits of which were accruing abroad, in that case the Government had no right to demand a return, except for so much as might be received in this country. All the Amendment sought was to prevent the Government pursuing a course which would be equally futile and unjust.

Mr. MACFARLANE observed, that the discussion had turned entirely on persons in trade; but he wished to hear from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the case of a personal investment of a large sum in securities, he claimed a return for Income Tax of the income arising from the whole of those investments, or whether he contented himself with a charge on what came into the United Kingdom? The rule was that, as regarded interest arising from securities out of the United Kingdom, the duty was to be assessed on the amount which had been, or would be, received in the United Kingdom in the course of the year.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, that if the profits came as trade profits into Schedule D they would be chargeable; but if they did not so come into that Schedule they would not be chargeable.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, that in the case he had mentioned the profits did come within Schedule D.

MR. BIGGAR said, it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had endeavoured to lay down the law clearly and fairly; but, at the same time, he thought his hon. Friend the Member for Carlow (Mr. Macfarlane) had been thoroughly justified in bringing forward the question, and that the arguments were entirely in his favour. It was quite impossible, in practice, for the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Childers) to carry the law as it stood into practical operation. He would illustrate what he said by citing one or two cases that might, and would probably, arise. Suppose an Australian had made a large sum of money in sheep farming, and came to London and took a house, did anyone think it would be fair to ask him to pay the full amount of Income Tax here on his whole property in Australia, in addition to Income Tax on the money sent to London to him? Take a German—the late Prince Batthyany, for instance —who had a large amount of property in Germany, or Austria, or Hungary. Suppose he had property in the funds, on which the dividends were paid in the country in which the funds existed, was it to be considered that he should pay Income Tax on the coupons in that foreign country and in this country as well? It was clear the contention of the right hon. Gentleman could not hold water, and that, in practice, the scheme he proposed must break down. If a person held a small amount of foreign bonds, he could very well have the coupons paid through an English banker and pay Income Tax on them; but where there was a large sum in question the law would be sure to be evaded, and the Income Tax would be sure not to be paid. Seeing how certain it was that the law would be evaded, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would do well to agree to the Amendment.

MR. GORST said, that, according to the doctrine of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Income Tax must be paid twice over. Let them take the case of a man domiciled in this country who derived the whole of his income from Italian funds, and had only part of the profits remitted to him in this country. According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was bound to pay Income Tax not only on the amount he received here, and had protection for under English laws, but upon the whole of his profits. A member of an Italian Company domiciled in England would not only have to pay Income Tax on his profits in Italy, but, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the whole of those profits in England also. Take the case of an English subject domiciled in Italy, and the Italian Government demanding a second tax on the income he might derive from funds invested in England which already paid Income Tax in England. An attempt of that kind had been recently made in Italy, and our Foreign Office had intervened on behalf of the British subject domiciled in Italy, and had taken pains to point out to the Italian Government the extreme injustice of their demand. It was fair enough, said the British Government, to charge the British subject domiciled in their country on the whole of the income he derived under the protection of their laws; but it was a monstrous thing to attempt to make the British subject resident in their country pay Income Tax on funds which were not derived under the protection of their laws. No one saw the injustice of the demand more clearly than the British Government.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he was not aware of the case referred to by the hon. and learned Member. The simple principle on which they proceeded was that the whole trade income should be taxed. If they adopted any other they would have to inquire in each case whether, in fact, the Income Tax had been paid in the foreign country or not.

MR. PUGH said, it did not seem to him that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had even yet answered the question. The question was this—if a man who had a certain amount of capital invested in foreign securities, and did not receive profits from those securities in this country, should he be liable to pay Income Tax? To his mind, the answer should be, clearly not. The profits received in the foreign country might be left in the hands of a partner and treated as capital, and in such a case it would be most unjust to tax them in England. Was there no difference between money invested in Foreign Loans and money invested in a business in a foreign country?

Mr. BIGGAR considered the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not given a sufficient answer to the question put to him by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst). The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think it was very material whether the Income Tax was paid on dividends or on the profits of a business carried on in a foreign country; but he (Mr. Biggar) did not look upon it as an important matter at all, for if a person did not pay Income Tax on the profits he received out of a business in a foreign country he would be sure to pay some other tax in regard to those profits. What was complained of was that they should be taxed twice over. It seemed to him very clear that profits made in a foreign country should not pay Income Tax, unless those profits were really brought into this country. If they were brought to England and spent here, no doubt they ought to be taxed.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 99; Noes 158: Majority 59.—(Div. List, No. 92.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Provisions of Income Tax Acts to apply to duties hereby granted) *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Provisions as to duty on dividends, &c. paid prior to passing of this Act) *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (Assessment of income under Schedules (A.) and (B.) and of the inhabited house duties for the year 1883-4. 32 & 33 Vict. c. 67.)

Mr. HICKS said, he very much objected to the clause, which appeared to him to be at the root of the objection to the Bill. It introduced an entirely novel principle and practice into the way in which the Income Tax was collected and assessed.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): I can assure the hon. Member this is the customary clause which is inserted in every Bill of this character. There is nothing novel in it.

Mr. HICKS said, he was very sorry if he had misunderstood the clause; but he wished to know what "assessors and surveyors" of the Income Tax were? He understood what the assessors were—they were officers appointed by the local authorities of the country; but, as he read the clause, the surveyors were officials appointed by the Government. If he had misread the clause, he could only say that he was sorry for having taken up the time of the Committee unnecessarily. If it was not intended to interfere with the present system there was no objection to the clause; but if the present system was to be altered the Committee had a right to call on the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state distinctly what the alterations were.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, he was sorry to interrupt the hon. Member just now; but the object of his interruption had been to point out that this was the customary clause in the second and third year of the assessment. The first year was the local assessment; but during the second and third years there was nothing but formal work to be done, as provided for under the clause.

Mr. HICKS: Am I to understand that there is to be no alteration in the present system?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): None.

Mr. HICKS: In that case I will not go on with my objection.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Provisions of Income Tax Acts to apply to duties to be granted for succeeding year) *agreed to.*

Part III.—Collection of Income Tax.

Clause 13 (Extension and construction of this part of Act. 43 & 44 Vict. c. 19.)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): On this clause, as it is the first clause in Part III. of the Bill, the Committee will expect to hear from me some explanation of the change which it is proposed to make in the collection of the Income Tax under Schedules D and E. Under the present system in Scotland, in Ireland, and in about one-eighth of the towns of England, while the collection and assessment under Schedules A and B, and the assessment under Schedules D and E are made by the local officers, the collection under

Schedules D and E are effected by the officers of the Inland Revenue. But in the other districts—in Ireland, Scotland, and about one-eighth of the English towns—the collections under Schedules D and E are effected by the officers appointed by the local Commissioners of Income Tax. We propose by this clause, as I have amended it, that as vacancies occur in those collectorships the collection shall be transferred to the officers of Inland Revenue, on the condition that the Treasury is satisfied in each case that the change will produce an economy. The Committee will observe that the provision is in Section 14. What is proposed is, that where it will be found advantageous to the Public Service, and an economy, that the collection under Schedules D and E should be transferred to officers of Inland Revenue; that transfer shall take place, not as against existing collectors, but on the voidance of office by them. I will state the reasons for the proposed change. The collection of Income Tax under Schedules D and E is a very delicate matter. The collection under Schedules A and B is similar to the receipt of rates. There is no secrecy as to the amount at which houses and property are assessed, and that collection may well go on in the hands to which it is now entrusted. But the Income Tax under Schedule D relates to the profits in trade. The system of employing locally-appointed collectors is open to the objection that by the process of collection a man gets to know the income of his neighbours. For these reasons the system of transfer from the local to the Imperial officer has been steadily going on. Whenever such a thing takes place as the failure of the local authorities to appoint an officer, or an officer's unwillingness to give security, from that day the collection of Income Tax under Schedule D is transferred to a responsible collector on salary, from an irresponsible official on poundage. Parliament has thus, in Scotland and Ireland altogether, and step by step in England, decided to transfer this collection from the irresponsible collector on poundage to a responsible collector on salary—that is, a public officer. In support of this view I may state that for three years the Associated Chambers of Commerce recommended us to make this change, and in each year I think unanimously; and in the last year not only was a recommendation arrived at by the Chambers of Commerce, who may be understood to represent in the main the trade of the country, but Mr. Sampson Lloyd, who used to sit in this House, and was then President of the Chamber, was requested to address a letter in August, 1876, on the subject to the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which, in describing the objections to the present practice, he, on behalf of the whole of the Chambers of Commerce, used these words—

> "The system is, further, objectionable to the taxpayer, inasmuch as it reveals the amount of tax paid, and, consequently, of income enjoyed by him, to a neighbour who may possibly be his rival in trade."

These words, I think, sum up very simply the objections which are felt by a very large proportion of traders to the continuance of the present system. But I have another reason which I think will have some weight with the Committee, and that is the extravagance of the present system, and the very decided economy which will result from the change. The present charge for the collection under Schedule D is £52,000; and, after very careful inquiry, we compute the charge under the system we propose, when the whole of England is brought under it, at £21,100; so that there will be in the end a saving of £30,900 a-year. I may take particular districts which we have carefully inquired into. I will take, for instance, the collection in London. The whole amount of poundage received at the present time by collectors in London is about £41,000 a-year. Of this amount, £26,000 is in connection with Schedules A and B, and therefore would not be affected by the change; but the poundage under Schedules D and E in London is £15,438. There is no doubt that the whole of the Tax could be collected through the Inland Revenue at a cost of £4,500, so that in London alone there would be a saving of nearly £11,000. I may say that I allow in that calculation for the possibility of having, in some cases, to increase the poundage on account of other Schedules. There have been two arguments set up as practical reasons why this change should not be made. The first is, that if we make it the collection of the Income Tax will be slower than it now is; and that in that way the Government would be the losers. We have carefully considered that argument, and I will give one or two facts as the result. I have taken the collection of last year. I find that in Birmingham, from which there has come a strong request on the part of certain persons that the collection should not be interfered with, the amount of tax under D and E collected before the end of March was 50 per cent, or one-half of the whole amount. In the same way, the amount collected in Southwark was 63 per cent; in Marylebone, 73 per cent; in Manchester, 64 per cent; but when we turn to the towns where the collection has been already transferred to the public officers we find a very different result. In Bristol the amount collected at the end of March, instead of being 50 and 60 per cent, is 96 per cent; in Bradford, 83 per cent; in Bolton, 91 per cent; and in Warrington, 92 per cent; and the fact is, that whereas, under the present system, the collection is extraordinarily unequal, and in many large towns extremely slow, where the collection has been transferred it is tolerably equal, and the collection is considerably more rapid. But there is one other argument which I have heard lately, and as to which I should like to give some facts to the Committee. It has been stated by hon. Gentlemen on the other side that the result of the present system is that, from the collectors knowing the habits and circumstances of those from whom they collect, they are able to apply to them at the right time; and that, therefore, the amount of bad debts is much less than it will be if the collection is transferred to Government officials. As to that, I have also made careful inquiry; and the result is that, so far from the amount of collection in respect to bad debts being larger under the old system than under the new system, the bad debts under the old system are about 2 per cent, whereas, under the new system, they are only about 1 per cent, so that on that point—which, when I first heard it, strongly impressed me—the result is exactly the opposite of that stated. The tax is more equably levied and better brought in under the new system than under the old; and from Liverpool downwards, where the new system is in force, I have not received a single complaint; whereas my box is full of complaints from taxpayers, under the old system, that their neighbours have not paid their tax, all of which points to the inexpediency of entrusting this collection to persons who are not responsible public officers; and the expediency of transferring it to those who are responsible to the Government. These are the main reasons why we propose the change. I hope the Committee will adopt this plan, which not only is proposed by me, but was proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1879; and that, this done, we shall, at any rate, carry out steadily and slowly the principle which has been adopted by Parliament during the last few years—namely, wherever the opportunity occurs, gradually transfer the collection under Schedule D to salaried officers of the Government. Clause 13 is merely formal; the actual clause is the 14th. Clause 13 says that the Bill shall only apply to England; but, as a matter of fact, the system we propose already applies to Scotland and Ireland; and, therefore, we can only apply it to England. I hope the proposal will receive the approval of the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

Mr. SLAGG said, he was most unwilling to stand in the way of what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said would be a great public advantage; but he must ask for an assurance on one or two points before he could assent to this striking change, which really aimed at the alteration of what might be considered the Constitutional collection of the Income Tax, and which was a serious step in the direction of compulsory centralization. The Chancellor of the Exchequer based his plea for this alteration on three grounds—public demands, great economy, and celerity in the collection of taxes. He did not wish to stand in the way of progress; but he must represent to the Committee opinions which had reached him of such irresistible force that it would be a dereliction of duty not to place them before the Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that there was a strong popular feeling in favour of this alteration, which was expressed by a number of letters in his possession. But since it became a matter of public notoriety that he (Mr. Slagg) was taking an interest in this matter, he had received a vast number of letters, and amongst them those in favour of the change were infinitesimally small in number; while those expressing a strong desire to adhere to the present system were exceedingly numerous. Of course, the system of Petitions was received with more or less cynicism by the House; but he thought Petitions might be weighed as well as counted. There were over 100 Petitions from influential ratepayers praying that the present state of things might be continued; and with regard to a Petition he had presented from Manchester, if he were to collect all the names to which he attached the greatest weight on any matter he could hardly collect a more influential list than those on that Petition. The same might be said in regard to a Petition from the City of London. The names of the leading merchants and bankers and Chairmen of great public Companies had been appended to Petitions to the same effect. What would this alteration do? It provided for the dismissal of one set of officials in order to appoint another set to do precisely the same thing. He gratefully acknowledged the concession made by the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the continuance of the present collectors, although he was not specially concerned in their class grievances. It was said that this change was proposed on the ground of economy, and the right hon. Gentleman stated that this plan had worked well in Ireland; but he should like to call attention to the expense of its operation in Ireland. The receipts in that country for Property and Income Tax last year were £462,930, while the poundage paid to Government officers amounted to £10,500, or 2½ per cent. In England the net receipts were £8,653,364, while the poundage amounted to £122,500, or 1½ per cent. Of course, he would be told that the circumstances of Ireland were somewhat different, and that the cost was proportionately greater; yet this disparity was very remarkable. But this plan had been tried in Liverpool, and he had strong reason to believe that there was no great economy under the new system in Liverpool; and the right hon. Gentleman had not stated, and probably could not state, what the cost had been. But other experiments had been made, and although they were on a small scale they would serve for illustration. At Enfield the officers' salaries last year amounted to £1,010, whereas the poundage under the old system was only £223. At Tooting the poundage was £40, whereas the new collector's salary came to £145. The cost of collecting the taxes under the old system, it should be remembered, included offices, furniture, stationery, and all other charges. As to the inefficiency of the present collectors, he should like more proof. The evidence in his possession was entirely in favour of the present collectors, and he had not met with any objections on the ground of a want of reticence on the part of the collectors with regard to their neighbours, which seemed to create so great an impression on the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There was, indeed, strong evidence of general satisfaction with the present state of affairs; and he would refer, in support of that statement, to the Petition from the City of London. There were on that Petition some names which must appeal in great force to the Committee—for instance, Mr. Thomson Hankey, the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, Sir Thomas Chambers, the Chairman of the London and St. Catherine's Dock Company, Alderman Waterlow, Mr. W. H. Heath, and many others of great influence. In that Petition they said they were perfectly satisfied with the present state of things, and they further complimented the collectors in their speedy collection of the tax. But his strongest objection to the change was that it was not being done in a thorough manner. He should have no objection to discussing a complete change; but here, instead of the whole of the Schedules being transferred to the Excise officers, they were split up in a manner which would cause great public inconvenience and annoyance. He had read a letter from a collector in Hulme, in his own constituency, where this experiment had been tried, and he stated that in nearly all cases the taxpayers under Schedules A & B also paid under Schedules D and E, so that the whole of the taxes could be collected with the greatest convenience by the same persons. As to complaints with regard to disclosures by collectors, what was to prevent the Excise officers also making disclosures? Instead of one person able to make disclosures there would, in future, be two, because the present collectors would still act as assessors; and he knew of nothing in regard to ordinary Excise officers which would serve as a safeguard for reticence. The Committee must bear in mind that it was now open to any community to alter the present system, and adopt the one which the right hon. Gentleman had proposed. Taxpayers might also select a number of methods of paying Income Tax which would avoid the possibility of disclosures to their neighbours; but very few availed themselves of these opportunities. He ventured to bring these facts before the Committee, because they had been brought under his notice by influential authorities, and because he thought they were entitled to the consideration of the Committee.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was anxious to say a few words, because his name, and that of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, had been brought before the Committee in consequence of a clause having been introduced into the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill when he had the honour of being Secretary to the Treasury, under the late Government. When they introduced that clause they believed—as he had no doubt the present Chancellor of the Exchequer now believed—that there were a vast number of complaints throughout the country as to the present mode of collecting the Income Tax; and the facts the right hon. Gentleman had stated to-night as to the disclosures, and the delicate nature of the matter to be dealt with by the collectors, as reasons for an alteration of the system, were so pressed upon the late Government by the Inland Revenue authorities that a clause similar to that now proposed was introduced into the Bill. But what did they find? They found almost immediately the same storm as had arisen round the right hon. Gentleman now; and they were so satisfied by the evidence produced that the proposal would not be beneficial that they withdrew the clause, and substituted for it a clause giving the option which was now law. They introduced a clause making it optional for a locality to go to the Inland Revenue and place themselves in the hands of the Government collectors if they thought the existing mode of collection was objectionable. Since that time there had not been such a large number of people who had availed themselves of that option as to show that the grievance was of such force as to necessitate a reversion to what was at first proposed. He would remind the Committee that besides the option being in the Bill, every taxpayer had the option called to his mind every time the papers were sent out. He was asked under which head he would be taxed, and he had only to notify that he desired to be taxed by the Excise officers to be freed from all inconvenience, such as was suggested. As to the advantages of this scheme, the right hon. Gentleman stated, in the first place, that all objections would be got rid of; but he thought he had shown that the complaints had not been of such a character as to render the alteration necessary. In the next place, the right hon. Gentleman told them they were to have a saving effected by this proposal. Well, he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) would not set up his knowledge against the power of acquiring knowledge which the right hon. Gentleman possessed in regard to such a subject; but the cases which had been submitted to him showed that in consequence of the change a larger amount would have to be paid for collection than was now paid to the local collectors. The hon. Member who last addressed the House (Mr. Slagg) had mentioned one or two cases—one, no doubt, dated some time back; but there were several others in which it appeared that the amount paid to the Inland Revenue collectors since the transfer took place was in excess of the amount paid to the local collectors. And they ought not to lose sight of this fact—which formed one of the most important features of the case—that if they handed over the collection of these taxes to the officers of the Inland Revenue, there would not be the same guarantee which existed at present that the feelings of the people would be respected as far as possible, and a knowledge of their circumstances considered in the manner in which it ought to be considered. A hard-and-fast line would have to be drawn, and the demands of the collectors would be made without any consideration for the feelings or the means of the people, all of which circumstances were taken into consideration by the local collectors, who knew the people's circumstances under the present system, and that was a fact which now made the Income Tax more popular than it otherwise would be. By the change of system now proposed, much would be done to increase the unpopularity of a tax which was certainly not very popular in this country. These were reasons which convinced the late Government, in 1879, that they made a mistake in proposing this very system, and which obliged them to withdraw the proposal, and substitute for it one which left it optional with the taxpayers themselves to say whether the tax should be collected by the Inland Revenue officials or by the local collectors. He believed that that would be found now, as the late Government found it in 1879, the better course to adopt; and he trusted that the Government would see their way not to insist on the proposal they had made. He felt convinced that if they did insist on it it would result in a great deal of harm to the collection of the tax; and not only would that be the case, but it would never realize the sanguine expectations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to a saving in the collection.

MR. RYLANDS said, his hon. Friend who had just sat down had reminded them of the fact that the late Government made a proposal of this kind which was afterwards withdrawn; and no doubt his hon. Friend, who was then Secretary to the Treasury, had given the correct reason for that withdrawal. Of course, it was impossible to make any change, however much ultimate benefit it might promise, without giving to the class who might be interfered with by the change a very strong motive to use whatever power they possessed in stimulating opposition to it, even though it might be a public improvement. No doubt, the opposition, as his hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Mr. Slagg) had said, came from all parts of the Kingdom. It came from those who, when they found that under this Bill they would suddenly be removed from Office, naturally felt very much aggrieved, and they could make their voices heard, and applied to all their friends and neighbours to assist them in preventing the carrying out of such proposals. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had met his hon. Friend the Member for Manchester in a perfectly fair manner, and had recognized the feelings of that class whose mouthpiece the hon. Member for Manchester had been that night, because the right hon. Gentleman had now put the matter in this position —that no existing Income Tax collector would be displaced, and that only as vacancies occurred in the existing body of collectors would the collection be placed in the hands of the officials of the Government. This was a matter which would commend itself to the Committee, not only on the ground of economy, but also because it would, he was satisfied, bring about a great improvement in the efficiency of the collection of the tax. When hon. Gentlemen talked of centralization, he knew that centralization had been increasing, and he was as much opposed to it as any hon. Member could be; but it certainly did appear to him that the Government taxation ought to be collected by the Government officers, and that was a kind of centralization which he could not object to. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated, the new method of collection had been tried in the borough which he (Mr. Rylands) did not now represent, but with which he was connected — the borough of Warrington. In that borough they had now had an experience of both systems; and the result was that the old system had proved to be a most unsatisfactory system, while, so far as he could learn, the new system, under which the tax was collected by the Excise officers, had given perfect satisfaction. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated, the money was collected promptly under the new system; and, so far as could be ascertained, there were no complaints. He (Mr. Rylands) wished to remind the Committee that in all their towns they had these Excise officers, who were paid by the Government, and engaged in the duty of collecting the taxes; and they could certainly be charged with the duty of receiving the Income Tax without the necessity of adding very largely to the number of officers. In fact, in many cases, he had no doubt, there would be no necessity for the appointment of additional officers at all—those who received the assessed taxes now could easily receive the Income Tax as well. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer had offered a compromise, he (Mr. Rylands) hoped his hon. Friend the Member for Manchester would be satisfied, and that the result would be to effect a considerable economy in the Public Service.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he thought the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had furnished some arguments against the proposal of the Government, for if the question of economy ought to be chiefly considered, surely the present system ought to be adhered to. He (Mr. Smith) did not stand there as the advocate, in the least degree, of the interests of a class. He thought it most undesirable that Members of Parliament should at any time appear there to represent individuals or classes. His objection to the proposals of the Government was an objection founded upon principle; for he thought it most enexpedient, and most undesirable, that what seemed to him to be a fundamental alteration should be made in the law relating to the Income Tax, and that the functions of the Government should be unnecessarily extended. He had for some time watched the course of events with regard to the functions of Government, and he had come to the conclusion that they were discharged in a manner which was more costly and less efficient on the whole than work done for the Government by private means, and by means independent of the Government, when that work could be accomplished without the aid of public servants. In saying that, he made no aspersion whatever upon the officers, or upon the Commissioners of the Inland Revenue. He believed his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been convinced by the arguments addressed to him that the change which was now proposed was for the public advantage; and, on the other hand, he had not the least doubt that the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, in urging this matter on the Government, were perfectly convinced that it would be accompanied by all the advantages which they so strongly urged; but it certainly was opposed to the principle on which the Income Tax was originally established. ["No, no!"] Well, he would quote some words which would, he thought, show that he was right. He maintained that the principle on which the Income Tax was originally established was this—that there should be Commissioners representing the people who should appoint their own clerk, their own assessors, and their own collectors; and that, on the other hand, the Crown, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue should have their surveyor and their inspector, to see that the Crown received no damage, and that the duties, as charged, were realized. That was the principle of the Act originally, and it remained the principle of the Act still. Now, what was it that was proposed by the change now before the Committee? It was proposed that one of the ancient safeguards which were thought to be necessary in raising the tax originally should be done away with. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had properly designated the tax as a very delicate tax, which required to be dealt with with very great care and consideration. It was proposed to withdraw one of the original safeguards; and, undoubtedly, the officers of the Inland Revenue, in the discharge of their duty, would show zeal and activity, and would press for the recovery and realization of the tax, probably at an earlier period in some cases than the ordinary collector would do, when acting under the directions of the Commissioners. He was not sure that that would be an advantage. The right hon. Gentleman had said that in the result there would be a considerable saving. He (Mr. Smith) had never heard any change proposed in the way of an extension of public duties which was not recommended as an economy. That was always the case; and the Inland Revenue, no doubt, believed that an economy would result from the adoption of the present proposal. But what was their experience at that moment? Why, that the cost of the collection of the Revenue was far greater now than it was only five, six, or seven years ago, when there were similar duties to collect. The charge for the collection of the Revenue by the Inland Revenue was greater now by some £100,000 or more than it was seven years ago, and the amount collected, £1,000,000 a-year less. That, he was sure, was a fact known to the right hon. Gentleman; and, if that was the case, they had better leave things as they were with those who were responsible for the collection of the Income Tax. If, as the right hon. Gentleman said was the case, there were people who complained bitterly of the present system, and who preferred to have the officer of the Excise, they could, under the law made in 1879, have him at once. The door was open for them. There was no difficulty whatever in their way. But he (Mr. Smith) did object—and he objected on principle to a change which he believed to be fraught with mischief, and which, he maintained, would endanger the tax itself. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer shook his head when he (Mr. Smith) said that the change was opposed in principle to the doctrine laid down by Sir Robert Peel. He (Mr. Smith) went into the Library that evening to look at the speech made by Sir Robert Peel in introducing the Income Tax in the year 1842, and he found that Sir Robert Peel used these words—

> "I hope that I shall be able to retain that provision, because the policy of the law hitherto has been with respect to the assessed taxes, and it was the principle with respect to the property tax, not to make the collection depend upon the will of the Government, because it was thought more consistent with Constitutional Law to entrust the amount to local parties, and that those who may have the confidence of their neighbours shall be employed for this purpose."—(3 *Hansard*, [61] 912.)

There was a sound principle of human nature embodied in the views thus expressed by Sir Robert Peel. That great statesman said it was necessary that the collection of the tax should be left to the people themselves; and he (Mr. Smith) believed it to be essential that the tax should be so collected, so long as the people were willing to collect it; and he, therefore, trusted that the Committee would accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Slagg), and that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself would give way upon the subject, when the matter had been so strongly urged upon his attention. The right hon. Gentleman had said that a great advantage would be gained by getting rid of certain individuals—the neighbour, the tradesman in the same street, who became acquainted with the affairs of his fellow-tradesman, and was cognizant of the amount that he paid; but he (Mr. Smith) could see no provision in the Bill which would relieve that tradesman, that neighbour, in the same street, from the duty of making the assessment. He understood that the assessment was to remain with the officers appointed by the Commissioners; and they would, therefore, have the tradesman, the neighbour resident in the same street, making the assessment, while there would be the addition of a good many Excise officers to make the collection. That, he thought, was clear as the Bill now stood; and if it were intended that Excise officers, or other persons not appointed by the Commissioners, were to make the assessment, then new provisions of a very grave and serious character would have to be introduced into the Bill in order to effect that object, and he believed they would make the raising of this tax at all a very difficult and a very serious work.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he did not desire to trouble the Committee at any length; but, as an Income Tax Commissioner in the City of London for 10 years, he felt bound to say a few words. He could say, without hesitation, that there would be no economy in the change now proposed; and he was sure that any prediction to the contrary would not be fulfilled. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer should, in addition to giving them his own opinion —which they were all bound to listen to with the greatest respect—have favoured them with some substantial statistics showing that where the change had been in operation there had been a considerable saving of expenditure. What was the principle followed in the present law of collection? The collectors now received 1½*d.* in the pound, or 1-160th per cent, on the amount collected; and what he wished to ask was, whether it was not the fact that in numerous districts where the tax was not collected by collectors appointed by the Commissioners the Government were paying 6*d.*, 8*d.*, 10*d.*, and even 1*s.* in the pound? But the whole thing, according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, ought to depend upon the celerity with which the tax could be collected. Well, the right hon. Gentleman had taken the most favourable case he could—because if he did not take the most favourable case he was not doing justice to himself or to his own proposal—and what was the result? The right hon. Gentleman quoted the case of Warrington, where, he stated, 92 per cent of the tax was collected before the end of March—that was to say, that of the duties due in January 92 per cent was collected before the end of March. But he (Sir Sydney Waterlow) would ask the right hon. Gentleman to take the case of London, where the largest collection had to be made under great difficulties, and where they had had to ascertain the profits on all kinds of trades and all sorts of processes of manufacture. In that great City, up to the 31st of March in the present year, 86 per cent was collected, amounting to £933,421; and the whole of the collection closed a very short time afterwards. It was now proposed to appoint as collectors a number of persons who had no knowledge of the taxpayers, and no knowledge of the circumstances under which they were able to pay the tax in the easiest manner; and these men were to be appointed in the place of persons who had had long experience. It was said—"We do not propose to make the change until vacancies occur in the existing body of collectors; and when that happens you yourselves would have to appoint new men." But who were the new men appointed to fill vacancies under the present system? Why, they were men who had had experience in the collection of local taxes, who knew the taxpayers familiarly, and the taxpayers were more than satisfied with the manner in which the collection was conducted. His hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Mr. Slagg) had referred to one Petition; he (Sir Sydney Waterlow) would refer to another. It was a Petition presented in favour of the present system, and it was signed by C. J. Morgan and Co., Frühling, Goschen and Co., and a number of firms of that character holding the very highest standing before that House and the country. He would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give the Committee the relative cost of collecting the Income Tax in Liverpool under the old system and under the new. That would be a fair comparison. Liverpool was a large town—not so large as London; but large enough to afford a fair test in comparing the two systems. He would venture to put this to the House—was it likely that where two persons were to be employed in future instead of one it could be done for less money than was paid now? Was it likely that, under such circumstances, a cost which now amounted to £52,000 a-year would be reduced to £21,000, and that £30,000 a-year would be saved? He would ask those hon. Gentlemen who had any business experience to remember this—that it was proposed to give up paying for piece work, and to pay for day work instead. Did anybody ever know a man to earn as much when on day work as when on piece work? No. The work was to be done by the ordinary officers of the Excise, and he understood that about 500 of these officers were to take the places of the several thousands now employed by the Commissioners. Those who were now employed gave six weeks of their time at the beginning of the year to the collection of the tax, and they went to other employments afterwards; but what would have to be done with the extra number of Excise officers who would have to be employed under the new system? They could not be employed for anything else; there would be no need for them; but they would have to be paid all the year through, and that would increase the cost to a very much larger sum of money than it amounted to now. He asked the Committee to hesitate before making a change which was a breach of the original condition under which the Income Tax was originally imposed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. Smith) had quoted the words of Sir Robert Peel in putting forward the conditions arranged for the imposition of the tax; and one of those conditions was that the tax was to be collected by people who were known to the taxpayers, and who could collect it with the least amount of irritation, and with the least amount of disclosure of the private affairs of those who had to pay the tax. But what was now proposed was to double the extent of the disclosure, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not propose to take away the duties of the present assessors; and, therefore, there would be one class of men to assess, and another class of men going round afterwards to collect the tax, and this other class must learn all that the assessors knew. He would ask whether the man who made the assessment, and who knew all the circumstances under which it was made, could not collect it better, and be in a more favourable position to answer questions which the taxpayer might wish to put, than a man who knew nothing whatever about the business? It should be remembered that a large number of people made no Returns at all, and the assessor went on putting up the amount until they did make Returns. When the collector was the assessor, he knew all about it; but what was the collector to do under the new system? He could only act on the principle—"Your money or your life! I know nothing whatever about it; but pay this money, or I will put in a bailiff!" The new collector, it must be remembered, would have no experience at all to go upon. The present Government ought to do what they could to lessen the irritation of the tax, for it was a tax which had always been unpopular, and they should not take a course which would only increase its unpopularity.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, in his opinion the concession made by the Government in this matter was a proof that they were aware that the collection of the Income Tax was an affair of confidence. The question was, whether the taxpayer would have more confidence in the local collector whom he knew, than in the Government collector who was a stranger to him? He (Mr. Newdegate) had been in communication with the Mayor of Birmingham, and on this subject Birmingham needed an independent Representative, owing to the close connection of her Members with the Government. He represented Birmingham, and those whom he represented preferred local collectors. He did not believe that the concession made by the Government would, in the least degree, remove the objection to the change proposed, which existed amongst the taxpayers. He was assured by the best authorities on the subject that the traders of Birmingham much preferred the present system of collecting the Income Tax to that proposed by the Government, by means of a system of central police.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, he should be extremely sorry to disturb the existing arrangements with regard to the Income Tax Commissioners; but the matter was quite different as to the persons who actually received the money. Those persons, although they were called assessors, were not so in reality, because, as was well known, the assessment, in the true sense of the word, was made by the Commissioners. He was able to say that a considerable economy had resulted from the changes that had been already effected. The entire expense of the arrangement, at the highest calculation, was put down at £20,000, although he did not believe it would amount to as much as that. At any rate, there would be a distinct saving of the cost of collection to the extent of £30,000 a-year.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 161; Noes 168: Majority 7.

AYES.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Acland, C. T. D.
Amory, Sir J. H.
Anderson, G.
Armitage, B.
Armitstead, G.
Arnold, A.
Balfour, Sir G.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Barclay, J. W.
Barran, J.
Biddell, W.
Biddulph, M.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Bolton, J. C.
Borlase, W. C.
Brand, H. R.
Brassey, Sir T.
Briggs, W. E.
Brinton, J.
Broadhurst, H.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Bruce, rt. hon. Lord C.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Buchanan, T. R.
Buszard, M. C.
Buxton, F. W.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell, R. F. F.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Carington, hon. R.
Causton, R. K.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Cheetham, J. F.
Childers, rt. hn. H.C.E.
Clarke, J. C.
Clifford, C. C.
Cohen, A.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Cotes, C. C.
Courtney, L. H.
Creyke, R.
Cropper, J.
Cross, J. K.
Crum, A.
Currie, Sir D.
Davey, H.
Davies, R.
Dilke, rt. hn. Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Duckham, T.
Duff, R. W.
Dundas, hon. J. C.
Ebrington, Viscount
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Adm. hon. F.
Farquharson, Dr. R.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Fitzwilliam, hon. C. W. W.
Fitzwilliam, hon. W. J.
Flower, C.
Fort, R.
Fowler, H. H.
Fowler, W.
Gabbett, D. F.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gladstone, W. H.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Grafton, F. W.
Grant, A.
Grey, A. H. G.
Gurdon, R. T.
Hamilton, J. G. C.
Harcourt, rt. hon. Sir W. G. V. V.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henderson, F.
Heneage, E.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Holden, I.
Hollond, J. R.
Holms, J.
Hopwood, C. H.
Howard, E. S.
Howard, G. J.
Howard, J.
Inderwick, F. A.
James, Sir H.
James, C.
Jenkins, D. J.
Jerningham, H. E. H.
Kingscote, Col. R. N. F.
Lea, T.
Leake, R.
Leatham, W. H.
Leeman, J. J.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Lloyd, M.
Lymington, Viscount
M'Clure, Sir T.
M'Intyre, Æneas J.
Mackie, R. B.
M'Laren, C. B. B.
Mappin, F. T.
Marjoribanks, E.
Martin, R. B.
Maskelyne, M. H. Story-
Maxwell-Heron, Capt. J.

Mellor, J. W.
Monk, C. J.
Moore, A.
Moreton, Lord
Morgan, rt. hn. G. O.
Nicholson, W.
Noel, E.
O'Shaughnessy, R.
Paget, T. T.
Parker, C. S.
Pease, A.
Peel, A. W.
Pennington, F.
Powell, W. R. H.
Power, J. O'C.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Reid, R. T.
Richardson, J. N.
Richardson, T.
Robertson, H.
Rogers, J. E. T.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Shaw, T.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Smith, E.
Smith, Lt.-Col. G.
Smith, S.
Stanley, hon. E. L.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Thomasson, J. P.
Thompson, T. C.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, rt. hn. G. O.
Vivian, Sir H. H.
Walter, J.
Waugh, E.
Whitbread, S.
Whitworth, B.
Wiggin, H.
Williams, S. C. E.
Williamson, S.
Willis, W.
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, I.
Woodall, W.
Woolf, S.

TELLERS.

Grosvenor, right hon. Lord R.
Kensington, right hon. Lord

NOES.

Alexander, Colonel C.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Aylmer, J. E. F.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Balfour, A. J.
Barne, Col. F. St. J. N.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bateson, Sir T.
Beach, rt. hn. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Bellingham, A. H.
Bentinck, rt. hn. G. C.
Biggar, J. G.
Bourke, rt. hon. R.
Brise, Colonel R.
Brogden, A.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Bulwer, J. R.
Callan, P.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Chambers, Sir T.
Chaplin, H.
Christie, W. L.
Clarke, E.
Cole, Viscount
Coope, O. E.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. Sir R. A.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Col. hn. L. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Dixon-Hartland, F. D.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Ecroyd, W. F.
Egerton, hon. A. de T.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, G. W.
Ennis, Sir J.
Fellowes, W. H.
Filmer, Sir E.
Floyer, J.
Foster, W. H.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
French-Brewster, R. A. B.
Garnier, J. C.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giles, A.
Goldney, Sir G.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Gorst, J. E.
Grant, D.
Grantham, W.
Greene, E.
Greer, T.
Gregory, G. B.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, I. T.
Harrington, T.
Hay, rt. hon. Admiral Sir J. C. D.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hicks, E.
Hill, Lord A. W.
Hill, A. S.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Home, Lt.-Col. D. M.
Hope, rt. hn. A. J. B. B.
Hubbard, rt. hon. J. G.
Jackson, W. L.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Kennard, C. J.
Kenny, M. J.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knightley, Sir R.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Lennox, rt. hon. Lord H. G. C. G.
Lever, J. O.
Levett, T. J.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
M'Arthur, Sir W.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Mac Iver, D.
Macliver, P. S.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
March, Earl of
Marriott, W. T.
Master, T. W. C.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, T.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Molloy, B. C.
Monckton, F.
Moss, R.
Murray, C. J.
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Nicholson, W. N.
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
Northcote, H. S.
O'Brien, W.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Kelly, J.
Onslow, D. R.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Percy, Lord A.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Price, Captain G. E.
Pugh, L. P.
Puleston, J. H.
Rankin, J.
Rendlesham, Lord
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, C. T.
Rolls, J. A.
Ross, A. H.
Ross, C. C.
Round, J.
St. Aubyn, W. M.
Salt, T.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scott, M. D.
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Sexton, T.
Sheil, E.
Slagg, J.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Stanley, E. J.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Thornhill, T.
Tollemache, hn. W. F.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Tottenham, A. L.
Walrond, Col. W. H.
Warburton, P. E.
Warton, C. N.
Whitley, E.
Williams, Gen. O.
Wills, W. H.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Winn, R.
Wolff, Sir H. D.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.

Fowler, R. N.
Waterlow, Sir S. H.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he should not proceed with Clauses 14 and 15.

Clauses 14 and 15 *negatived.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — SOUTH AFRICA — THE TRANSVAAL—POLICY OF HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he could hold out some hope that he would be able to afford a day for the conclusion of the debate upon the affairs of the Transvaal? He had understood the right hon. Gentleman to say, on a former occasion, that he did not consider that the Amendment of which he had originally given Notice was one for the discussion of which he could set apart a day, because it raised a new issue. He had, therefore, sacrificed his own wishes in this matter, and had endeavoured to frame an Amendment which raised the same issue as that which had been already discussed. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to say whether it was not possible to give a day for the resumption of the discussion, either on the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), or his own Resolution, or on the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman himself; or whether, in any form whatever, he would enable the House to pronounce judgment on the question?

MR. GLADSTONE said, he had already pointed out that if any arrangement could be arrived at which would simplify the issue before the House he would do his best to give a Government day for the discussion; but the state of the case was that there were a variety of Motions and Amendments on the Paper raising questions so complicated that, instead of progress being made on the last occasion, when a whole Morning Sitting was devoted to the subject, they had actually receded. He had then said that if arrangements could be made for simplifying the issue and taking the debate on the question in relation to the Transvaal, which the right hon. Gentleman was desirous to bring under the consideration of the House, he would then do his best to secure a Government day for its discussion, but that there was no chance of that in the then state of the Notice Paper. He had no desire to press the Amendment of which he had given Notice. He was perfectly willing to consent either to an immediate decision being taken on the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), and a subsequent discussion upon the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, or the entire withdrawal of the Motion of the hon. and learned Member, and the adoption of the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman as a substantive Motion. That he was perfectly willing to do; but as long as the Motions and Amendments were complicated one with another, as they were then, it was impossible for him to relieve Gentlemen themselves and their Motions from the state of entanglement into which they had fallen.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—EAST INDIA (EXPENDITURE).

MR. ONSLOW said, it would be in Mr. Speaker's recollection that last Tuesday they had a discussion on this Motion. In the "Votes and Proceedings" of the House he saw—

> "Motion made, and Question proposed, 'That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that early steps be taken to reduce the expenditure of India.'"

And subsequently—

> "Amendment proposed, 'To leave out all the words after the word 'House' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'every effort should be made to effect economy in the Government of India,'—instead thereof.
>
> "Question proposed, 'That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.'"

He wished to call attention to the fact that when Mr. Speaker left the Chair the Question before the House was, "That those words be there inserted." The Main Question was, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question;" and it was stated in the "Votes and Proceedings" of Wednesday, the 9th of May, 1883, that "Question put, and *agreed to*." He thought he was right in saying that this referred to the Main Question—that of his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope)—which was put from the Chair. He wished to ask Mr. Speaker whether what was done on the occasion referred to was correctly stated in the Votes of the House. He believed he was within the recollection of many hon. Gentlemen present who would agree with him when he said that the Motion of his hon. Friend was carried; and that after the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State was negatived, he (Mr. Onslow) rose to ask whether he could not move his Amendment as an addendum. According to his recollection, and that of other hon. Members, the "Votes" were not consistent with what had taken place. Finally, he asked whether his Amendment stood as a substantive one; because, if not, any hon. Gentleman might move an Amendment, just as the Under Secretary of State for India had done, at any word of the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lincolnshire.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, that, according to his recollection of the circumstances, the Motion of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire was put from the Chair after the Amendment of the Under Secretary of State for India had been negatived. The Speaker hung on the point whether the "Ayes" or the "Noes" had it, and the "Noes" did not in any way challenge the "Ayes;" and, after waiting for a second or two, the Speaker declared that the "Ayes" had it, and sat down. Thereupon the hon. Member for Guildford rose to Order, and asked whether he could move his Amendment. The Speaker at first said that the hon. Member was too late to move his Amendment, and the hon. Member then explained that his Motion was not an Amendment, but an addition. As he recollected the matter, the Resolution of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire was carried; and he certainly understood that that remained on the Books of the House as the Resolution of the House.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was present on the occasion, and his recollection of the circumstances agreed with that of his right hon. Friend. He was astonished to see how totally different the record on the Books was from the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Guildford and the right hon. Gentlemen who have addressed the House appear to me to lie under a mistake in supposing that the Motion of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire was fully carried. The only point fully carried was—"That the words proposed to be left out of the Motion stand part of the Question." If the Main Question had been put to the House as a whole, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Guildford would have been perfectly inadmissible, because, the whole matter being then before the House, no Amendment could be put.

Mr. ONSLOW asked, as a point of Order, whether, after that ruling, it was competent for any Member to move an Amendment to the Original Motion as it now stood?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Amendment of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire is now before the House, and until that is disposed of no other Amendment can be put.

SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS stated that as he could not bring on the Motion of which he had given Notice on this subject at that time, he would avail himself of the offer of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, and raise the question on the Motion for the Adjournment of the House at 2 o'clock tomorrow.

MOTIONS.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE.

Mr. DODSON, in moving for leave to bring in a Bill for amending the Law relating to Agricultural Holdings in England, said: At this late period of the night I shall endeavour to compress what I have to say in asking leave to introduce this Bill into the shortest possible space. The Bill will provide that a tenant who has made on his holding any of the improvements enumerated in the Schedule of the Bill shall be entitled, after the commencement of this Act, on quitting his holding, at the termination of his tenancy, to obtain from the landlord, under this Act, compensation for such improvements. The measure of such compensation is to be the value of the improvement to the incoming tenant. That is laid down as the general principle and basis for compensation. It is not limited by any rule as to number of years, or the amount of the tenant's outlay, or by any of the other conditions attaching a limited measure of value under the Agricultural Holdings Act. We thought the measure of value, taking value simply, would be the most just and equitable measure of compensation as a general rule, because the value of similar improvements differs widely in different parts of the country, and according to the circumstances in which they are made. Value, measured by years, constitutes a Procrustean rule. Value, measured by the amount of the tenant's outlay, we do not take; we think the simple value is a more equitable basis, and for this reason. Supposing a tenant has laid out money unwisely, or even unfortunately, he ought not to be expect to be compensated for that. On the other hand, if he has laid out money wisely and successfully, he is fairly entitled to the value of the improvement to the in-coming tenant. This compensation by the value of the improvement to the in-coming tenant is termed in the Bill—"Compensation under the Act." The machinery for ascertaining the value is that of the Agricultural Holdings Act, for which purpose we preserve the Procedure Clauses of that Act. The improvements to which the Bill applies are enumerated in the Schedule. I will first speak of permanent improvements, executed after the commencement of the Act, which will be the 1st of January, 1884. The permanent improvements are these—(1) The erection or enlargement of buildings; (2) the laying down of permanent pasture; (3) making and planting of osier beds; (4) making of water meadows or works of irrigation; (5) making of gardens; (6) making or improving of roads or bridges; (7) making or improving of water courses, ponds, wells, reservoirs, or of works for supply of water for agricultural or domestic purposes; (8) making of fences; (9) planting of hops; (10) planting of orchards; (11) reclaiming of waste land; (12) warping of land. In order to entitle the tenant to compensation under the Act the consent of the landlord must have been obtained for these improvements. That consent may be given unconditionally, or upon such terms as to compensation or otherwise as may be agreed upon between the landlord and tenant; and in the event of an agreement between the landlord and the tenant, any compensation thereunder shall be deemed to be substituted for compensation under the Act. Now I speak of another set of improvements, those that may be called temporary improvements. These are boning of land with undissolved bones; chalking of land; clay burning; claying of land; liming of land; marling of land; application to land of purchased artificial or other purchased manure; consumption on the holding by cattle, sheep, or pigs, of cake or other feeding stuff not produced on the holding. The tenant will be entitled to execute these improvements and claim compensation for them without being called upon to obtain the consent of, or to give notice to, the landlord. But under any new contract of tenancy beginning after the commencement of the Act, where any particular agreement in writing secures to the tenant for any of these temporary improvements which I have enumerated, executed after the commencement of the Act, fair and reasonable compensation, such compensation shall be deemed to be substituted for compensation under the Act. There remains another very important improvement which, perhaps, the House will observe is not included in the category of permanent or temporary improvements, and that is drainage. Drainage is an improvement of a durable character, of a very important character to both parties, a very general one, and one which it is desirable to promote. We make a special provision for that in the Bill. The tenant may execute drainage; but he is not entitled to compensation under the Act unless he gives notice to the landlord before, and the landlord on receiving notice has an option. He may either drain the land himself, and charge not more than 5 per cent to the tenant, or he may agree with the tenant on the terms upon which the drainage shall be executed. They may enter into any arrangement as to the terms upon which the work shall be done—as, for instance, dividing the expense, the landlord to find the pipes and the tenant the labour, or otherwise. But if the landlord will neither drain the land himself nor agree upon terms with the tenant for the drainage, then the tenant will be entitled to do it himself and claim compensation under the Act. Thus far I have spoken of improvements to be executed after the commencement of the Act. Now I will say a few words as to improvements executed before the commencement of the Act, and as to existing contracts of tenancy. The Bill applies to existing contracts of tenancy, but with a Proviso as to temporary improvements. Where an agreement in writing, or the custom of the country, or the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, provides specific compensation for any such improvement, compensation shall be paid as so provided, and not under the Act. Where no compensation is thus provided for, the tenant will be entitled to claim compensation under the Act. The enactment of the Bill as to compensation for permanent improvements and to drainage applies also to existing contracts; but in this case it applies only to improvements executed after the commencement of the Act. The requirements of the Act as to the consent of, and notice to, the landlord cannot, it is evident, apply to improvements executed before the Act. The landlord is to be entitled to obtain a charge upon the estate either for compensation under the Act or for compensation substituted under any agreement authorized by the Act. There is a provision that when the owner of an estate is not the absolute owner the charge shall not be spread over an unduly long period of time. I have already stated that the Act is to come into operation on January 1, 1884. Now as to new tenancies. A year to year tenancy, current at the commencement of the Act, is to run on till the first day after the commencement of the Act on which either the landlord or tenant might by notice to the other have brought it to an end, and from that date it shall be deemed to be a new tenancy. The section as to notice to quit will substitute a year's notice for six months in all cases where six months is now only required, but with this Proviso—unless, the landlord and tenant agree in writing that they wish to retain the six months. This Proviso has been inserted mainly because we believe that many tenants like to be at liberty to quit at short notice. There is a provision that every agreement, covenant, or contract which deprives the tenant of compensation under the Act, except arrangement providing substituted compensation as authorized by the Act, is void in law and in equity. Therefore, the Bill is compulsory to this extent—that the tenant will always be entitled to receive compensation under the Act, except where he agrees to take substituted compensation or what he prefers or considers equivalent in some other form. There is only one other part of the Bill to which I will refer, and that very briefly. That is the part dealing with the Law of Distress. The Bill substantially adopts the recommendations of the Committee presided over by the right hon. Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen). I may say here that the framers of the Bill are very much indebted to the hon. Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland), and that we have taken considerable liberties with his Bill. The Bill, I say, carries out substantially the recommendations of the Committee over which the right hon. Member for Ripon presided—that is to say, distress is to be limited to one year's rent. Agisted stock and hired machinery are protected in the manner recommended by the Committee; and the Bill goes on to alleviate distress in certain minor ways—that is to say, with regard to the statutory table of costs under the Act of 57 *Geo.* III., the limit of £20 in which is to be raised and taken to be £50. The time for redeeming things distrained is extended from five days to 15, and appraisements may be dispensed with. I hope that in trying to be brief I have not been unintelligible to the House. It was my intention to avoid entering into any controversial or argumentative matter, and I only wished, so far as I could, to put the House in possession of our proposals.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Law relating to Agricultural Holdings in England."—(*Mr. Dodson.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill for amending the Law relating to Agricultural Holdings in Scotland."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

MR. J. W. BARCLAY asked whether the proposed Bill dealt with the Law of Hypothec in Scotland, and whether its provisions were at all similar to those of the English Bill?

MR. JAMES HOWARD said, he had spent a good many years in bringing this question to the front, and he was very deeply disappointed with the statement which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman upon the English Bill, and——

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is that leave be given to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate to bring in a Bill for amending the Law relating to Agricultural Holdings in Scotland.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): At this late hour of the evening I do not propose to go into any detailed explanation of the Bill which I now ask leave to bring in. The object of the measure is to apply to Scotland the principles of the measure relating to compensation for tenants' improvements which my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster has just now explained. It is essentially the application to Scotland of the principles of that Bill. As we have not had an Agricultural Holdings Act for Scotland similar to the English Act of 1875, there has been a necessity to expand some of the provisions of the Bill in that respect, inasmuch as we require to state the machinery by which we propose to work out the provisions of the Bill if it becomes law. In regard to those other questions which my hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Barclay) has indicated, I must point out to him that those Amendments which are proposed to be introduced into the Law of Distraint by the English Bill do not in that matter place the agricultural tenant in England in as favourable a position as that of the Scotch tenant under the existing law in Scotland. Under these circumstances, I do not know that my hon. Friend expects that we should deal with the matter to which he refers—namely, the question of Hypothec, which has been so recently under the cognizance of Parliament as 1880, there having been in that year a Bill which substantially abolished the Law of Hypothec, except in regard to existing leases. No doubt there were certain provisions contained in that Bill of a compensatory nature; but, undoubtedly, the Law of Hypothec was abolished so lately as 1880; and, therefore, in the two countries the matter is in no way in the same position. We are very much in advance of what is proposed to be introduced in England by the English Bill. I think I may sufficiently explain the nature of the Scotch Bill by saying that it is substantially the application to Scotland of the principles of the Bill explained by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by The LORD ADVOCATE and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 190.]

MR. J. W. BARCLAY asked when the Bill would be in the hands of Members?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, he hoped both the Scotch Bills would be in the hands of Members on Saturday morning. There might be a few copies in the Vote Office tomorrow.

HARBOURS OF REFUGE.

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Harbours of Refuge do consist of Twenty-three Members:—Mr. MARJORIBANKS, Mr. STEVENSON, Sir THOMAS BRASSEY, Viscount BARING, Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD, Sir DONALD CURRIE, Mr. HANBURY-TRACY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HENEAGE, Sir GEORGE BALFOUR, Colonel NOLAN, Mr. BLAKE, Mr. CHARLES ROSS, Mr. SALT, Sir EARDLEY WILMOT, Sir EDWARD WATKIN, Colonel WALROND, Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Lord ARTHUR HILL, Sir CHARLES MILLS, Colonel MILNE HOME, Lord RENDLESHAM, and Mr. GUY DAWNAY were nominated Members of the Committee, with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the nominators of the Committee had, somehow or other, overlooked the Representatives of the Irish maritime districts affected by the scope of the Committee. Looking to the nature of the Irish coasts and their extent, and to the important Irish interests involved, he could not but think that at least another Irish Member ought to be added. If it was possible he would have great pleasure in proposing that Mr. Leamy, the hon. Member for the City of Waterford, should be added to the Committee.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, the House had already agreed to the Motion that the Committee should consist of 23 Members, and therefore it would be necessary for the hon. Gentleman to give Notice of any addition he might think wise. In the meantime, he might point out that there were already three Irish Members who had been appointed on the Committee, and that was the usual proportion of Irish Members on Committees of this kind; in fact, he believed it was rather above the usual proportion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman cannot move the addition of a name without Notice.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 186.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read a second time upon *Monday* 28th May."

MR. JAMES HOWARD said, he did not want to be too severe upon a Bill which he had not had an opportunity of reading; but judging from the outline of the measure as sketched by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy——

MR. SPEAKER: A discussion on this Motion would be quite irregular.

MR. JAMES HOWARD begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not competent for the hon. Gentleman to make that Motion. The Question is that the second reading be taken on Monday the 28th of May. The hon. Member must give Notice.

MR. JAMES HOWARD begged to give Notice that he would move, when the second reading was proposed to be taken, that it should be taken that day six months.

Motion *agreed to.*

POOR LAW CONFERENCES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. PELL, Bill to provide for expenses incurred by Guardians of the Poor in relation to Poor Law Conferences, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. PELL, Mr. STANSFELD, Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, and Mr. HOLLOND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 187.]

MEDALS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. COURTNEY, Bill for preventing the Sale of Medals resembling Current Coin, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. COURTNEY, Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 188.]

BURGH POLICE AND HEALTH (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, Bill for regulating the Police and administration of towns and populous places in Scotland, and for lighting, cleansing, paving, draining, supplying water to, and improving the same; and also for promoting the public health thereof, *ordered* to be brought in by The LORD ADVOCATE and Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL for SCOTLAND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 191.]

LAND IMPROVEMENT AND ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. COURTNEY, Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts for facilitating the improvements of landed property, and for the drainage and improvement of lands in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 189.]

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES (LONDON) [SALARIES AND EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament in the first instance, of the Salaries of Commissioners and Officers who may be appointed, and of Expenses incurred, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session to provide for the better application and management of the Parochial Charities of the City of London.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 11th May, 1883.

The House met at Two of the clock.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —*Resolutions* [10th May] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILL—*Report*—Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Fraserburgh Waterworks) [2]*.

QUESTIONS.

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS — THE BOARD OF TRADE — RESIGNATION OF PROFESSOR TYNDALL.

MR. GIBSON asked the President of the Board of Trade, Did the Irish Lights Commissioners agree to the proposals of the Board of Trade as to the constitution of the Committee on Lighthouse Illuminants?

COLONEL KING-HARMAN asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether Professor Tyndall, D.C.L., resigned his position as Scientific Adviser to the Board of Trade because a Committee was forced on the Commissioners of Irish

Lights which they repudiated, and on which, in consequence of its constitution, he refused to serve; and, whether any effort will be made to prevent the services of this eminent man being lost to the Country?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir, in reply to these Questions I would refer to the Correspondence which has been presented to-day, and which will show very fully the circumstances attending Professor Tyndall's resignation. In the meantime, I may say that it is not true that any Committee has been imposed upon the Irish Light Commissioners. A Committee was suggested, and the three Lighting Boards were all asked to send representatives to it. They were requested to nominate their own representatives, and they all agreed to do so. The Irish Light Commissioners made some objection to the constitution of the Committee; but they now state that they will abstain from pressing their objections, and have acceded to the request of the Board of Trade to appoint two members to serve on the Committee. I may add that in the course of these proceedings I had a personal interview with Professor Tyndall, in which I endeavoured to overcome his objections to serve on the Committee, but without success.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—OUTDOOR RELIEF.

Colonel COLTHURST asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, as President of the Local Government Board, he will take steps to make known to all Boards of Guardians that they have power to issue outdoor relief in cases of sickness in a family, even if the head of the family be not himself sick, and that these powers are not confined to cases of occupiers of land referred to in Circular of February 7th 1880?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I take my hon. and gallant Friend's point to be that, because no mention is made in the Circular referred to of the cases of persons not in any way connected with the occupation of land, misapprehension may exist on the part of Boards of Guardians as to their powers with respect to the grant of outdoor relief in such cases. I will take the opportunity, when in Ireland during the Recess, of ascertaining whether there is reason to believe that any such misapprehension exists on the part of any Boards of Guardians.

Colonel COLTHURST: My right hon. Friend has misapprehended my Question. My object was to convey to the Guardians an expression of opinion that families may be given outdoor relief even though the head of the family may not be sick.

Mr. TREVELYAN: In the view of the Local Government Board the Circular to which my hon. and gallant Friend refers is sufficient; but if my hon. and gallant Friend will point out to me any particular in which he does not think it sufficient, I will have inquiry made into the matter.

Colonel COLTHURST: Have the Boards of Guardians acted on the Circular?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The question is whether they understand it.

Colonel KING-HARMAN: As Chairman of two Boards of Guardians, I beg to say that they have acted on it.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—WATERFORD CO.

Mr. LEAMY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is the fact that, on May the 4th, the Sub-Commissioners for hearing Land Cases in the county of Waterford adjourned their Court until September next; if it is the fact that a considerable number of cases from that county, in which originating notices were served as far back as December 1881, are still undisposed of; and, whether arrangements will be made to enable the Sub-Commissioners to take up the hearing of cases at an earlier date than September, and to sit more frequently than hitherto, and for longer periods?

Mr. TREVELYAN: This Question, which only appeared on the Paper yesterday, was telegraphed to the Sub-Commission yesterday, but no reply has yet been received, owing, it is presumed, to the interruptions caused by bad weather. I am, however, informed by the Land Commissioners that, according to the arrangements made for the Waterford Sub-Commissioners, they were to sit at the City of Waterford until the 6th of this month, unless all cases listed had been previously disposed of. All cases from County Waterford lodged during 1881 have been listed, but some of them stand adjourned. It is not the case that the Sub-Commission will not again sit in the county until September. They are appointed to sit at Dungarvan on the 30th of July to hear cases from the Unions of Waterford and Dungarvan.

IRELAND—EVICTIONS IN CO. SLIGO.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to a resolution adopted on the 16th ultimo by the Tobercurry (county Sligo) Board of Guardians, condemning the conduct of certain local landlords in evicting nineteen families, after the parish priest, the Reverend J. Conlon, had several times proposed terms of settlement which he considered fair; whether the families in question have been obliged to resort to the Board of Guardians for assistance; and, whether the Irish Government will consider the expediency of refusing to grant the aid of the armed forces of the Crown in carrying out evictions, in cases where there is proof that fair terms had been offered on the side of the tenant, and that the landlord had refused to entertain them? He also wished, in putting the Question, to know whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen the report made by Mr. N. Devine, who visited these poor people on the 19th ultimo, and described their condition as wretched and miserable in the extreme; and whether any steps would be taken to prevent the loss of life amongst them from exposure and starvation?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have seen the resolution referred to, and also the report of Mr. Devine. I am informed that the families in question have applied to the Board of Guardians, and are getting outdoor relief. I am not prepared to recommend legislation with the object of carrying out the suggestion contained in the last paragraph of the hon. Member's Question. The Sheriff is entitled by law to call for the protection of anyone, including military and police, in carrying out the process of the law.

Mr. SEXTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the period during which the Guardians can legally give outdoor relief to these families is now expired?

[No reply was given.]

Mr. SEXTON: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider the case during the Recess, and see what can be done.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SECTION 14—SEARCHES FOR DOCUMENTS—MR. JOHN CULLEN, OF MANORHAMILTON.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that Mr. John Cullen, of Manorhamilton, denounces as a calumny the statement that he wrote a letter suggesting to the police the searches made in his own and his friends' premises; whether he is aware that Mr. Cullen, by his active part in the Land League agitation, has incurred the enmity of landlords, bailiffs, and policemen in North Leitrim; and that he has been in a special manner brought into collision with a bailiff named James M'Cullagh, who is in possession of specimens of Mr. Cullen's handwriting; and, what opportunity Mr. Cullen will be afforded of vindicating his character from an odious imputation or of satisfying the public of the nature of evidence on which the imputation was based?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am aware, Sir, that Cullen has made the denial referred to; but this does not influence the opinion of the authorities, which is very well-founded. I am also aware of the position once occupied by Cullen in connection with the Land League. The particular circumstances referred to in connection with a bailiff named M'Cullagh are not before me, nor do I think them material, though I suppose it is intended to imply that the bailiff having specimens of Cullen's handwriting in his possession imitated it so successfully as to deceive experienced officials and a professional expert. The Government has no intention of taking any steps in the direction suggested by the last paragraph of the Question. If there is any sense of grievance on account of the publicity given to the views of the authorities on this case, I must remind the hon. Member that that publicity has arisen from the action of Mr. Cullen's friends, and not through any desire of the authorities to give prominence to the matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Is a grievance never to be exposed for fear it would be utilized to make anonymous charges against the person aggrieved?

MR. TREVELYAN: If in every case in which the police took action in England and Scotland Questions were put to the Home Secretary, explanations would have to be made which would be unpleasant and uncomplimentary to some persons concerned. I think that is the real state of the case. The authorities arrived at conclusions on certain grounds which satisfy them that they are well-founded, and if Questions are asked those grounds may be stated.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Does the right hon. Gentleman adhere to or withdraw the statement that Mr. Cullen wrote the letter which caused the police to search his premises?

[No answer was given.]

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is intended that the office of Chief Superintendent of the Dublin Metropolitan Police (included in Schedule 3 of the Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill, will be filled up from the ranks, in the same manner as all grades in the force under that of Commissioner, have hitherto been filled up, or whether it is intended that a person not already a member of the force shall be appointed to the office?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the office referred to is not vacant, and, therefore, the question as to how it is to be filled has not arisen. No doubt, in the event of a vacancy, the appointment would, as heretofore, be made from the ranks, if there is a properly qualified man for the post. I hope such a man will be found.

CRIMINAL CODE (INDICTABLE OFFENCES) BILL (IRELAND).

MR. SEXTON asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the Government intend to introduce into the Criminal Code (Indictable Offences Procedure) Bill, a Clause excluding Ireland from the operation of that measure?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in reply, said, this was the first time he had ever heard the suggestion that this Bill should not be made applicable to Ireland. An Irish Judge was placed upon the Commission which considered that Bill in order that the Commission might derive benefit from his knowledge of Irish law and procedure, as it was the desire of the Government to assimilate as much as possible the law of Ireland and England. Though he should be glad to modify what he anticipated would be the severe criticism of the Bill by the Irish Members, he could not at present see his way to exclude Ireland from the operation of the Bill.

DUCHY OF LANCASTER LANDS ACT, 1855—COUNCIL OF THE DUCHY.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, If he would explain on what grounds he stated that when the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster sits by himself he is the Council of the Duchy; and, on what grounds afforded by Charter, Act of Parliament, or otherwise, it is considered necessary that the members of the Council of the Duchy of Lancaster should be convened for the purpose of exercising the statutory powers conferred by "The Duchy of Lancaster Lands Act, 1855?"

MR. DODSON: Sir, the practice in question rests upon usage of 200 years and upwards, The matter was investigated by a Committee of the House of Commons, who stated in their Report, in 1857, two years after the passing of the Act in question, that it appeared by the evidence of the Law Officers of the Duchy—

> "That the absolute power rests in the Chancellor; that he is not obliged to consult his Council on any matter, and that a minute passed by him alone is equivalent to a minute passed by the Chancellor and Council."

They further stated—

> "That certain persons were added to the Council by the advice of Lord Campbell, but that they have no independent power, and are consulted only by the Chancellor when he desires their advice. This opinion is confirmed by the researches of the Clerk of Records."

The Law Officers of the Duchy at that time were that erudite lawyer, Mr. Ellis (Adolphus and Ellis), and Mr., after Lord Justice, James—and the Clerk of the Records referred to is Mr. Hardy, the present well-known Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. The evidence of the Law Officers and of Mr. Hardy will be found in the Blue Book and is most full and explicit. I find that Lord Campbell during the four years that he was Chancellor of the Duchy, on 21 different occasions, sitting alone as Chancellor and Council, dealt with land by sale or purchase; and on cursorily inspecting the Minutes of the Duchy Court I find that in the four years immediately succeeding the passing of the Act of 1855 no fewer than 22 cases of sales of property were sanctioned by the Chancellor sitting alone.

EMIGRATION (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is true that the Board of Trade have issued a Minute to the Emigration Officials at Liverpool to refrain from furnishing the Press with any information respecting the movements of emigrants from that port; and, if so, what is the reason for withholding this information, so valuable to the public?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir, the value of this information to the public is fully recognized, and in consequence it is now published officially, not only for Liverpool, but for all other ports. It was thought undesirable that the local officers should communicate with the Press without the knowledge of the Board of Trade, as the information which had been given was not altogether accurate.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON: I suppose there will be no delay in publishing it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: None at all.

Mr. MOORE: Will the right hon. Gentleman state the nature of the information that the Board of Trade have directed the emigration officers to suppress?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The information is with reference to the movements of emigrants. There is no intention to suppress information; but it has been thought advisable that the same information which has hitherto been given unofficially and inadequately by the local officers shall now be published officially.

PARLIAMENT—LORD ALCESTER'S AND LORD WOLSELEY'S ANNUITY BILLS.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can now inform the House by what means he proposes to substitute lump sums for heritable pensions in the Annuity Bills relating to Lords Alcester and Wolseley?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I feel, Sir, that in answering this Question I ought to treat it as a dry matter of fact, and to refrain for the present from explaining the reasons which have influenced Her Majesty's Government in coming to the decision they have arrived at. After full consideration of all the circumstances of the case, and after consulting various public interests, the Government have come to the conclusion that they ought to alter the basis of their Bills from an annuity, which has been the usual course, to what is called in the Question a lump sum, and the lump sum which they propose to offer, having regard to the fact that this is a new development of the proposal laid before the House, will be £25,000 for Lord Alcester and £30,000 for Lord Wolseley. The course of proceeding would be this. In order to be perfectly regular, it would be right to set up Committees in order to vote these lump sums, because from the nature of the case contemplated in the original proposal with regard to the pensions, which had not reference simply to lives in existence, it is impossible to say with that certainty which the House is ordinarily entitled to exact that these lump sums are within the value of the annuities, or that the precise actuarial value can be stated. We shall, therefore, set up these Committees and take the Report of the Resolutions, and then I shall move to instruct the Committees on the Bills to insert these lump sums, and upon that Instruction a convenient opportunity for making a statement will arise.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Will the right hon. Gentleman name a day when the Bill will be brought forward?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I cannot state this at present; but I propose to take the preliminary stages on the very first day that Parliament re-assembles; but I will take care to make some convenient arrangement for the discussion of the matter when I move the Instructions.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: May I ask whether there is any necessity for legislation, and why the lump sums should not be voted in the Estimates, as in the case of Sir Frederick Roberts and Sir Donald Stewart?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, the consideration which has weighed with the Government is one which I think the noble Lord will appreciate. This proceeding grew entirely out of a Message from the Crown sent not to the House of Commons only, but to the House of Lords; and the House of Lords, in answer to that Message, expressed its willingness to take the matter into consideration. Were we to proceed by a Vote in Supply, although it would have to us very great recommendations, inasmuch as it would be a far simpler method of proceeding, the House of Lords would be entirely ousted from all consideration in the subject. That would not be, I think, consistent with the respect which is due to an independent branch of the Legislature.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I presume the Resolutions will be so framed that any proposal to reduce the Vote can be moved in Committee; and, in that case, I imagine there would be no disposition in this part of the House to obstruct the preliminary stages?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Undoubtedly it would be open to any Member to move to reduce the sum.

PARLIAMENT—GRAND COMMITTEES—REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What arrangements have been made for reporting the proceedings of the Grand Committees; and, whether these proceedings will be reported in Hansard like the proceedings on Bills in Committees of the whole House?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, the state of the case is this—the Government has really no primary part to play in regard to this matter. We shall be guided in a very great degree, first of all by the wishes of the Committee as made known to us by the Chairman and Members; and, secondly, by the authorities of the House. From neither quarter have we received any information which would lead us to believe that the time has come for taking any measures on the subject, and I do not think it would be for us to initiate any. My own personal opinion is that a little experience and the proof from experience of what amounts to a public desire would alone be a safe guide.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that Mr. Hansard did not take any notes of the proceedings of the Committees?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I do not think that circumstance should lead me in any respect to vary my answer. It is only experience that can guide us in the matter.

REGISTRATION (IRELAND) ACTS—REGISTERED CHARGES ON ESTATES.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he will furnish a Return showing, by Counties and Provinces, the amounts of the Registered Charges on Estates in Ireland?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am informed, Sir, that the Registration Acts do not require the nature, or amount, or other particulars of the charge to be stated in the memorial registering it. The date of the instrument creating the charge, the names of the parties, and the particular lands charged are all that need be stated, and it would, therefore, in a vast number of cases in which charges are registered be impossible to ascertain the amounts. Many charges may get paid off or satisfied, or may fail to take effect without there being anything whatever on the registry to show that they are no longer charges. It would be wholly impossible to prepare such a Return. The Registry Acts were drawn, and the machinery of registration devised, without any intention that the particulars of such charges could be ascertained in the Office. It is the business of the solicitors of the individual client to obtain those particulars.

PARLIAMENT—ADJOURNMENT—THE DERBY DAY.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, that a paragraph had appeared in *The Times* that morning stating that a right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. Lowther) intended on Tuesday week to move the Adjournment of the House until Thursday, and that the proposal had the tacit approval of the Leaders on both sides of the House. He wished to put a Question to the Prime Minister on this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out that the Question which the hon. Member desires to put does not relate to any Bill or Motion before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON wished to know whether he might ask the Prime Minister whether he tacitly approved the proposal? [*Cries of* "No!"]

Subsequently,

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked whether any Member of the Government intended to move the Adjournment of the House over the Derby Day?

Mr. GLADSTONE: No, Sir. That matter is one which, I am happy to say, has by custom passed over to the care and charge of independent Members, and there I hope it will always remain.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether it was in Order for a Member, who was not a Member of the Government, to make a Motion for the adjournment of the House at half-past 4 o'clock? Two years ago he wished to move at half-past 4 that the Business of the House was not urgent, and the Speaker then ruled that it was not competent for private Members to move such a Motion at that hour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Such Motions could not, as a general rule, be made by a Member not being a Member of the Government; but the occasion in question is exceptional, and I should not feel authorized to refuse to put a Motion of that kind, regard being had to the usual practice of the House on this particular question.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had not refused to recognize the practice since the last time when such a Motion was made by the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin)?

Mr. SPEAKER: My course has been uniform in the matter. If the question of the hon. Member contemplates a Motion without Notice, I may add that the Motion could not be brought forward without Notice.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that when in the Session before last he consulted the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair, with regard to his right to put down a Notice of Motion for half-past 4, to the effect that the Business of the House was no longer urgent, the right hon. Gentleman then represented to him that it was not competent to a private Member to put such a Notice on the Paper, and when he (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) brought to the right hon. Gentleman's notice the fact that it was a private Member who put the Notice on the Paper with regard to the Derby Day, the right hon. Gentleman said that the case of the Motion of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire was not one which he could recognize as a precedent.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Motion with regard to the Derby Day is, as I have already said, exceptional. It has been allowed for many years, by myself and my Predecessors in this Chair. Any Motion not relating to that matter could not be allowed.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON gave Notice that he should oppose any Motion for adjournment over the Derby Day.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE NATIONAL DEBT BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Prime Minister, Whether, considering the immense importance of the National Debt Bill to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, he would undertake that due Notice should be given of the Motion for the second reading, and that it should be made the first Order of the Day?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he would promise that due Notice should be given of the second reading; but he was afraid that, in the present state of Public Business, he could not give a pledge that the Bill would be taken as the first Order.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE DUBLIN MURDER TRIALS.

Mr. BIGGAR: I wish to ask the Prime Minister a Question of which I have given him private Notice, and it is, Whether, seeing that in the recent criminal trials in Dublin, the juries have been invariably and systematically packed—["Oh, oh!"]—and the witnesses for the Crown—[*Loud cries of* "Order!"]—the Government would not, under the circumstances, undertake to commute the punishment of the prisoners now lying under sentence of death? [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]

Mr. MACARTNEY: I rise to Order, and I wish to ask you, Sir, whether any Member is entitled to ask a Question containing such debateable matter as this?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not catch the whole burden of the hon. Member's

Notice; but it certainly did strike me that the Question was irregular.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

MR. MOORE asked whether the Irish Votes would be taken in Supply on the days immediately following the Recess, or whether the Government would postpone them?

MR. GLADSTONE said, he believed there would be no difficulty about the postponement of the Votes referred to.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly tell us what the course of Business after the Recess will be; what class of Supplies will be taken; and what will be done in the case of the Corrupt Practices Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, the Corrupt Practices Bill is a Bill of primary importance; and with probably a fortnight's work in Supply before us after the Recess, I must reserve any further statement with regard to that measure until the House meets after the Holidays. Among Bills which cannot be called primary Bills, but which are of importance, we are very anxious to get forward with the Police Pay and Pensions Bill (Ireland), and we must endeavour to make progress with it during the first fortnight after the Recess. With regard to the branches of Supply which will be taken, I have to say that we shall take Civil Service Estimates other than Irish on the first day (Monday), and on the Thursday my noble Friend will proceed with the Army Estimates. On the following Monday we shall again consider the Civil Service Estimates. I ought to say one word in explanation of a matter referred to last night. With regard to the question of the Transvaal and the Chiefs of Bechuanaland, I should wish the exact position of the Government to be understood. The Government do not themselves perceive any public advantage to be derived at the present moment from the discussion of the Convention relating to the Transvaal, because, in their opinion, the facts are not sufficiently clear for that purpose. But we cannot say that a discussion would entail a distinct public mischief; and, therefore, being willing to meet the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite, I have gone so far as to say that, for the purpose of discussing this question, we must endeavour to find a Government night as soon as the state of Public Business would permit. But, with regard to the question of the Chiefs of Bechuanaland, my opinion is—although I have not the least disposition to deprecate any opinion of the House on the question—that we should not be justified in appropriating any further portion of the Government time for its discussion, it having been already debated through one whole Evening Sitting and on two Morning Sittings. In the information which has indirectly or casually reached us since the debate took place, there is nothing, in our view, to justify us in appropriating more Government time for the discussion. I believe there is no other matter of Public Business on which I have anything to state at the present moment.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Perhaps, Sir, I may be allowed to read the words of the Prime Minister in his speech in the debate on the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst). Referring to the Bechuanaland question, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We do not think that the House should leave the question without some expression of opinion."

The right hon. Gentleman also placed a Notice of Motion upon the Paper; and I am bound to say that I can scarcely reconcile the statement which I have read with the view expressed by the right hon. Gentleman on the present occasion.

MR. GLADSTONE: I think, Sir, I can reconcile the two statements very easily, and also remove the difficulty which the right hon. Gentleman appears to feel. I placed a Motion upon the Paper on the subject now under consideration; but it was not at all intended as an original Motion. We had no intention or desire to put forward an original Motion on the subject; but, after the debate that had taken place, it did appear to us that it was the general wish that some opinion should be recorded. I have no disposition to object to taking the sense of the House upon that Motion. If it is thought fit to take it, by all means let it be done. What I do object to is the appropriation of the Government time for the further discussion of a subject which appears to me to have been discussed, I will not say excessively, but certainly on a scale which is very ample, relatively to the pressure of other matters awaiting consideration.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked whether the Government intended to give precedence to the Corrupt Practices Bill or the Agricultural Holdings Bill after Whitsuntide?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he must ask a little time to consider that matter.

NAVY—H.M.S. "LONDON."

Sir JOHN HAY (for Mr. Slagg) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether any report has reached the Admiralty as to the condition of the depôt ship "London" in Zanzibar Harbour; whether that vessel is unhealthy and unfit for service; and, what steps the Admiralty intend to take in regard to it?

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is no doubt that, during the unhealthy season of the year, the *London* has had a good deal of sickness on board. It is now intended to pay her off before the beginning of the next unhealthy season; and an arrangement is being made for other measures being taken for the suppression of the Slave Trade on the Zanzibar Coast.

Sir JOHN HAY asked if any other ship would be sent to replace the *London?*

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir.

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT—ADJOURNMENT (WHITSUN RECESS).

SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR —EGYPT—AHMED KHANDEEL.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Monday the 21st instant."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he rose to call attention to the surrender of the Cuban refugees at Gibraltar. He much regretted that neither before Easter nor since had he been able to obtain a day to press the Motion of which he had given Notice to a position in which he would have been able to obtain the decision of the House upon it. His only chance of bringing it on was on the Motion with respect to the Easter Recess, and he had then refrained from doing so on the appeal of the Prime Minister, who represented that to bring it forward at that time would be greatly inconvenient to the Public Service. The story which he had to tell was a very simple and a very short one; but he must say that if it were simple, it was sad, and if it were short, it was shameful. He knew of no case in modern times where the British Government had been guilty of such gross neglect as in this. The facts of the case he would tell in the words of the persons most concerned. These Cuban refugees came to Gibraltar, believing that they were coming under the protection of the British Flag. There could be no doubt they were political refugees, who trusted themselves to the protection of that Flag, but did not obtain it, though entitled to it. Senor Castilio's own account, as set forth in the Memorial of the refugees, was that on the night of the 15th of August Maceo and two other prisoners confined for participation in the Cuban insurrection succeeded in escaping from Cadiz and took refuge at Tangiers. On the 20th of August they left Tangiers on the British steamer *Hercules* bound for Gibraltar, where they arrived on the afternoon of the same day. On landing they applied to the Inspector on the wharf for tickets to enter the city, and they were requested to wait. Subsequently three policemen conducted them to the police-station, where they were kept for some hours. When the Chief Inspector came he gave them to understand that they would be handed over to the Spanish authorities. Maceo protested, saying that they were political and not criminal refugees, and requesting that they should be kept in Gibraltar Prison until the truth of their story could be ascertained. Notwithstanding these protests, they were conducted by policemen outside Gibraltar across the neutral ground and handed over to the Spanish authorities, who were waiting to receive them. In a Petition from Maceo's brother he described what took place, and how they were handed over in spite of their strong protestations, and amid the loud lamentations of the women and children by whom they were accompanied. They were mercilessly given over to their enemies and conducted to a fate worse than death. If this story was true, and there was no reason to doubt it, there had been the most flagrant neglect on the part of someone and the most grievous injury had been done to these men. They were entitled to the protection of the British Flag, and the right of asylum—one of the most cherished—had been grossly violated entirely through the neglect of our own Government. He could not understand the Notice given by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) to move the Previous Question unless it indicated that the Liberal Party had so changed its principles that it was a matter of entire indifference to them whether the right of political refugees to asylum on our shores was violated or not. It was clear that in this case there was an arrangement made between the Spanish officials—he did not speak of the Spanish Government—and the English officials at Gibraltar that these persons should be received and handed over. Nothing more disgraceful to either party could be conceived. They might have been sent back by the steamer and not permitted to land. That was within the province of the English officials; but, knowing what they were doing, the English authorities enticed them from beneath the protection of the British Flag, and then, with deliberate treachery, handed them to their enemies. On the 2nd of October, Lord Napier, in answer to a question from the Colonial Office, explained how it was that the Gibraltar police came to act in this way. It appeared that the Spanish Consul wrote to the Colonial Secretary at Gibraltar informing him of the escape of the prisoners, and requesting that the English authorities would insure the expulsion of the refugees in the event of their entering the port of Gibraltar. Thus there was a direct invitation from the Spanish Consul to the English authorities to act in this manner. The Colonial Secretary then wrote to the acting police magistrate at Gibraltar, transmitting the letter of the Spanish Consul and requesting him to give the necessary instructions "to facilitate the apprehension" of the refugees on their arrival. The acting police magistrate reported to him subsequently that the men had arrived, and being without passports had been placed without the line. He added that the Spanish authorities had been communicated with, and at once arrested the prisoners. After that the Spanish Consul wrote back to the Colonial Secretary thanking him for what had been done. Although the English officials were very much to blame in this matter, yet the Spanish authorities were quite as blameworthy. They must have known that the Extradition Treaty between the two countries related only to criminals; they must also have known that criminals meant criminals and not political offenders. They must have known that in trying to induce the English officials to facilitate the apprehension of these men they were doing what they had no right to do, and were, therefore, just as guilty as this country was for handing them over. That was the view practically of Her Majesty's Government. It was perfectly clear that the Spaniards were as much in fault as ourselves, and the shameful treatment which the ladies of the party had received was an aggravation of the case. These refugees—Maceo, at any rate—were put into a horrible dungeon, and up to the present time they had not been released. He did not wish to say a word disrespectful to the Spanish Government. His remarks would apply to the Spanish officials simply. But what action was taken by Her Majesty's Government in this matter? Inquiries were made by the Colonial Office, and the officials in Gibraltar, who were to blame, had been very properly and justly punished for their flagrant breach of duty. So far as that went, Her Majesty's Government was right; but, if our people were wrong, so were the Spaniards. He would be able to show clearly that Her Majesty's Government had been guilty of the grossest neglect of duty in this matter, and that there had been such delay in action and such unquestionable indifference to the whole story as was perfectly inconceivable. On the 7th of September a paragraph appeared in *The Times* giving an account of what had taken place on the 15th of August, and adding that if the facts were as narrated, and the English authorities had been misled, there was reason for a most searching investigation. That paragraph was sent to Lord Napier, who replied in the letter to which he had already referred. On the 11th of October his despatch was received, and on the 16th a Petition came from one of the prisoners. It was referred by the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, which sent back a letter in which the Correspondence was laid before Lord Granville. That letter contained all the letters of the Spanish Consul, the Colonial Secretary, and the acting police magistrate. Lord Kimberley observed in that letter that the acting police magistrate must have been aware that, although nominally removing these persons from the garrison under an Order in Council, he was in effect arranging for a surrender of political prisoners, who, as such, were protected from surrender by the Extradition Act. The Foreign Office, in reply, expressed surprise that an Order in Council, intended to meet a different matter, should have been used for such a purpose. All these facts were known to the Foreign Office on the 19th of October. They knew that the men had been handed over by our own police on the invitation of the Spanish authorities. It was quite right that there should be an investigation to discover the guilty parties on our side; but what did the Foreign Office do? They did not utter a single syllable, but sat with their hands folded until a Question was asked in the House of Commons on the 30th of October. The first communication was evidently not from the Foreign Office, but from the Colonial Office. The Colonial Office telegraphed to Sir Robert Morier. Nothing more happened so far as the Colonial Office was concerned, except telling Sir Robert Morier not to take any steps till he received the Report of the Committee of Inquiry. On the 29th of October the Report of the Committee was received. That Report stated that the surrender was deliberately arranged between the Spanish authorities and the officials at Gibraltar. The Spanish authorities were told that the prisoners would be brought to the line and prevented from going back to Gibraltar, and that there would then be an opportunity for their arrest. What action was taken by Her Majesty's Government? Instead of writing to our Minister at Madrid, they referred the matter to the Law Officers of the Crown. That was certainly most extraordinary action. They should have consulted the Law Officers before, if they desired their opinion. On the 26th of December the British Government received another Petition from Maceo, complaining of the treatment he had endured, and of the gross insult and injury inflicted upon him; and to that complaint the only answer vouchsafed, on the 26th of December, was that "the Government had had the matter laid before them, and that it was under their consideration!" It was not until the 29th of January, five months after the transactions took place, that the Foreign Office made any official communication to their Representative at Madrid on the question. During all that five months the men had been confined in a most horrible prison. He thought he had made out this at all events, that not only had there been unwarrantable delay on the part of the Government in this case, but that there had been most unaccountable indifference to the sufferings of these people. If their delay was unwarrantable and their indifference unaccountable, certainly the mode of procedure of the Government, when they did take action, was even more extraordinary. On the 30th of October a Question was asked in Parliament, and the answer given was to the effect that—

> "The surrender of the prisoners having taken place by reason of a gross mistake on the part of our police authorities, their re-delivery by the Spanish Government, with a view to the case being dealt with in accordance with the Extradition Treaty between Spain and Great Britain, would be regarded as a graceful and friendly act, which Her Majesty's Government would highly appreciate, but which, in their opinion, must be left to the generosity and chivalry of the Spanish Government."—(3 *Hansard*, [274] 373.)

On the 4th of November Sir Robert Morier received a telegram to this effect, and also a letter recommending him to make an unofficial communication to the Spanish Government. Sir Robert Morier, in his answer to that communication, stated that the way in which he viewed the transaction was this. He commenced by saying that it was not the intention of the English Government to make any representation to the Spanish Government on this subject. He explained to the Spanish Government that there was no question of any interference in the matter, for the surrender had taken place by the fault of their own police authorities, and the Government did not intend to take any step, but would leave the question to the generous and chivalrous initiative of the Spanish Government. He admitted at once that, in view of what had taken place, no question of the re-extradition of these prisoners could be raised. Surely that was a very curious way of putting forward a request. If you were going to ask for something, was it wise to give up your whole case beforehand, and to admit that the action of your opponent had been altogether right? All this was done before the Government received the Report of the Committee of Inquiry; and surely that formed an additional reason for not abandoning the whole of their own case in making their application to the Spanish Government. On the 29th of January, however, they made their first official communication, being in no better position as regards information than they had been for months previously, and having had a despatch of the Spanish Minister on the question in their pigeon-holes for two months. They deserved the bitter irony of that Minister's reply of the 28th of February, 1883, pointing out that, inasmuch as the British Government had admitted that their own officials were entirely at fault, they were hardly in a position to criticize the action of the Spanish authorities. But the question was then raised before the House of Commons, and then, and not till then, did matters take a different turn. In view of the pending action of the House of Commons, a small concession was granted, and Maceo was interned. Sir Robert Morier never even asked for his release. But the Government, on hearing of that small concession offered by the Spanish Government, wrote to Sir Robert Morier informing him that he was authorized to accept the proposal of the Spanish Government, and, although he was not to say that the Government were actually satisfied with what had taken place, he might say they were much gratified by it. Sir Robert Morier, however, did more than this. He telegraphed that Her Majesty's Government approved of the solution, and were much gratified at it, and the Foreign Office never disclaimed this message. Her Majesty's Government had given up the whole case from the very commencement; they had gone on their knees to the Spanish Government and told them they had not a right to claim in any formal shape, and that anything that might be done must be entirely upon the will and motion of the Spanish Government. There was one other point that he must allude to, and he did so with considerable pain. In the long course of Questions which were asked on this matter, the House—he admitted unintentionally—was misled as to what was going on between the English and Spanish Governments. He quoted the answers given by Ministers from time to time in answer to Questions about the fate of the Cuban refugees. Although at an early stage Ministers had deprecated any questions being raised, he had never seen anything in the early communications from Sir Robert Morier to the effect that no representations should be made in the House of Commons. On the 9th of November it was stated that it was difficult for our Minister at Madrid to approach the Spanish Government, and yet he had done so. [Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Unofficially.] He (Sir R. Assheton Cross) did not care whether it was officially or unofficially. If the Government, through its Representative, went to the Spanish Minister and told him we had not a leg to stand upon, and that it was entirely our fault, and if they afterwards went back and withdrew those expressions, how would the Spanish Minister treat them? Our Representative at Madrid made no distinction between official and non-official words. On the 21st of November the right hon. Gentleman said it "was too soon yet to make a statement as to the steps taken to secure the release of Maceo and his companions," and added that "it was impossible to state what correspondence had passed." Why it should have been impossible to state what correspondence had passed he did not know. The right hon. Gentleman further stated that Her Majesty's Minister at Madrid was desirous that no statement should be made until the matter was completed by inquiry. But these or any such words were not, as far as he could find, in the official Papers. At this time they had had a distinct intimation through Sir Robert Morier from the Spanish Minister that as to giving up these people there was no hope whatever. If the whole Correspondence had been on the Table at the time these answers were given the House would have been extremely astonished. That was really the whole case. The Government were in this position—they must stand on one leg or on the other. They must either say that they did make communications to the Spanish Government, in which case they made them with full knowledge of the facts contained in the letter of Lord Napier in October, or they must say they took no action and made no representations until after they had received their Report, and that the first action they took was on the 29th of January. If they chose to take that line, all he could say was, that the delay was so great and the case so palpable that they were guilty of a gross breach of duty in not taking action before. They had their Report before them on the 28th or 29th of November, and not one single word of official representation was made to the Spanish Government till the 29th of January. He was bound to say that if the Spanish Government had relaxed their action more than they had done, they would have been exceedingly generous and chivalrous. What was now to be done? The whole case was given up by the English Government. They could not address the Government of Spain again, and the only possible chance for these men lay in a generous expression of opinion from all sides of the House. It appeared to be too late now to address any further remonstrance to the Spanish Government; but he hoped there would be such an expression of opinion from all sides of the House, even from the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) himself, showing that there was unquestionably a deep feeling that the right of asylum had been violated, and a strong trust that we should never again see such a gross violation of it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said, he was not astonished that a subject which had excited so much interest should have been brought before the House of Commons; but, with all respect to the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, he was bound to say that the right hon. Gentleman had in the course of his remarks made statements and allegations which were not on all fours with the facts as revealed in the Papers. The allegation was that, not only had a wrong been done, but that there had been a miscarriage of justice consequent on the action taken by the Government. But the right hon. Gentleman had really evaded the main point—namely, to show on what grounds of International Law action of a different kind could have been justly, fairly and equitably pursued. The right hon. Gentleman's allegation was that not only had a wrong been done in equity, but that there had been gross neglect and delay on the part of Her Majesty's Government; and the right hon. Gentleman quoted dates in support of his contention. He did not, however, quote all the dates, because there were some that tended to give a different colour to the facts referred to by the right hon. Gentleman. Now, the first notice ever brought to anyone in this country of the arrest of these men was on the 7th of September in a paragraph in *The Times.* Within 48 hours the Government took action by calling for an immediate Report in reference to the statement in the public newspapers. When the right hon. Gentleman was making so grave an indictment of negligence against the authorities, it was odd that, as he had studied the Papers, he passed over entirely the only serious instance of omission in the whole case—that was the omission of the Governor of Gibraltar to have any knowledge of what had happened within his own government. It was not the case that there was negligence on the part of the Foreign Office. It was the Foreign Office that called on the Colonial Office to press for full inquiry; but still the matter dragged with almost inconceivable dilatoriness at Gibraltar, until, on the 24th October, Lord Kimberley had to write to Lord Napier urging him peremptorily to hasten the inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman had asked why the Government did not take action without such a full inquiry being made; but it would have been unwise to take action without a full knowledge of the facts of the case; and he would remind the House and the right hon. Gentleman that if they had done so, they might have been afterwards compelled to recede from positions they had taken up; whereas, having waited for full information, they had not been required to recede from a single point, but had, on the other hand, been able to drive the Spanish Government from positions which they had taken up. It would have been unwise also if our Representative at Madrid had made any representation to the Spanish Government before official data were obtained in reference to the case. With all the facts before the House, it was evident that the blame rested with those who, with grave and unaccountable ignorance of their duty, had made at Gibraltar a surrender which was contrary, no doubt, to what was right in equity, though not contrary to the technicalities of law; and, therefore, all that Her Majesty's Government could do at this time, the 4th of November, was to make an appeal to the generosity of the Spanish Government, with a view to the liberation of the men. If the right hon. Gentleman read the Papers with a candid mind, he would see that the statement he had made to the effect that Sir Robert Morier showed a tendency to soften down the appeal he was authorized to make to the Spanish Government—to be subservient to the exaggerated pretensions of that Government—was very unjust. On the contrary, Sir Robert Morier made the communication fully in the sense of his instructions, and carried out the duty intrusted to him firmly and with great energy, and induced the Spanish Minister to concede points which he had previously refused to do. The Spanish Minister, mounting the high horse, had said that nothing on earth would induce him or his Colleagues, in view of all the facts and surroundings of the case, to entertain the idea of the men being liberated; nevertheless, Sir Robert Morier, by perseverance and by firm language, succeeded in inducing him, in view of the strong feeling which existed in this country on the matter, and in view of the preservation of friendly relations between the two countries, to concede the point and to entertain the idea. Sir Robert Morier treated the matter as one in which a positive claim arising out of existing International Law could not be made, and asked, by way of compromise, that Maceo should be interned. This the Spanish Minister was at first unwilling to accede to, proposing to release merely the companions of Maceo; but Sir Robert Morier intimated that in no sense would this be regarded as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, and by his good temper and persistency he gained for Maceo the large concession, the benefit of which he was then enjoying. According to his (Mr. Cartwright's) information, Maceo was at the fortress with the rank of a General Officer, and was permitted the society of his wife and family. Now, what more could have been done, seeing that the whole difficulty was created by the negligence and blunders of our own officials? These were the facts of the case, and he believed, notwithstanding the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, that there was no foundation for the charge of supineness and indifference brought against Her Majesty's Government, or for saying that they did not value the right of asylum to purely political refugees, which always had been and still was most highly considered among Englishmen.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that he did not perceive, as the hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright) had inferred, that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had made any attack whatever upon Sir Robert Morier, nor did he, indeed, conceive that any such attack was possible under the circumstances. The duties of a diplomatist were to carry to a successful issue, so far as he was able, the policy intrusted to him by the Government. It must, however, in his (Sir H. Drummond Wolff's) opinion, have been exceedingly difficult for Sir Robert Morier to have carried out what the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) had termed the weak and cringing policy of Lord Granville. The hon. Member for Oxfordshire had challenged them to produce an authority showing their legal right to call upon the Spanish Government to surrender these prisoners. He accepted that challenge. He believed the Government overlooked, and probably purposely overlooked, facts which, if properly urged, would have placed us in a position to have demanded the surrender. It appeared that Sir Robert Morier, on the 12th of November, 1882, wrote to Lord Granville adverting to the fact that he had been charged to make the Spanish Government a strictly unofficial communication with reference to the Cuban refugees, and that his instructions were to do so in the most amicable terms, and in the spirit of one friendly Government to another. His own contention, on the contrary, was that the blunders of the English officials were not the only grounds on which they had a right to approach the Spanish Government, for it was through a want of candour on the part of the Spanish Consul, so gross as to almost amount to a false pretence, that the prisoners were ever surrendered at all. It would have been absolutely impossible for any circumstance of this character to have occurred in this country. It simply occurred because the Spanish Consul took advantage of a local ordinance to play a trick upon the local Government at Gibraltar. But what right had the Spanish Consul to make use of an existing amicable arrangement between his Government and the authorities at Gibraltar, for the purpose of obtaining the surrender of political and not civil offenders? By Article II. of the Extradition Treaty between Spain and this country, it was laid down that extradition should be granted only for the certain specified offences, and Article IV. declared that no person should be surrendered for any political offence. By a later Article it was provided that application for the extradition of prisoners was to be made to the Secretary of State, and that, where the case arose in the Colonies and other places out of the country in question, the same procedure should be gone through by the Consul. If the Spanish Consul had made application under the Extradition Treaty, the matter would have been inquired into by the Judges, and Maceo and his companions would not have been delivered up. But the Consul evaded that course, and carefully led General Baynes to believe that these unfortunate men were not political criminals. On the 16th of August application was made by the Consul, and a letter was forwarded to the Colonial Secretary, in which it was stated that he had been informed that the Governor of Cadiz had made representations with regard to the apprehension of the transported Maceo. The translation said "exiled," but that was not a correct rendering. Then there was a letter sent to the Governor of Cadiz, in which it was stated that Maceo had arrived there *en route* for Ceuta. In this letter was the extraordinary expression, "It is inferred that he was undergoing his term of imprisonment." If that were so, what was it for? The Consul and others saw General Baynes—whom the Government had now sacrificed to clear themselves—several times on the subject, and they never informed him that this man was a political prisoner. It was positively certain that, had application been made under the Treaty, the matter would have been inquired into by the Judges, and a *habeas corpus* might have issued or proceedings been taken to prevent the surrender. The only application that was made was under a local ordinance, to which there was no analogy in this country. The fact was—although Sir Robert Morier had stated in one of his despatches that he had no desire to make any charge against the Government—that the Spanish Government had not acted in good faith, for they had entrapped General Baynes by making a fraudulent use of the local ordinance to which he had referred. But, strange to say, Her Majesty's Government had kindly accepted the interpretation of the Spanish Government, and had unnecessarily exculpated the Spanish Consul from all blame. By the extraordinary action of Her Majesty's Government, the rights which they possessed of affording a political asylum had been surrendered, and he could not but think that the Flag of England had thereby been disgraced. If this were the only instance in which we had been insulted by the Spanish Government it would not be so important, but there were several similar cases. The hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had lately brought the case of the *Leon XIII.* before the House; there was also the case of the *Tangier;* and that now under discussion was additional evidence that the Spanish Government meant to act offensively. Surely we had a right to complain of such conduct? Lord Palmerston had stated that if there was one rule more than another which was observed by all independent States, both great and small, it was the rule not to deliver up political refugees, unless bound to do so by the positive obligations of a Treaty. The general feelings of mankind forbade such proceedings, and persons making such a surrender would be regarded as degraded and dishonoured.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he perfectly agreed with the words of Lord Palmerston with which the hon. Member for Portsmouth had concluded his speech, and also with much of the speech itself; but he entirely failed to see how either Lord Palmerston's words or the words of the hon. Member himself had any relevancy to the matter before the House. He always thought that, however good a case might be, it was spoilt by a different line being taken by the Mover and those who supported him. The hon.

Member for Portsmouth had made an attack on the Consul.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I said his conduct was almost fraudulent.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he should like to read what Sir Robert Morier had written about the action of that official. He wrote that nothing could be more straightforward or loyal than the action of the Consul. He never pretended that Maceo was a convict or a criminal. The hon. Gentleman then went on to complain of the conduct of Sir Robert Morier.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he did not blame Sir Robert Morier, but the Government.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, they were perfectly prepared to support Sir Robert Morier in the whole of his action. The hon. Gentleman had then made a series of charges against the Government which were quite unworthy of him. He accused them of mistranslating a despatch in their own interest. The hon. Member ought to have hesitated before making such a charge. He further insinuated that they sacrificed General Baynes, an innocent man, and were entirely deceived by this most wicked Consul, and that they had thrown over General Baynes to exculpate themselves. Surely the conduct of General Baynes was deserving of the censure passed upon him, as he took none of the steps which he ought to have taken in reference to this matter. He never inquired whether the offence charged against this man was a political offence or not. It was his business to have asked certain questions relating to the nature of the man's offence and the reasons for which his surrender was demanded. So far he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had agreed with the hon. Gentleman on his own basis. The hon. Gentleman assumed that a surrender was asked for.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF explained that he had never said so. What he said was that the Spanish Consul had asked not for the man's surrender, but that the procedure should be taken against these people which was usual under a local ordinance.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had understood the hon. Gentleman in another part of his speech to use the word surrender. General Baynes did what he was not asked to do by the Spanish Consul. He handed these men and the ladies who were with them to the Spanish Government when he was not even asked to surrender them; and yet the hon. Member said they had sacrificed General Baynes in order to clear themselves. He now came to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross). One of the main portions of his case was that great delay had occurred. It was necessary, however, to act in this doubtful matter on the highest legal advice obtainable in this country, and the result was that in the months of December and January constant correspondence was passing between the Foreign Office and the Law Officers of the Crown and the Colonial Office respecting the final answer to be given to the Spanish Government. On the 5th of December they received the first main document from the Law Officers of the Crown, giving their opinion on this question. In the latter part of December they communicated with the Colonial Office as to the answers to be sent to Spain. All through the early part of January communications were passing between the Colonial and Foreign Offices, and he was bound to say that he could not see that there had been any undue delay. The right hon. Gentleman also made somewhat of a personal attack on himself in regard to answers given by him in the House on this subject in November and December. He followed the right hon. Gentleman carefully with the answers in his hand, and while the right hon. Gentleman was speaking he only thought there was one point on which he was at all on the face of things open to the charge of having misled the House. The right hon. Gentleman said that on the 21st of November he stated that Her Majesty's Minister at Madrid had asked the Government, in the interests of this question, not to make any statement till the inquiry was completed. The right hon. Gentleman rightly said that no record of that communication appeared in the Papers. The telegram in which the request of Sir Robert Morier was contained was dated the 11th of November, and the substance of it was in the despatch of the 12th of November. The last paragraph of the telegram was not, according to custom, expanded, and was not contained in the despatch. The reason why the telegram was not laid before Parliament had reference to a matter which greatly confused this question for a considerable time, and on which most careful inquiry was necessary—namely, the question as to the exact spot on which the arrest of the men by the Spanish authorities took place. That was the reason why he stated that the Government could not at that time make any communication. The main charge brought against the Government by the right hon. Gentleman was, that in the first days of the transaction the Government gave up their whole case, as our Minister at Madrid, in approaching the Spanish Government unofficially, put the case so gently and mildly as to invite the refusal they afterwards met with. His (Sir Charles W. Dilke's) view of the case was this. Either we had a right to demand the surrender of these men or we had not. Our contention throughout was that we had no such right. There had been no conduct on the part of the Spanish Consul or Government to give us an international right to demand that these men should be handed back to us. That being so, was it not in the interests of these men—and that, after all, was the real question at issue—was it not advisable for the sake of saving them from prolonged confinement in a dungeon, that the Government should take the course which was pursued, and which had had the effect of extricating two prisoners from imprisonment altogether, and of greatly ameliorating the severity of confinement of the other prisoner? Having nothing like an international right, the Government appealed to the generosity of the Spanish nation; and he believed that Lord Palmerston, who had been referred to in the debate, would have adopted that course under the circumstances. The demand of the Consul, which was put forward as the ground for the Government taking another course, was a demand which he had a right to make, and the Government had no reason to suppose—indeed they had a distinct statement from Sir Robert Morier to the contrary—that the demand was made in bad faith. The main charge brought against Sir Robert Morier by the right hon. Gentleman was that our Minister did not, in these unofficial communications, pretend he had a case when he had not a case. The right hon. Gentleman really contended that the Government, having no case, ought to have bragged and blustered on this occasion.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS explained that that was not his allegation. What he maintained was that the Government had put the case too mildly to the Spanish Government, and that Sir Robert Morier really invited a refusal.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the right hon. Gentleman did not venture to contend, although the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) had done so, that the Government had an international case. Having no international case, they were to go with a bad case and pretend that they had a good one.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS, again interposing, said, what he contended was that the Government did not put their case in October as they put it in January.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that he had already dealt with that matter of delay. The ascertaining of the facts and the taking of the opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown had caused the delay of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken. In regard to the main case, he believed the House would agree that if there were one thing worse than having a bad case, it was that, having a bad case, we should go to a Foreign Government and pretend that we had a good one.

Sir HARDINGE GIFFARD said, that the right hon. Gentleman had quoted the despatch of the 12th of November, in which Sir Robert Morier described the conduct of the Spanish Consul as being straightforward and worthy of all praise. But what was the foundation of that opinion? It was that Maceo and his companions were conveyed outside the British lines, "where they fell into the hands of the Spanish Municipal Guard." Here the statement was that they "fell" into the hands of the guard. But it turned out afterwards that instead of their falling into the hands of the guard, there was a preconcerted arrangement between the British officials and the Consul, and that made all the difference. So long as it was supposed that there was a blunder on the part of the English authorities to which the Spanish authorities were no parties, and that it was not a preconcerted arrangement or conspiracy, he could understand Sir Robert Morier's expression of opinion; but it could not be justified when it was known that the Consul had induced an English subordinate officer to exceed his authority. He put it to his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General whether it was consistent with International Law that the Representative of a Foreign Power should induce the Representative of another Power—a subordinate officer—to exceed his authority, and to be guilty of a fraud on the law well known to both of them, and that the Government of that Foreign Power should decline to retract the action of their Representative, and so far adopt it as to keep persons in prison who were handed over to them by that preconcerted arrangement, and then say they were not guilty of any international offence? Did the case submitted to his hon. and learned Friend and the Solicitor General assume as one of the facts on which they were to advise that the Spanish Consul was altogether innocent of any guilty participation in this transaction? That would make a difference to the whole transaction. When it was discovered that there had been a preconcerted arrangement the whole situation was changed. It could not be denied that there had been a preconcerted arrangement, for in Lord Granville's despatch it was said that the surrender was effected in the manner suggested by the Spanish Consul, "by way of preconcerted expulsion and arrest." These refugees were to be expelled out of British territory, and it was arranged by the Spanish Consul that the moment they were expelled they were to be arrested by the Spanish authorities. That was a discreditable arrangement of which there was every reason to complain as a violation of International Law, seeing that a subordinate officer was induced to exceed his authority. It was a totally inadequate answer to say that at the time when the communication was made it was unofficial. The Government wanted to take credit for their immediate action, and what they did was to give up the whole cause of complaint. It might be true that there had been no demand made under the Extradition Acts; but the charge was, that the authorities had connived at this transaction because they knew there could be no proceedings under the Extradition Acts. For having induced a subordinate English officer to exceed his authority, the Spanish Government ought to have been addressed in a very different tone as soon as the facts became known to Her Majesty's Government, instead of which the Government went down to the dust and entreated them humbly to do something for them as an act of grace.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James) said, the charge was that there had been trickery on the part of the Spanish Consul, and that English officials entered into conspiracy with him, and that as the expulsion of these men was the result of the trick and of the conspiracy the English Government ought to have assumed a different tone. The question was whether there had been trick, fraud, or conspiracy?

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would call the hon. and learned Gentleman's attention to Sir Robert Morier's despatch of the 16th of August.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James) said, that the passage referred to was one dealing with the whole transaction; but he was now speaking of the foundation on which the British Government could have alleged fraud, trickery, and conspiracy. British officers were parties to everything that was done. It was by their acts alone that this unpleasant situation had been brought about. He could conceive nothing weaker than for a nation represented by its own officials to throw them over, to repudiate what they had done, and to ground upon that repudiation a grave official demand for reparation because the officials of another nation had acted wrongly. It was admitted that the conduct of the British Government towards their own officials had been perfectly correct, and that they were right in throwing the blame on their own officials instead of endeavouring to cast the responsibility on the Spanish Government.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman of the following passage in the despatch of Sir Robert Morier on the 9th of March:—

> "The point specially insisted upon in my note was that the expulsion thus suggested on the 16th of August was the initiatory step to the carefully considered measures jointly taken by

our authorities and the Spanish Consular *employés* on the 28th of the month, by which the police agents of the two countries, acting under common preconcerted orders, were able to carry out the desires of the Spanish authorities that the fugitives should be replaced in their custody."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James) said, there was nothing in that inconsistent with what he was endeavouring to say. The Spanish Consul knew that the British officials at Gibraltar had legal powers of expulsion vested in them by Order in Council, and he made no misrepresentation on any point. He did not represent the persons to be criminals, but only stated that he had been charged with the capture of Maceo and his companions, and he requested that they might be expelled from the garrison. When the Consul appealed to the English officials to expel the fugitives, he asked them to do it if they could. It was impossible for the English officials, who knew what extradition meant, to suppose that that was a demand for extradition, or that it meant an appeal to a legal tribunal, and an order by such a tribunal. Therefore, they adopted a mode of putting these unfortunate men outside the lines. But that was the fault of the English officials, who misconceived what was their duty; and it was not because they misconceived their duty that the blame should be thrown upon the Spanish Consul. His hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General and himself had most anxiously tried to see whether they could find cause of blame in the conduct of the Spanish Consul, and if they did they would have pointed it out. But they felt that, for them to torture acts ingeniously, and to endeavour to create an unfounded impression, would have been very wrong when they were called upon to advise the Government whether a claim could be framed against the Spanish official. It was not for them to take up a position which could not be maintained. Therefore his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General and himself gave their attention to the proper construction to be placed upon the demand of the Spanish Consul, and, finding no misrepresentation in them, they did not think they could say, as the right hon. Gentleman had done, that there was treachery on the part of the Spanish Consul, who only stated what was perfectly accurate, and did not make illegal demands which could not be supported. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Launceston (Sir Hardinge Giffard) knew the distinction between representations made in an officious and an official manner. It often happened that a Minister, in order to obtain the desired end, thought that his duty would be better fulfilled by means of non-official representation rather than by official demands. Sir Robert Morier, knowing the Government with which he had to deal, thought that the proper way to approach them was not by making demands in a peremptory tone, but by saying—"We make no charge of treachery or fraud, but we do say that the English officials having wrongly given up these men, and placed them where they ought not to have been placed, you ought to put them in the same position as they were before." It was a happy thing, considering the tone of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Launceston, that no threat was used towards the Spanish Government, and that they were not told that their officials had been guilty of treachery and fraud. If that had been done what would have become of these men, one of whom had been released from custody, while the other was kept in honourable confinement? It was because they thought the end they had in view would be better accomplished by making friendly representations, and even by understating the case, that they had arrived at a conclusion which would never have been reached if the tone of his hon. and learned Friend had been assumed. If they made their demand on insufficient grounds, and insisted that the Spanish Government should release the men, how could they enforce that demand? And if they made it officially they should have either to retreat from it or to enforce it. To have retreated would have provoked something of the condemnation which the right hon. Gentleman had passed upon the Government—it would, as he had said, have been "discreditable;" and if a Vote of Censure was asked for, that vote would have been well deserved if they had made a peremptory demand which they did not intend to enforce.

Mr. O'KELLY said, there was one line in the Correspondence which proved clearly that the authorities at Gibraltar were misled by the representations that were made to them by the Spanish Consul. On this line rested the whole case against Her Majesty's Government. The translation of this line in the despatches was inaccurate in the English version. If the right hon. Gentleman would turn to the Spanish despatch he would see in the last line the words—"*Estoc suppone que fue sufriendo cadena.*" The clear meaning of that phrase was that Maceo was a convict. The English Government were more to blame in this affair than the Spanish Government. After having surrendered, upon the faith of the promise given by a British Consul that he would be allowed to become an exile, Maceo was pursued by a Spanish ship-of-war, and made prisoner in violation of that agreement. The English Government, however, thought that its honour was not involved in the transaction and took no notice of it. Yet if the Government had remonstrated, he believed that they would have succeeded in procuring the liberation of the captured officers. Up to the 6th of this month Maceo was a close prisoner in a Spanish fortress. That was the fact, although he had been told by the spokesman of the Government here that the arrangements made by the Spanish Government had been carried out, and that Maceo had been given a limited liberty. It was possible that the continued ill-treatment of Maceo was due to the fact that the Commandant of the fortress in which he was immured did not understand the real nature of the arrangement which this Government had made. The Spanish War Minister, he felt convinced, would not be a party to any breach of faith in the matter, and he believed that if the Government would take the trouble to put Maceo's case before that Minister the arrangement that had been made would be carried out. In the name of the great principle of the right of asylum he demanded that this man, who had been surrendered to the Spanish Government, should be given absolute unconditional liberty.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, he was of opinion that the words of the Correspondence to which the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) had referred could not be held to substantiate the charge of fraud and conspiracy made by some hon. Members against the Spanish authorities. He agreed with the Attorney General that it was well that this debate was not raised earlier, for it might have influenced materially the conduct of the Spanish Government towards the prisoners. If accusations of conspiracy and fraud had been made while the negotiations were still pending, the chances of the liberation of the two prisoners who had been set free would have been greatly lessened, as well as the chances of better treatment for Maceo himself. Not having abandoned the hope that before long Maceo might be liberated by the exercise of the clemency of the Spanish Government, he felt bound to say that he did not think that the tone of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) and of the hon. and learned Member for Launceston (Sir Hardinge Giffard) would assist the Government in obtaining the liberation of the prisoner whose liberation they had so much at heart. He was astonished to hear the charge of delay made against Her Majesty's Government. When he became Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in December last, the first question with which he became acquainted and which was pressed upon his attention was that of the Cuban refugees. No neglect whatever could be shown against anyone in the Foreign Office, and the President of the Local Government Board would bear him out in saying that Lord Granville had given the most careful attention to the subject. Therefore the Foreign Office had a right to complain of the disagreeable charges that had been brought forward against it by the right hon. Gentleman—charges which he had not been able to substantiate. He said there were no despatches on the question.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I never said that. On the contrary, I quoted them.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: The right hon. Gentleman said there were no representations on this question, and he subsequently said there were no official representations.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he had pointed out that there was no despatch from Lord Granville between that of the 28th of November, 1882, in which his Lordship stated that Her Majesty's Government could take no further action in the matter until the Commission of Inquiry had reported, and that of the 29th of January, 1883, LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, that, as stated in one of the earliest despatches, there had previously been representations not of an official character, a course which, as the right hon. Gentleman was aware, was frequently adopted in very delicate questions such as this. Then the right hon. Gentleman said there was a variation in the form of the representations made by Her Majesty's Government at different periods. That allegation had been already fully dealt with by his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General. There had been no variation. But it had unfortunately happened that the Colonial officials at Gibraltar had placed themselves in the wrong, and the Government had been obliged to make the best of it. If the right hon. Gentleman had no more to say than that, what became of his demand for a full-dress debate? He ventured further to say that even assuming the right hon. Gentleman was right in his statement that there was a variation on the part of Her Majesty's Government, he was not entitled to come and ask for such a sacrifice of the time of the House. All through the speech of the right hon. Gentleman he never ventured to impugn what he might call the centre of the position of Her Majesty's Government. Neither did the hon. and learned Member for Lunceston venture to say that the Government were wrong in the view they took of the position of these officials and of the conduct of the Spanish authorities. He hoped the House would pardon his occupying their time at such length. He had made these explanations because it was important that the public should know that there had been no variation on the part of Her Majesty's Government. Sir Robert Morier, writing to Lord Granville, quite at the commencement of the controversy, on the 12th of November, said that "nothing could be more straightforward or loyal than the action of the Spanish Consul." Then he proceeded to admit that the British authorities had been in the wrong. In almost the last despatch Sir Robert Morier said that the Spanish Consul—

> "Was so well up in his business that, knowing that if he demanded their extradition he would, on the plea of their being political refugees, be probably refused . . . he suggested their expulsion instead. On their arrival at Gibraltar the expulsion on the land side and the immediate arrest beyond the British line by the Spanish police was, as stated above, and fully proved by the evidence, pre-arranged and preconcerted between our authorities and the Spanish Consular authorities. In all this I see no act of bad faith on the part of the Consul, but only great zeal in obeying the orders of his superiors, and great *savoir faire* and ingenuity in availing himself of the excessive readiness of our officials to render themselves agreeable to him. If they, through ignorance were ready to act against the spirit of the Treaty of Extradition, it was not for him to point this out to them."

There was no variation on the part of the Government. Their conduct was perfectly consistent. On reference to Lord Granville's despatch of the 29th of January, it would be found that Her Majesty's Government recognized the situation and had to mark their disapprobation of the conduct of their officials by the dismissal of those most immediately responsible for the error committed. Anyone listening to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman would have thought that the refugees were in prison, for he only stated parenthetically that some of them had been released. Anyone hearing the right hon. Gentleman would have thought that the Government had made a terrible *fiasco*. The simple fact was that they had asked the Spanish Government to accede to their demand for the release of the refugees in the manner most calculated to obtain the desired result. They had succeeded in the main in obtaining that result by the release of two of the refugees, and they did not despair, notwithstanding the imprudent speeches of the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. and learned Member for Launceston, of inducing the Spanish Government to release Maceo himself. The right hon. Gentleman, however, had asked the Government to take advantage of their own wrong. He would add that using the language of bluster and threatening was not the line Her Majesty's Government were in the habit of taking. The matter had been fully considered in all its bearings. If the Government were to use strong, unnecessary, and violent language when they were in the wrong, they might do themselves injury in cases in which they had the law on their side. He believed he had satisfied the House that there had been no delay on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and that the line and attitude taken by them had been successful, for it had resulted in the release of two.

of the prisoners, and the promise of the release of the third, without departing in any way from those doctrines as to the immunity of political prisoners which were always treated as of the highest importance in this country.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he thought the subject that had been under discussion was now pretty well threshed out, therefore he would call attention to another question, which was a matter of some urgency. He was glad to learn that the Government had been successful in preserving the rights of asylum and yet had got rid of the old plan adopted by Lord Palmerston of backing up their Agents abroad in all they did, whether right or wrong. He was glad that the Government had set an example in the course they had adopted; it was much better than indulging in an empty display of bluster. As regarded the right of asylum, there was another political offender—Arabi Pasha—who had not been fairly dealt with. The Government sent a force to catch him and handed him over to his enemies, and everyone concerned in the matter had had a sword or a dinner given him. Then there was another political offender being tried on the same charges as Arabi—Ahmed Khandeel—in whose case there seemed to be a very great danger of a miscarriage of justice. Lord Granville, in his despatch of November 23 with regard to Arabi and his companions, required as the conditions of their trial that the trial should be a public one, and that the prisoners should have the assistance of counsel. Khandeel, the Prefect of Police at Alexandria, was said to have been implicated in the massacre, but he was not receiving a fair trial, and the conditions required by Lord Granville had been ignored. Was it fair that the prisoner should be convicted on a preliminary trial when the evidence was not taken in his presence? It was altogether unjust. Mr. Mark Napier, his counsel, had lately returned home because the facilities given to other prisoners had not been given to this prisoner. If the evidence were taken in open Court, it would have a material bearing upon the Egyptian Question. There was positive danger to the lives of this man and his companions if something was not done. His only reason for interposing at this point was because he thought the Government were bound, in the interests of justice and humanity, to send out immediate orders that this man should have a fair trial equally with the other prisoners.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he desired to strengthen the case put by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. The Prime Minister, in replying to a Question of his the other day, said that counsel would be allowed to Ahmed Khandeel when the trial began. He did not think, however, that the Prime Minister was aware that the *dossier* to which he alluded was the actual trial. He had heard that this was so from Mr. Mark Napier himself. What was called in England a trial was in Egypt called a preliminary proceeding. Nothing was done in the way of calling witnesses; all the Court did was to read the depositions, debate about them, and then give its decision. It was impossible that a man could have justice done him under the most favourable circumstances, because it was open to the Court to accept evidence of any kind they chose. He was certain justice would not be done to this man, because nothing was so difficult in Egypt as to secure an open trial. It appeared that Ahmed Khandeel was the only man who could throw any light on the real origin of the massacre of the 11th June. It was stated—and the statement could be substantiated—that Omar Lufti, the present Minister of War, who was Governor of Alexandria at the time of the massacre of the 11th of June, was the agent of the Khedive in getting up that massacre. It was a Palace intrigue on the part of the Khedive and Omar Lufti for the purpose of injuring Arabi Pasha. Arabi Pasha said that he would preserve order; but to bring him into collision with Foreign Powers, and to show that he was unable to preserve order, Omar Lufti was employed as an agent of the Palace to concoct these massacres. Omar Lufti wanted Ahmed Khandeel to assist him; but Ahmed, a nervous retiring man, was taken conveniently ill, and remained in bed during the time in order to be out of the way. Were we going to support the Egyptian Government in the efforts they were making against Lord Granville's despatch, and against the instructions we had given to the Egyptian Government? Were we prepared to make ourselves parties to the suppression of evidence for the sacrifice of a man who was perfectly innocent? The only way in which we could do justice to Ahmed Khandeel was to treat the whole proceeding by the Egyptian Government as utterly invalid, and to insist on the preliminary proceeding being commenced *de novo* in the presence of Ahmed Khandeel's counsel. He was certain the Prime Minister would not lend himself to a foul intrigue of the lowest and most despicable kind on the part of Egyptians, compared with whom Arabi Pasha was purity itself, for the sacrifice of an innocent man because he might damage their present position. He asked the Prime Minister to put aside the ordinary traditions of the Foreign Office, which were unfavourable to this man, to look at the matter broadly, and to allow this poor man to have justice done to him, for by so doing he would really strengthen the position of the British Government in India.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I am in one respect sorry and in others glad that I have heard the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock as well as that of my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle. I am sorry because of the reference that speech contained to the Khedive, upon whom, as an *obiter dictum*, and not as a main part of his speech, the noble Lord has cast the most grave charges that can possibly be advanced against any man—that is to say, that in the view of the noble Lord the Khedive had employed other instruments for getting up the massacre of the 11th June.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I said it was believed by competent authorities that Ahmed Khandeel would be able to prove that in his own defence.

Mr. GLADSTONE: It is difficult to be prepared, and I do not think the House would conceive it possible for anyone to be prepared, to meet a charge of this kind. Some credit is due to a man who has been the Chief of the Egyptian community for several years in very difficult times, in a very imperfectly organized country, who has had to confront danger in a hundred forms, and who has never down to this moment to our knowledge been guilty of any proceeding inconsistent with the character of a benevolent and an upright Ruler. ["Oh!"] Well, that is the result of our experience of the Khedive, and it would be monstrous on our part readily to give ear to any imputation of that kind, and I thought it my absolute duty to protest strongly against the provisional acceptance of such a charge. Passing from that I come to the more material part of the speech of the noble Lord and the demand of my hon. Friend. The noble Lord has placed before us in a very clear form the nature of the evil which he wishes to provide against, and he likewise explicitly stated the remedy which he thinks ought to be offered. The evil against which he wishes to provide is that the preliminary process, as it has been called—without any opportunity to the prisoners to have the advantage of counsel—is really and virtually the substantial trial—that, in point of fact, if I understand the speech of the noble Lord, it does not appear to him that there is any power on the part of the prisoner to bring in rebutting evidence against that advanced by the accusers. I am bound to say that information, considered as information, is quite at variance with that we have received. The distinct account given to us by Lord Dufferin is that the Egyptian procedure is in essential the French procedure, that this preliminary process and the formation of the *dossier*, as it has been called, is the process that prevails in the French Courts, and though it may be alien to English notions it is familiar and prevalent in a great part of the countries of Europe. But what we understand is, that when in that preliminary process there is gathered together the particulars that form the case of the accusers, that evidence may go before the Court, and it goes there to be examined and sifted, to be cross-examined, to be rebutted, and to be contradicted by counter evidence.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: There is no cross-examination in the higher Court.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am simply stating what was the information given to the Government. I do not hesitate, however, to say I agree with the noble Lord thus far, that if the preliminary proceeding and the calling of evidence on what we look upon as the real trial is simply the arrangement of that written evidence by the Judges, that is not in accordance with our ideas of a trial, nor of the French procedure, nor of the procedure, though alien to ours, which exists in many countries in Europe. That statement having been made, I admit it is one that deserves the attention of the Government; and not only so, but I will say it is not now for the first time the subject has received the attention of the Government, for immediately upon having reason to believe that suspicion existed on the subject, my noble Friend (Earl Granville) took means to make communications with the Egyptian Government in order that we might be possessed of the whole state of the facts. I cannot agree with the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock in saying that our request ought to be that the preliminary proceedings should be recommenced. There is the objection to that course that it would tend to bring into grave disrepute and disparagement all proceedings in Egypt if there was to be a cancelling of what has been done, and a recommencement of the whole question; but what has been done should be sifted and examined, and be liable to be rebutted. That I quite understand, and that seems to me what we should all think among ourselves should be the main object in view, and we shall do all that we believe we are entitled to do. I am not at liberty to say in what cases hereafter we should be justified in interfering with the administration of justice in Egypt—it requires a grave case to warrant it, and our constant interference even for good might end in producing a balance of mischief. In this instance the promise has been given that counsel shall be employed, and we understand that distinctly to mean that the employment of counsel shall mean the bringing out the whole facts of the case without fear or favour. That is the end we shall keep in view, and with that assurance I trust the House will be satisfied.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he desired to say, with reference to the Question he had put on the Paper the day before, respecting the Viceroy of India, that he did not withdraw it, as had been insinuated on the other side of the House, from any fear of asking it, but because he was advised by those who were acquainted with India, that it was better not to press the Government on the subject. They were, he understood, disposed to recede so far as possible from the unfortunate position they had taken up, if not publicly pressed. The challenge of the Prime Minister, the day before, as to the facts stated in his (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett's) Question, compelled him now to make a few observations. They would be very brief, as the House was anxious to rise for the Holidays. He did not wish to criticize what the Prime Minister said in defence of the Viceroy; but he believed the present state of India was graver and more serious than it had been since the Mutiny. The introduction of the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill had produced exasperation between the two races such as had not been known for 20 years. There had been meetings, Petitions, and protests from the European inhabitants, in every part of India. And now a counter agitation was being fomented among the Natives. It was said to be anomalous not to give the Native magistrates certain powers; but, as a great statesman had said, if we took our stand against anomalies, the real anomaly was in our being in India at all. Let us give the people liberty and good administration; but it was perfectly impossible and ridiculous, so long as we retained our hold on India, to give Native races full equality. This Bill was one affecting 250,000,000 of people, the commerce of India, and hundreds of thousands of Englishmen. Why, the loss of India would represent a deduction of 5*s.* or, perhaps, even 10*s.* from the wages of every able-bodied working man in the country. He charged the responsibility for this against Lord Ripon, the present Viceroy. Lord Ripon was an amiable and well-intentioned official, but he was a crotcheteer, a sentimentalist, and a pseudo-humanitarian. It was, he maintained, quite true that the Viceroy had been publicly slighted. He had several letters from India to prove it, and these he would adduce when he got authority to quote them. Moreover, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, who opposed the Bill, had been everywhere fêted, in marked contrast to the reception of the Viceroy. It might be that Lord Ripon was about to come home, and that the extravagant eulogy of the Prime Minister was meant to cover his retreat with some show of public appreciation. He only hoped that was so, and he would not grudge the Viceroy such praises. Indeed, he would suggest that, as the present Advisers of Her Majesty made Lord Ripon a Marquess for one of the most unfortunate transactions in English diplomacy, the Alabama Negotiations, some 16 years ago, so they should now recall him from India at once, and reward his conduct there by bestowing upon him the honour of a Dukedom.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I have no right to address the House again; but with its permission, I wish to say a word or two in reply to a speech of the nature of that which we have just heard with respect to a man like Lord Ripon serving his country in a most arduous Office. I do think, Sir, that both sides of the House will agree with me when I say this—that nothing can be more clear than the title of Members of this House to bring charges and accusations against all the persons employed in the service of the Crown; and so far am I from thinking that the eminent position occupied by Lord Ripon exempts him from the application of that rule, that I think, on the contrary, the higher the position the more necessary it is that the freedom of this House and the Members of this House to canvass their conduct should be maintained without limit or stint. But there is a correlative consideration, and that is that in proportion to the gravity of the circumstances there should be care and conscientiousness, and the production of evidence of a trustworthy kind on which these charges are made. [Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I have not had time.] The hon. Member says he has not had time; but if he has not had the time to obtain evidence, then he ought not to make these charges. I do not know that in this case there will be any very great disadvantage to anyone, for I cannot pretend to express the apprehension that Lord Ripon will suffer in the estimation of any man from what has just been said. The hon. Gentleman said that Lord Ripon was made a Marquess for the conclusion of a most unfortunate negotiation. I am not going to open a chapter which would require time which is not now at our command; but Lord Ripon was not the only person concerned in that negotiation; and when I refer to the participation of other men in it I do so, not for the purpose of casting the burden upon them, but simply of doing them honour for a most patriotic course in bringing about a result with respect to which we, who were the Advisers of the Crown, undoubtedly had the full and ultimate responsibility. But Lord Ripon, according to the hon. Gentleman, is a crotcheteer, a sentimentalist, and an ultra-humanitarian. [Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: A pseudo-humanitarian.] A pseudo-humanitarian! I am sorry that the artistic touches of the hon. Member should be so marred and blurred when his picture comes to be manipulated by a person like myself. He says Lord Ripon is a pseudo-humanitarian, a crotcheteer, and a sentimentalist; but, unless I am very much mistaken, I am accustomed to hear language of this kind applied to every Member who sits on this side of the House. What are we all who sit on this side of the House but a set of crotcheteers, sentimentalists, and pseudo-humanitarians? If that be so, I think the hon. Member will see that his time and his breath are wasted in making an appeal to us, because we are absolutely disabled, by internal defects, from appreciating the truth and justice of the charges brought by the hon. Gentleman. Why, Sir, so far from being able to discuss even the first elements of the truth in this matter, we rather believe that Lord Ripon is both a just and a wise man, that Lord Ripon, in the course of a public career which has now reached not very far short of 40 years, has more and more approved himself to the judgment of his Sovereign and his country; that no part of the career of Lord Ripon has been more honourable or more beneficial than the three years which he has spent in India; and that, if the time be approaching—and I know nothing specifically of the approach of Lord Ripon's return—if, unfortunately, according to the tenure of Office, or according to the necessity of health, to be considered particularly in regard to a man of advanced years, the time be approaching when Lord Ripon will have to make over to some as worthy, but not worthier, person the high Office he holds, I believe he will come back to be held in honour among the people of this country, and I believe that he as much as any Viceroy that ever lived has written his name upon the hearts of the people of India.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, he would not detain the House more than a minute; but after the elaborate eulogy which the right hon. Gentleman had passed upon Lord Ripon's Administration, he felt bound to say, with a full sense of responsibility, that there never was a more foolish or ill-advised measure introduced by the Government of India than that denounced by the hon. Member for Eye. It had done what every prudent statesman had been careful to avert; it had brought about a conflict and antagonism between the White man and the Black man. He only wished to enter his protest against the concluding words of the Prime Minister's eulogy of Lord Ripon, for he was perfectly convinced that the Indian Government and the Government at home would have the greatest difficulty in extricating themselves from the dilemma in which they had been placed.

MR. O'DONNELL praised Lord Ripon's Administration, and referred to the Indo-European Press as ridiculing the pretended danger from the Ilbert Bill. He knew as much about India as either the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex (Lord George Hamilton) or the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), and he utterly repudiated as unfounded the statement that Lord Ripon had been slighted by the European population of India. On the contrary, the Government House was never more popular than at present.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he desired to express his concurrence in the eulogy passed by the Prime Minister upon the conduct of Lord Ripon in India. He was not one of those who were enthusiastic about Lord Ripon when he went out to India; but he knew something about India, and he had been a careful observer of what had been going on, and he wished just to say that Lord Ripon had gained not only his admiration but the admiration of many others who had watched the noble Lord's career in India.

Question put and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at five minutes
before Seven o'clock, till
Monday, 21st May.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 21*st* *May,* 1883.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I.— PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.—Votes 6 to 14.

PUBLIC BILLS – *Second Reading*—Gas and Water Provisional Orders* [165]; Local Government (Gas) Provisional Orders* [164]; Water Provisional Orders* [166]; Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) [171].

Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee on Canals—Canal Boats Act (1877) Amendment [139].

Considered as amended—Customs and Inland Revenue* [140].

Third Reading—Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Fraserburgh Waterworks)* [2], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION — APPLICATIONS UNDER THE ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. SEXTON) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has observed that practically the whole of the applications to the Irish Land Commission under the Arrears Act had been lodged before the 31st December 1882, the number of applications received up to that date having been 45,703 joint and 40,382 separate, whilst the number of additional applications up to the 31st of March, the date of the latest available return, was only 136 joint and 55 separate; whether, notwithstanding the length of time that has elapsed since the applications practically ceased, there still remained at the date of the last return an enormous arrear of business, there being yet about 50,000 holdings to be investigated, the orders for payment reaching only to three-eighths of the estimated amount involved in the applications, and the amount actually paid £122,224, being only about one-seventh of the estimated amount involved, £808,502; whether he has observed a Note to the Return of Applications up to the 30th November last, from which it appears that 14,271 of separate applications had then been investigated by the proper official persons, and how it happened that four months later, namely, on the 31st of March, orders for payment had only been made in 6,392 of these separate applications (and payments made in less than half as many), leaving 53,062 holdings the subject of joint applications, and 34,045 holdings the subject of separate applications, still remaining to be dealt with by the Commission; and, whether anything can be done to expedite the discharge of the arrears, and by what date the Commission expect to be able to bring to a close their business under the Arrears Act?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, it is the case that the great bulk of the applications were received before the end of last year. The hon. Member for Longford is, however, mistaken in referring to the March Return as the latest available in connection with this subject. The Return for April was laid on the Table of this House on the 7th of May, and shows a substantial rate of progress, which, I understand from the Land Commissioners, has been sustained during the present month. As far as I can learn, up to the 12th of this month, orders for payment have actually been made in upwards of 85,000 cases, or nearly two-thirds of the whole number to be disposed of. Three hundred and eighty-four thousand pounds had been paid on the 12th of May; and payments are being made at the rate of £10,000 a-day; which is, surely, a fair rate of progress. The Commissioners anticipate that by the end of next month almost all the applications will have been dealt with; but they cannot, at present, fix a date upon which they will be able to bring their business to a close.

STATE OF IRELAND — DECREASE OF CRIME — WITHDRAWAL OF EXTRA POLICE.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. Sexton) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has examined, during the Recess, the recent official Returns of exceptional crime in Ireland, and whether he has observed that, in the month of February, there were fifteen Irish counties from which no crime was reported, eight from which only one crime was reported, five from which only two crimes were reported, and but four counties from which crimes exceeding two in number were reported; whilst in the whole month, from all Ireland, there was reported but one offence against the person, an assault; whether, in the month of March, there were five counties from which no crime was reported, ten counties from which only one crime was reported, eight counties from which only two crimes were reported, and but nine counties from which more than two crimes were reported; whilst in the whole month, from all Ireland, there were reported but two offences against the person, namely, assaults, and no more serious crime; whether this general freedom from grave criminality has continued through the month of April; and, whether, in view of three continuous months of such experience, the Irish Government will now proceed to relieve the people from the burden of the cost of extra police; and, to ask this question particularly with regard to the county of Sligo, where, in the month of February, no offence of any kind was reported, and, in the month of March, no offence against the person or against property?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the hon. Member for Longford is not quite accurate in his quotations of figures. There are one or two important discrepancies between his estimate of the case and that shown in the official Returns. The hon. Member has correctly stated, however, that the Returns up to last month showed a very gratifying diminution of agrarian crime. The Government is very anxious not to continue the presence of additional police under the Prevention of Crime Act any longer than may be necessary for the preservation of the peace. The matter is constantly kept in view; and, up to this time, 26 proclamations have been revoked, 10 of which have been revoked quite recently, out of a total of 70. Moreover, during the Recess special inquiries have been made by Circular, with a view of enabling the authorities to find out whether further proclamations may be withdrawn. In considering this matter, it is necessary to remember that the actual cessation of outrage, as recorded in the Returns, is not always conclusive proof that a district is in a satisfactory state. In many places "Boycotting" still prevails, and persons whose lives are threatened are under police protection, so that there is reasonable apprehension of further outrage should the police be withdrawn. These circumstances do not appear in the outrage Returns. In the case of the county of Sligo, to which the hon. Member specially referred, two districts only were proclaimed under the Prevention of Crime Act as requiring additional police, and one of those, which was issued in August last, will be withdrawn at once, the proclamation having been revoked that day. In the other, the proclamation was issued in January last, in consequence of the commission of serious offences—firing at a constable and house attacks—and the apprehension of further outrage of the same kind, owing to the existence of secret societies. In this district it has not been deemed prudent, as yet, to remove the additional police.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN asked for the name of the district in which the proclamation had been revoked?

MR. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, the official name of the district was Ardglyn, and the district in which the proclamation remained in force was Ballyglass.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—SPECIAL RESIDENT MAGISTRATES AND THE CONSTABULARY.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. SEXTON) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following passage in the Report of the Committee of Inquiry on the Irish Constabulary:—

> "Complaints were made with evident reserve by many of the men that the authority exercised by the special resident magistrates was calculated to harass and disorganise the Force. . . . The officials we refer to are unconnected with the Force, and have no direct responsibility for its discipline. They do not, and, owing to the division of authority, cannot, set it in motion with perfect economy of the men's strength and of money;"

what is the annual cost of the special resident magistrates, and their attendant functionaries; and, whether the Government still think it necessary or expedient to maintain this extraordinary class of officials; and, if so, for what probable period?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, it is not the intention of the Government to continue the system of special resident magistrates longer than is absolutely necessary. Those officers have rendered good, indeed invaluable, service during the disturbed state of the country; but it is hoped by the Government that, by strengthening the local police administration, it will be possible to dispense with their services shortly. The proposed changes will require the sanction of Parliament, and a Bill for the purpose has been prepared and will shortly be introduced, and the Government hope to carry it this Session. It would not be possible to dispense with the special resident magistrates, unless the services they perform are supplied by special legislation. The extra cost occasioned by the special resident magistrates system, up to the present, amounts to about £9,700 a-year.

POOR LAW ELECTIONS (IRELAND).

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (for Mr. MAYNE) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in the "Munster Express" of April 14th, to the effect that John Kirwan, under agent to the Marquess of Waterford, accompanied the policeman who distributed the voting papers at the late Poor Law elections to the tenants of his Lordship, and insisted upon them signing their voting papers in his presence, in favour of the candidate approved by his Lordship, under threat of having the hanging gale on their holdings demanded should they not comply; and, whether this conduct constitutes an offence under the Crimes Act; and, if so, whether he will take steps to punish such conduct, and have the election voided at which it was practised?

MR. PLUNKET said, that before the right hon. Gentleman answered the Question, he (Mr. Plunket) wished to ask him a Question of which he had given him private Notice. It was, Whether it is a fact that in the Poor Law Union of Portlaw, in the county Waterford, previous to the late election for Poor Law Guardians, the parish priest directed the voters not to sign their voting papers until he was present in person; and whether, afterwards, the same rev. gentleman went round with the Land League candidate, and, in one instance, so intimidated a voter as to cause him to destroy his voting paper, because he had voted against the Land League candidate; also, whether the curate of the adjoining parish of Clonea visited the voters before the papers were distributed and directed them to come down to the chapel-yard and sign them there?

MR. O'DONNELL said, he wished to ask, Whether the presence of the Catholic clergymen in these cases was not necessary to prevent the agents of the landlords from tampering with the voters?

MR. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, he had made careful inquiries into the case of Mr. Kirwan, and he was informed that the allegations in the Question were wholly without foundation. The circumstance which gave rise to the allegations was that Mr. Kirwan went with the police to two houses at which voting papers had been left according to law. The voting papers belonged to Lord Waterford, and he went for them. With that exception, he did not call upon any voters in the manner described. With regard to the Question of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket), he had received a report from the Special Resident Magistrate which practically bore out the suggestions made in the Question with respect to the conduct of the priests named. With regard to the practical part of the Question, he might say, what he had often said before—that the Government did not, on either side, intend to put the Prevention of Crime Act in force with reference to any matters that occurred at the recent Poor Law elections.

STATE OF IRELAND—EXTRA POLICE (TIPPERARY).

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (for Mr. MAYNE) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that no crime or outrage has been committed in the townlands of Kilnaseer, Penayne, Mardyke, and Gorthrea, in Loughmore East, county Tipperary, since January 1882; whether the inhabitants of this district petitioned the Lord Lieutenant to revoke his proclamation imposing extra police on the district, with the result that the police were withdrawn soon afterwards; whether the amount levied subsequently of £57 17*s.* 2*d.* liquidates all charges for these extra police to the date of their removal; whether the police have, within the last few days, posted a proclamation levying another tax for extra police on this district; and, whether he will state why this new tax has been imposed on a district in which no crime or outrage has been committed for a period of sixteen months?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, no outrage occurred in the particular townlands named, which, however, form part of a district proclaimed in consequence of the murder of William Hickey in September last, in an adjoining townland. The Lord Lieutenant was petitioned to withdraw the extra police, and, in consequence of the representations made, and the improved state of the district, His Excellency suspended the proclamation, and the police were withdrawn on the 17th of March. The amount levied includes all charges up to that date. The hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) has been misinformed as to any fresh proclamation imposing a further tax having been posted up or issued.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE PHŒNIX PARK MURDERS—PATRICK DELANEY.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any undertaking or understanding was come to with Patrick Delaney, one of the murderers of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, that his life should be spared in consideration of his pleading guilty; whether any intimation was conveyed to any official of the Crown that he would or could make a statement incriminating Timothy Kelly, in whose case two juries had previously disagreed; and, what was the object of producing in court, during the third trial of Kelly, this man Delaney?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER): Sir, I have been asked to answer this Question for my right hon. Friend. There is no foundation whatever for the offensive insinuations contained in it. Patrick Delaney, who recently pleaded guilty to the charge of murder, had practically admitted his guilt before the magistrates; and, after his committal, he repeatedly volunteeered full and detailed statements of all the particulars of the crime, including the part taken in it by Kelly as well as the others, and expressed over and over again his determination to plead guilty, whatever came of it. So far from being induced to take that course, he was warned that he had nothing to look for, and was advised to take his trial. A distinct intimation to that effect was conveyed to his solicitor, who stated in Court that he had given this advice to his client. No undertaking whatever was entered into that his life would be spared. The statement made in Court by him, after pleading guilty, came wholly from himself, and the officials of the Crown were not aware that he intended making it. Delaney was brought into Court to be identified.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he wished to know, whether it was a fact that although Delaney was told he could expect nothing, yet his sentence of death was commuted?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER): I am not in a position to say whether that is so or not.

MR. HARRINGTON said, he would ask whether it was not true that, after two juries had disagreed in the case of Timothy Kelly, Patrick Delaney was brought on the table to be identified by a witness who was in the Park at the time of the murder?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER), in reply, said, he had already stated that he was produced in Court for the purpose of identification, but the witness failed to identify him.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, CO. LEITRIM.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. McGivern, police pensioner and agent of Colonel Tottenham, at the last Poor Law election in county Leitrim, said to Bartle M'Morrow, who refused to vote for Maguire, the favoured candidate of Colonel Tottenham, "I will be revenged on you for that;" whether Mr. McGivern also threatened a man named Meehan, of Lacoon, that he would process him for £10 for cutting a tree in his garden if he did not vote for Maguire; whether, if above statements are true, the Government will prosecute him for intimidation; and, whether by such conduct he has forfeited his pension?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, Bartle M'Morrow alleges that M'Givern threatened him, as stated, and M'Givern denies having done so. There is no corroboration; and I am informed that there is no evidence which would sustain a charge of intimidation against M'Givern. As regards the case of Meehan, it appears that M'Givern did say something to him about processing him for cutting down a tree, but not that he would do so if he did not vote a particular way. Meehan himself states that M'Givern used no threat against him in connection with the election. M'Givern has not forfeited his pension.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—CAVAN.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he could explain the reason the Sub-Commissioners for the county of Cavan have not disposed of the cases in Drumcrow Colesmore, for which originating notices were served eighteen months ago, while cases entered at the same time have been decided many months ago by the county court judge?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, I am informed that the reason is the much greater pressure of business in the Court of the Sub-Commission than in the Civil Bill Court, there having been entered in the Sub-Commissioners' Court from the Union of Cavan 578 cases, while in the Civil Bill Court the number was only 100.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—MAIL SERVICE IN CO. SLIGO.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, If he is aware that the morning mails are not delivered in Blacklion until 10.25 a.m.; that before the Sligo Railway was opened they arrived at 8.30 a.m.; that a memorial was sent some months since asking a return to the old arrangement; that memorialists were informed that there was not a sufficient circulation of letters to warrant a change; that Florence Court Post Office, with not one-fourth the circulation, has been within the last month supplied by a special messenger at extra cost to the Postal Department, said messenger leaving Enniskillen at 6 o'clock a.m. and arriving at Florence Court at 9 a.m.; and, will he give the same postal facilities to Blacklion, Letterbreen, Glenfarne, and several other post offices in the same neighbourhood?

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, it is the case that the mail bags now reach Blacklion at 10.25 a.m., whereas, formerly, they arrived at 8.30 a.m.; and the later arrival has resulted from an alteration in the working of the morning train from Enniskillen, which has taken place since the mail bags were placed upon the railway. It is also the case that Florence Court is supplied by a letter carrier from Enniskillen, arriving at 9 a.m., put on in consequence of the train becoming unsuitable for the purposes of an earlier delivery. I will consider, however, whether a better mail service cannot be introduced; and if I find upon inquiry that there is no likelihood of the train running at an hour more convenient than at present, I will consider whether a road service can be reverted to for the mails of the district generally. I may remark that the use of the railway has not been without advantage, as it has admitted of a day mail being afforded to Blacklion and other places.

IRELAND—INFLAMMATORY LANGUAGE—THE REV. CHARLES FLYNN.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that on Sunday, April 22nd, the Rev. Charles Flynn, R. C. curate of the parish of Clooclare, county Leitrim, addressed the congregation in the chapel at Kiltyclogher, on the subject of payment of rents, and used the following words, inter alia :—

> "I have been begging for you and doing all I could for you for the past two or three years, and now I find that you are settling with and paying rents to people who have no mercy, and had you refrained from paying rents the property would have been in the courts before now ;"

and what action the Government propose to take in the matter?

MR. TREVELYAN : Sir, I am informed that the Rev. Mr. Flynn's words are very inaccurately quoted in the passage contained in this Question. I have taken great pains to obtain every information that can be got on the subject; and, in addition to the report I have received, the constable who was actually present in the chapel, and who has been removed to another part of Ireland, has been communicated with, and has given his recollection of what was said, which certainly, in substance, is very different from that quoted in the Question. The statement made by the rev. gentleman was of quite a different tendency and character.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, KILDYSART.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. SEXTON) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in the late election of a guardian of the poor for the electoral division of Renealon, in the union of Kildysart, Mr. Green, Lord Leconfield's estate bailiff, went about among the voters who were tenants of Lord Leconfield, and told them before the election that, if they did not destroy the voting papers which they had filled up in favour of the popular candidate, they would be processed for the price of flour which he had given them as a gift in 1879; whether any voting papers were destroyed in consequence of this threat; whether Mr. Power, the candidate favoured by Mr. Green, was returned by a majority of two; and, whether notice will be taken of the conduct of Mr. Green, and a new election ordered?

MR. TREVELYAN : Sir, I am informed that Mr. Green canvassed for Mr. Power, but that no threats of any kind were used, and that he told the electors whose votes he sought that he asked for them as a friend of theirs and a friend of the candidates, and that he was not authorized by Lord Leconfield or his agents to make the canvass. Eleven voting papers were destroyed. That was not done in consequence of any threat, but under the following circumstances:—One woman had filled her paper in favour of Mr. Kelly, the other candidate, but on being asked by Mr. Green to vote for Power, she destroyed the paper. Her son emphatically denies that any threat was used. Another voter destroyed his paper, because he had not filled it up when the police called for it. Mr. Power was returned by a majority of two. There does not appear to be any ground for taking any notice of Mr. Green's action in the matter.

IRISH BANKRUPT AND INSOLVENT ACT, 1857—TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can state or would furnish a Return showing what money was transferred from the General Fund Account in the Bank of Ireland to the Unclaimed Dividend Account, pursuant to Section 294 of "The Irish Bankrupt and Insolvent Act, 1857;" what moneys have since been paid into the Unclaimed Dividend Account, and how all the moneys paid into such Account have been invested, and how the interest has been applied, pursuant to Sections 295 and 296 of the same Act; and, what money is now lying to the credit of the Unclaimed Dividend Account, and how the same is invested?

MR. TREVELYAN : Sir, this is not a matter which is under the control of the Irish Executive; but I have made inquiry on the subject, and have been furnished with particulars by the Chief Registrar of the Bankruptcy Court. The details asked for could not be conveniently given in answer to a Question, but I see no objection to their being given in the form of a Return if the hon. Member chooses to move for it.

INDIA—THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, CALCUTTA—MISLEADING TELEGRAM.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, I have given private Notice to the Under Secretary of State for India of a Question which I wish to put to him, but which, if he is not able to answer it now, or prefers a longer Notice, I will put next week. Before putting it, I will explain the object I have in asking the Question. Some time ago there appeared in the Press of this country a telegraphic statement, purporting to come through Reuter's agency, and to be a summary of a debate which took place in the Calcutta Legislature on the Bill now known as Mr. Ilbert's Bill. It was supposed at the time that it was a private communication forwarded by Mr. Reuter; but the Indian papers which have come to this country recently, seem to show or assert that the telegram was forwarded by the Government of India, that the expenses of transmission were defrayed by the Government of India, and that the communication had an authoritative character, though, according to comparisons with the later accounts of the debate, it was not a fair or an accurate summary. I wish to ask, therefore, Whether the telegraphic account of the proceedings was authorized, and if its transmission was directed by the Government of India; whether the expense was defrayed out of the revenues of the Government of India; and, whether, if it was so authorized, there will be any objection to lay it on the Table of the House, so that it can be compared with the fuller reports which have since been received and published on the subject?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, we have not received any communication from the Government of India on the subject of the right hon. Gentleman's Question, and I cannot therefore answer the Question as to whether the cost of the telegram was defrayed by the Government of India; but if the right hon. Gentleman will repeat the Question during the week, I shall be glad to answer it.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I will repeat the Question on Monday.

ARMY (INDIA)—EUROPEAN SOLDIERS AT BARRACKPUR.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If it is true that the conduct of the European soldiers at Barrackpur has been the subject of serious complaints by the Native population; whether a Petition has been presented to the commanding officer from the inhabitants of Barrackpur, stating that—

> "Unless some stringent measures are at once taken, the honour, the property, and, above all, the caste of the Native population are threatened with imminent danger;"

whether numerous allegations of assaults and insults to Native men and women are stated in support of the Petition; whether a letter has been addressed by the Native inhabitants of Barrackpur to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, declaring that the Petitioners—

> "Are the victims of the lawlessness of soldiers who have apparently set law and discipline at defiance;"

and, whether steps have been taken to establish an impartial investigation into the facts?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, nothing beyond a newspaper report has reached the India Office on this subject. That report says that the circumstances alleged have been brought to the notice of the officer commanding the troops at Barrackpur. Doubtless, if that is the case, or if any representation is made to the Government of Bengal, the matter will be thoroughly investigated.

INDIA (BENGAL)—THE RYOTS OF MEHERPUR.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is true that a Petition has been presented to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, from the Ryots of Mehurpur, in the district of Nuddea, complaining of the continued exactions, oppression, and extortion practised by indigo planters upon the native cultivators in order to force them to grow indigo for the factories; and, whether it is proposed to introduce any amendment in the Law upon the subject?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, the proceedings of the Government of Bengal have been searched, and no mention of the Petition referred to by the hon. Gentleman can be traced. The Bengal Rent Law, which is at present under the consideration of the Government of India, will deal with the relations of ryots and superior holders.

INDIA—THE MADRAS CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. GIBSON asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether, in the matter of the Madras Civil Service grievances, and with reference to the concessions granted last year by the Secretary of State for India, in order partially to relieve the block of promotion in the Service, the Madras Government, upon finding that those concessions had not had the desired effect, owing to the limited scope given to them, some time ago recommended certain extensions of them to the Government of India; whether, if the Government of India have not yet forwarded the recommendations made for the consideration and orders of the Secretary of State, they may be required to do so without further delay; and, whether, in the same matter, it is true that the Government of India have, of their own motion, in order to carry out a system of grading not yet approved by the Secretary of State in Council, readjusted the emoluments of certain high executive appointments in the Madras Presidency; and, if so, whether he will cancel, with retrospective effect, the changes brought about, as being made without his sanction, and as aggravating the grievances complained of?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, it appears from the proceedings of the Government of Madras, that last January, they made recommendations of the nature referred to in the first part of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's Question. No despatch on the subject, however, has yet been received from the Viceroy, who, no doubt, is considering the matter before addressing the Secretary of State on the subject. The latter portion of the Question relates, I presume, to a system of grading, such as prevails in the other Presidencies. This has been the subject of correspondence between the Governments of Madras and Bombay, and must be submitted for the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council before it can be carried out. I may add that the system of grading has already, so far as the general principle is concerned, been approved by the Secretary of State in Council, subject to obtaining the matured opinion of the Government of Madras upon it.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS — PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND YOUNG PERSONS—LEGISLATION.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When it was intended to bring in the measures in substitution for the Contagious Diseases Acts, and the Bill for the protection of young girls?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that in the absence of his noble Friend the Secretary of State for War, he could not state when the measures in substitution for the Contagious Diseases Acts would be brought in. It was expected that the Bill for the protection of young girls would be introduced in the House of Lords next week.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES BILL).

Mr. GORST asked, Whether there was any truth in the statement which had appeared in one of the public journals that morning, that it was the intention of the Government to abandon the Corrupt Practices Bill?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that the statement in question had not reached him, nor had he read it in any of the journals. He very often read statements which did not turn out to be accurate.

Mr. GORST: But this is a journal supposed to be particularly in the confidence of the Government — namely, *The Standard*.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—MILITIA UNIFORMS.

Mr. BELLINGHAM asked, Whether, in the event of any Militia regiments being obliged to make any change in their uniform, the propriety of giving some compensation to the officers of such regiments, for the expenses to which they might be put, will be taken into consideration?

Mr. BRAND: Sir, there is no present intention of making any changes in the uniform of the Militia, other than those prescribed in 1881. Where those changes have still to be made, an allowance of £25 is granted in aid of the cost of the new uniform, if the alteration is of a complete character

LAW AND JUSTICE (INDIA)—TREATMENT OF EUROPEANS AND NATIVES.

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If his attention has been called to the fact that, in a recent prosecution against the European proprietor and a Native captain of a Bombay line of coasting steamers for alleged breach of the Passenger Acts, both the European proprietor and the Native captain were sentenced to fines by the magistrate; whether the European proprietor made use of his right of appeal as a European to procure a rehearing of the case in a higher court, with the result that it was decided that no breach of the Passenger Acts had been committed, and that his fine must be remitted; whether the Native captain, because he was not a European, had no right of appeal, and cannot have his fine remitted; and, whether Government intends to maintain the privilege of appeal for some of Her Majesty's subjects and to refuse it to others solely on the ground of difference of race?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Sir, I have not seen any report of the case referred to in the Question, and can, therefore, form no opinion as to the rights of the parties. But, supposing such a case to have occurred, if the Native had been as little liable to conviction as the European, the High Court would, as a matter of course, exercise its powers of a Court of Revision, and would, of its own motion, deal with the Native as it had dealt with the European. No alteration of the law, in the direction indicated by the hon. Member, is at present contemplated.

INDIA—THE SALEM RIOTS—MR. MACLEAN.

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that Mr. Maclean, collector, of Salem, has been publicly accused of not being on circuit duty during the Salem riots when he represented himself to be so engaged as an excuse for absence from the scene of disturbance; and, what steps Government intend to take in the matter?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Sir, statements to the effect indicated in the hon. Member's Question have appeared in one or two of the Indian newspapers. No official information on the subject has been received by the India Office; but the Government of Madras will, no doubt, take any action in the matter that may appear to them necessary.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—MR. HEALY, M.P., MR. DAVITT, AND MR. QUINN, PRISONERS IN RICHMOND GAOL.

MR. LALOR begged to asked the the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that Mr. Healy, M.P. for Wexford, Mr. Michael Davitt, and Mr. Quinn, at present confined in Richmond Gaol, have been deprived of the usual privilege of receiving visitors, because of Mr. Healy's having published a letter in reference to the Pope's Circular on Friday last; and, if it is true, whether, for the future, it is to be considered a punishable offence to make any remark in regard to the justice or injustice of the Pope's interference in Irish affairs?

MR. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, he could not complain of the hon. Member not giving him a longer Notice, as he had had no opportunity of doing so; but the consequence had been that he (Mr. Trevelyan) had not been able to refer to Dublin upon the matter. Therefore, he could only tell the hon. Member what was within his own personal knowledge. Mr. Healy and Mr. Davitt sent their letters open with cheques, and with a request that, after having been perused, they might be forwarded to the newspapers. The letters were sent open to be read, according to the rules, and they were read. In fact, he saw and read them himself. They were afterwards, it being rather late, posted by the Under Secretary, so that he could hardly think that Mr. Davitt and Mr. Healy should be subjected to any punishment, seeing that they had taken great pains to conform to the prison rules.

MR. LALOR said, that as information had reached him to the effect he had already stated, he should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman would make inquiries as to whether there was any truth in the report.

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, it was possible that something might have happened, which had come to the hon. Member's ears; but he (Mr. Trevelyan) had stated all he knew personally on the subject. However, he would make inquiries to-day, and would take care to ascertain if the case was as he represented; and he would take care, if he found it to be correct, that the prisoners would be relieved from the inconveniences complained of.

Mr. LALOR intimated that he would ask the right hon. Gentleman for the result of the inquiries on Thursday.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE ADJUTANT OF THE ANTRIM MILITIA.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that, since appointment of Adjutant of Antrim Artillery, the Commanding Officer has been in the habit of incorrectly certifying that the Adjutant kept a horse, thereby enabling him to draw forage allowance; and, whether it is a fact that it is only within the last few weeks that this Officer has been in temporary possession of a horse?

Mr. BRAND, in reply, said, he had been requested by his noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) to state that as these matters related to questions of discipline, they were now being inquired into; and he would ask the hon. Member for that reason to postpone his Question to Thursday week.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that he would do so.

SUPPLY—THE ARMY ESTIMATES.

Sir HENRY FLETCHER asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance Whether he would postpone the Medical Vote No. 4 of the Army Estimates, and also the Vote relating to the Royal Hospitals of Chelsea and Kilmainham, the Report of the Committee of the Medical Commissariat Department not yet having been supplied to Members, although it had appeared in the journals?

Mr. BRAND, in reply, said, the Question was a very reasonable one, and he would undertake that the two Votes mentioned should not be taken until the Report was in the hands of Members.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he also had to complain that the whole of the Report had appeared in the newspapers, and he should like to know how it had occurred? Its appearance was a violation of the undertaking made by the Government that the Reports of Committees should not be published in the newspapers before their distribution among Members. He also wished to give Notice that in Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates, upon the Reserve Vote No. 8, he would call attention to the present state of the recruiting, the crime and waste of the Army, and their effect upon the efficiency of the Reserve; and, on Vote 11, he would call attention to the inexpediency of making any change in the colour of the uniforms of the Army; and, on Vote 19, to the compulsory retirement of purchase colonels under the Warrant of 1881.

Mr. BRAND said, an inquiry was being made into the matter of the publication; therefore, perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman would postpone his Question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

(1.) £95,000, to complete the sum for Public Offices Site.

Mr. DILLWYN, in rising to oppose the Vote, said, he thought it was one concerning which the Committee was entitled to a full explanation, and also to some assurance that economy was intended to be practised by the Government, who had not, at present, given to the House any reason to expect that such a state of things was likely to come about. Not only was a large expenditure of public money contemplated, and, for that matter, intended, in connection with the Admiralty and the War Office, but a large sum was intended to be spent at the Foreign Office in addition to what had been already expended there; and he therefore held that explanation, to a much larger extent than had been already afforded, ought to be given. A good deal had been said about the intentions of Her Majesty's Government to practise economy in reference, especially, to building operations; but no tangible evidence had yet been given of the reality of such intentions. He had, on many previous occasions, endeavoured to enforce the right of Parliament, by moving the rejection of Votes in Committee of Supply, to have, if not assurances of intention to practise enconomy, at any rate, sufficient explanations of proposals, which, to some Members of the House, savoured strongly of needless extravagance. He certainly could not think that the Government was entitled to spend so large a sum of money as was now asked for, immediately after completing the New Law Courts, at an enormous cost to the public. It, surely, was not unfair to ask for a little breathing time before starting upon any fresh undertaking of the kind. In any case, extravagance ought to be avoided, and to that end he would strongly urge upon the Government that the plans of the proposed buildings ought to be presented to Parliament, and, at any rate, an approximate idea of the total to be given before any money was voted. He strongly objected to the Government being left free to purchase sites for public buildings which were not only costly, but absolutely extravagant.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD, speaking as a Member of the Select Committee which considered the Public Offices Site Bill in 1882, was of opinion that the Estimate was one which ought to be accepted, because he believed that, in the end, economy would result from the building of the Offices on the proposed site. The proposal was, in his view, strictly consistent with economy and with the business which the two Departments had to carry on. It must not be forgotten that the site which it was now proposed to acquire would be much less costly than the one which was proposed to be bought in Great George Street, and it must not be forgotten either, that the right hon. Gentleman the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had filled the Office of First Lord of the Admiralty, and was, therefore, well acquainted with the Admiralty buildings, had given evidence before the Select Committee, to which he (Mr. Arnold) had referred, that a more wasteful building than the present Admiralty could not be conceived. He could not understand on what grounds it could be urged that it would not be advantageous to have the Admiralty nearer to Charing Cross, and the War Office nearer to the Horse Guards. No one, he thought, could doubt the wisdom of concentrating the Offices of the Government Departments; and, as this was a step in that direction, which was, in his view, at the same time, wise, economical, and beneficent, he hoped the Committee would accept it.

CAPTAIN PRICE, speaking in the interests of the Navy, supported the opposition given to the Vote by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). Whether it was, or was not, that the financial condition of the country was in so deplorable a state that it could not maintain an efficient Navy, he said nothing; but he certainly thought that the Government were not entitled to ask for so large a sum of money in order to erect new Admiralty Offices. To do that, would be to put the cart before the horse. What was wanted was a new Navy—a Navy strong enough to do the work which might be required of it. He quite admitted that there were certain inconveniences connected with the present Offices, both of the Army and the Navy; but he maintained that, before the additional money was spent in building more palaces, the Navy ought to be put into a satisfactory condition. The Government were going to spend a large sum of public money in carrying the effigy of the late Duke of Wellington from the other side of the Park, and they also proposed to incur a large expenditure in making new and unnecessary Offices for a Navy which was not efficient, instead of spending the money upon the Navy itself.

MR. BROADHURST said, he regretted that he could not support his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) in opposing the Vote. His hon. Friend did not oppose the Vote on the ground that anything like jobbery was contemplated by its means, but simply because he was opposed altogether to any further spending of public money at the present time on public buildings. The hon. and gallant Member opposite (Captain Price) was going to support the opposition to the Vote on an almost exactly opposite ground. He (Mr. Broadhurst) was unable to agree with either Gentleman. The money was proposed to be expended, not in the purchase of additional guns, as the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport seemed to desire, but in the erection of a suitable building for the transaction of the business of an important Department of the Government, which his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) seemed to deprecate. As it seemed to him (Mr. Broadhurst) the proposal was a very wise and just one, and if the erection of new public buildings was to be undertaken, he did not know that any time was likely to arrive more appropriate than the present. There was a great scarcity of work, and many men who would find employment in the erection of these buildings had been walking about for the last six months without being able to find any work to do. He hoped that, under no circumstances, would the contracts for the buildings be let out at prices which would have such disastrous results and altogether unsatisfactory work, unsatisfactory alike to the workmen themselves and the public whom they served.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that the Site of the Admiralty and War Office question had gone through what he might call a pilgrimage of Select Committees in recent years, and he was sorry to say that he had been engaged on some of them. He would venture to suggest to the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport that he should read a Report of a Select Committee which was appointed on the Motion of Mr. Baillie Cochrane, now Lord Lamington, in the last Parliament, if he wished to get an accurate idea of the ruinous, discreditable, and higgledy-piggledy condition of the present Offices of the Admiralty. He would learn something, too, of the then sanitary condition of the War Office, in Pall Mall, which was so atrocious as actually to have killed that gallant officer Sir James Lindsay, and to have made the Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Lord Eustace Cecil) very gravely ill. He did not say that, in his view, the proposed site was the best one that could be obtained for the new Offices. He should have preferred the Great George Street site; but he thought the proposal was a very fair compromise, and he hoped the money would be granted, and the work proceeded with.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that while he hoped the Committee would agree to the purchase of the site, as suggested by the Select Committee on the Public Offices Site Act of last year, he could not accept the proposition of the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent, that if workmen were out of work, the Government of the day ought to commence the erection of public buildings, in order to find employment for them.

Mr. BROADHURST, rising to Order, denied that he had suggested anything of the kind imputed to him by the right hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson). What he said was, that if new buildings had to be erected, it would be better to go on with them, when, as at present, there was great scarcity of employment.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was willing to accept the new and more satisfactory version of the hon. Member's statement. He had long been satisfied that it would be much better for the Public Service to concentrate the Public Offices, than to have them scattered in different parts of London and Westminster; and he thought that remark applied, with especial force, to Departments so closely connected as were the Admiralty and the War Office. He believed that the site which had been adopted would furnish the finest and, at the same time, the most economical mass of public buildings at present in existence in this country. He hoped that when his right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) was carrying out the plans for the erection of these new buildings, he would see to it that the greatest possible care was taken to avoid the architectural blunders which were committed in the erection of the most recently-erected block of public buildings in Whitehall—he referred especially to the defective drainage arrangements in the new Home Office at Whitehall.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN said, he had no doubt that both the War Office and the Admiralty were, at present, in a very insanitary condition; but he thought more definite information about the proposed purchase should be given before the Committee was asked to vote so large a sum as £100,000.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. Member for Swansea, who had moved the rejection of this Vote, seemed to have forgotten what took place in the House last year, when the whole question was considered in connection with the Public Offices Site Act. As far as he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) remembered, there was not, at that time, any opposition to the Bill from any quarter of the House. In the course of the discussion last year, he explained the matter fully, and showed that, while the site now proposed would only involve an outlay of £160,000, the site in Great George Street would not cost less than £1,300,000. It was therefore thought that, in an economical as well as an artistic point of view, the site which had now been determined upon was much preferable. The measure was referred to a Select Committee, and for reasons which the majority of the Committee thought adequate, they approved of the Bill. The conclusions at which they arrived received a general chorus of approval when the measure came before the House for a third reading, and the House was committed, at all events, to the acquisition of that site. In the course of the winter, after the Act became law, he was advised by the professional advisers of the Department and by Sir Henry Hunt that it was desirable at once to give notice to the freeholders that it was the intention of the Government to take the site. The object was to prevent the freeholders from making arrangements with their tenants which might enhance the value of the property if delay occurred. Acting in accordance with that advice, he had given notice to the freeholders of the Government's intention to take the property, and the result was that the Government were now under a legal liability to take it. He believed if that course had not been taken, and the purchase of the property had been delayed, the Government would have been involved in the end in a very much larger expenditure of money. He had reason to know that his action in the matter had already saved the Government several thousands of pounds. If the Committee rejected the Vote it would not be possible to get out of the bargain which had been made; and it was his firm belief that the Government would eventually be involved in a very much larger expenditure than was now contemplated for the purchase of the very same property. The Government proposed to make provision for the purchase of the freehold; and it was calculated that the purchase of the freehold interest of the property would involve an expenditure of about £100,000. That was the sum which the Committee was asked to vote now. Next year the Government would ask for power to purchase the leasehold interest of the property, which would involve a farther expenditure of about £65,000; and that, as far as was at present calculated, would be the whole sum in the shape of purchase money required for the site. Then came the question of the building. He proposed very shortly to invite a competition of the architects of the country for erecting the new War Office and Admiralty. That would take some months; and after the competition was completed and the designs were selected, some more months would be occupied in arranging as to working drawings, &c. Then would come the competition of the contractors; and before any money was spent in actual building a considerable time must elapse. It was his belief that, even next year, it would not be necessary to ask the House to vote any money for the buildings. If matters proceeded as they were likely to proceed, it was not until the year after next that they would be asked to vote any large sum of money. No Vote would be taken for building purposes until the whole of the designs had been submitted and the House had had an ample opportunity for discussing them. It was calculated that the total cost of the buildings for the new Admiralty and the War Office would be about £600,000. ["Oh!"] Some hon. Members seemed to be surprised; but it must be borne in mind that the War Office employed something like 900 persons, and the Admiralty about 700 persons; and he should not be surprised if the cost of accommodating these two great Departments came to something like the figure he had mentioned. It would be necessary to erect these two great buildings in blocks, in order that there might not be two removals of the staff. Consequently, one block would be completed and occupied before the next block was commenced, and the work of construction would be spread over a considerable period. Indeed, he should not be surprised if it took something like 10 years to complete the building of these two great Offices. If that proved to be correct, the total annual sum necessary for the House to vote for building purposes in any one year would not exceed £60,000. Therefore, the Vote this year was probably the largest that would be asked for for some time. Next year the Vote would be £65,000, and for some years there would be an annual Vote of about £60,000 required. That did not appear to him to be a very great strain upon the finances of the country. If they were ever to have the War Office and the Admiralty under the same roof —an object which every Minister and every economist had long considered to be a desirable one—it was right that a beginning should be made with the work. The Committee of last year unanimously reported in favour of the Bill, and the House subsequently passed an Act founded on the Report of the Committee. It was to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee that this Vote was now proposed, and he thought the Committee would do well to pass the Vote. It was quite certain that if the Vote were not passed the Government, in the end, would be involved in a much larger expenditure than was now contemplated. He would venture, therefore, to conclude by saying that in the course he had taken in this matter he believed he had acted in the true interests of economy, and also in the general interests of the public, in connection with the two great Departments which were involved in the matter. It must be borne in mind that when these new buildings were completed a rental of £16,000 a-year which they were now paying for the buildings at present occupied would fall in, and in addition there could not be a doubt that there would be considerable economy of men in bringing the staffs of both of these great Departments together. The disadvantage of the arrangement by which a large part of the staff of the great Public Departments was scattered in a considerable number of private houses—he believed about 50 altogether —had long been recognized. Any person who had anything to do with the administration of the Public Departments must admit that there was a great want of economy in the way in which the staff was now spread, and it was obvious that there could be no proper and complete supervision until each staff was congregated together in one place.

Mr. GORST said, the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, and the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold), had spoken as if the House were committed by the legislation of last year to the erection of these gigantic Public Offices; but both the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Member for Salford knew very well that, as a matter of fact, the question had never been considered by the House at all. The Bill introduced last year was dealt with as a Hybrid Bill, and was smuggled through the House in the small hours of the morning, when nobody had the slightest opportunity of discussing its provisions, and everybody knew that even the present discussion was a mere formality and a sham. They were only assisting in giving effect to a foregone conclusion. There was not a single Cabinet Minister on the Treasury Bench. Where was the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Secretary of State for War? There was not a single person present upon the Treasury Bench who was in a position to explain the views of the Government in regard to a question which they were told involved the expenditure of £1,000,000. He should have thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or the Secretary to the Admiralty, or the Secretary of State for War, would have paid the House of Commons the compliment of being in his place to explain the necessity of this expenditure. He was amazed at the innocent confidence of the hon. Member for Salford, who, although having now actually had a seat in the House for four Sessions, really believed, or professed to believe, that the House of Commons would have an opportunity of considering the plans and specifications of these buildings hereafter, and would have the power of nipping in the bud any extravagance on the part of the Government. Nobody ought to know better than the hon. Member for Salford that this discussion was a complete sham as regards the public, and that if they were ever to nip these extravagances in the bud it must be done that night. That was the first and the last opportunity the House of Commons would have of protesting against this expenditure of £1,000,000, for the necessity of which not a single argument had been adduced by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works. It must also be recollected that this extravagant expenditure was about to be incurred at a time when they were loudly complaining of the inefficient condition of the Army and Navy. They had been told that the finances of the country were in so straitened a condition, and their circumstances were so difficult, that they were obliged to cut down the shipbuilding of the Navy to the lowest possible point consistent with safety. A good many persons thought they were cutting it down very much too low for safety. Probably there were hon. Members present who were in the House the other night when a debate took place upon the Navy Estimates, in the course of which the noble Lord the Member for Chichester (Lord Henry Lennox) laid before the House many remarkable facts to show that the Navy of this country was almost in a state of inferiority to that of France, and that unless great efforts were made to improve it, it would very soon be in a relative position of inferiority. To that speech no answer had as yet been given, and no answer could be given, because the statements contained in it were true; and yet the Government came down to the House of Commons at a time when the Navy was in this complexed and starved condition without the Chiefs of the great spending Departments being present to explain why such an expenditure of the public money was necessary, and asked the House to take the first step in the career of extravagance which would land them at least in the expenditure of £1,000,000. He did not know what the Committee of Supply was inclined to do in this matter. Personally, he was in favour of real economy. It was said that there would be a great saving in respect of the salaries of clerks; but it could not be pretended that that saving would amount to the interest of £1,000,000. Were the Government prepared to say that the interest of £1,000,000 would be saved in clerks' salaries by the re-organization of the staff of the Admiralty and the War Office? If they were unable to do that, what was the use of their coming down to the House and saying that this expenditure would produce economy in the Public Services? There was no Department of the State over which the House of Commons exercised less control than that of the Office of Works. The Office was surrounded by a large number of architects, surveyors, and others, who had an interest in bringing about a large expenditure of the public money, and it was a Department which did not undergo the scrutiny which all the details in connection with War Office and Admiralty expenditure underwent. In point of fact it was a Department of the State by means of which monstrous extravagance could creep in, unless it was summarily checked by the Committee of Supply in the House of Commons. If it was a real Committee of Supply, if they had the power they were supposed to have of stopping this expenditure, he would appeal to the Committee to nip the extravagance now contemplated in the bud. At all events, let them put the Vote off for a year, so that the Government might have an opportunity of revising their plans, and seeing what amount of saving they could effect. They would then be able to come down with more information and detail to justify the House of Commons in assenting to their proposals. They all knew that, at the present moment, they were engaged in a mere empty performance. In point of fact, they were assisting the Government in enacting a play that was simply intended to throw dust in the eyes of the public. He believed that three-fourths of those who had been present and had taken an interest in the question, and who had listened to the arguments which had been adduced, were convinced that the proposal of the Government was a most extravagant one. But what would be the practical result of a division? As soon as the Government rang the Division Bell, a large number of their ardent supporters, who were at present in the Smoking Room, the Lobbies, and the purlieus of the House, would come in and vote away £1,000,000 with the lightest of hearts at the dictation of the Government Whips. It was because the Government knew that this would be the result that they could afford to laugh at people who, in the real interests of economy, objected to the expenditure of £1,000,000 for which no necessity had been shown. This was the first Vote for this new building, and if the Committee could nip it in the bud, he firmly believed that great public advantage would be secured. He would, therefore, follow his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) into the Lobby, in order to enter his protest against so extravagant an expenditure of the public money.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he was unable to discover, in the long speech of the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), that he had assigned any real and substantial reason against the Vote. The only reason, good or bad, was one which might be urged in reference to every Vote, and it would be impossible in that case to get through the Estimates—namely, that these new buildings were not required for the Admiralty and the War Office, because the necessities of the Government demanded more ships. He (Mr. Labouchere) would like to ask the First Commissioner of Works what he was going to do with all the property close by the House of Commons in Delahay Street? It appeared to him, at first sight, that it would be much more reasonable to build upon property which they already possessed, if it could be made available for Public Offices, than to go on purchasing more property. With respect to the present Offices, he believed Sir Henry Hunt's estimate was that if the War Offices were removed there would be a clear saving of £250,000. There was another question he should also like to ask the right hon. Gentleman—namely, with regard to the system adopted for paying the surveyors. Were the surveyors paid by the job when a certain property was bought and other land was sold, or were they paid by percentages? He was told that these surveyors made a very good thing, and that it was their custom to charge for surveying property intended to be bought, and then to charge again for surveying that which was to be sold. The natural consequence was that, in their opinion, all the property belonging to the nation ought to be sold and other property acquired, because they derived a large profit from the transaction. He wished to know, in regard to these charges, whether the surveyors were paid by salary or by valuation? He thought the Committee ought to have a clear explanation also in regard to what was proposed to be done with regard to the vacant spaces which already belonged to the nation, before they embarked in this large expenditure. At the same time, he thought there was no doubt as to the necessity of building a new War Office and a new Admiralty.

Mr. MUNTZ agreed with the remarks which had been made by the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), with whom he had the honour of serving on the Committee to which this question was referred last year. The Committee found that there were so many difficulties in the way of conducting the affairs of the War Office in a satisfactory manner, under the present conditions, that it was absolutely necessary to provide a new building. In point of fact, the whole of the business of these two Offices was in a state of chaos. He could not state from memory how many Offices there were; but the number was very considerable, and there was but one opinion among the Committee—namely, that a new Office must be built for the Admiralty and another for the War Office. It was also felt that this was a convenient time for undertaking the work. Prices were low; and if it was a matter of consideration that they should only undertake work of this character when it was wanted, he had no doubt whatever that these buildings were really wanted now.

Sir BALDWYN LEIGHTON said, he agreed with the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, which was clear and businesslike, and he should certainly support him on a division. He thought even he might have made his case stronger than he had by explaining the saving in present rents by the alteration. He believed there was a site at present existing in Delahay Street, which was perfectly waste; and he would venture to urge on the right hon. Gentleman that he ought at once, after obtaining this Vote, to get the designs for the new buildings, and proceed with their construction without further delay. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) that a great deal of saving might be effected in the manner in which the work was conducted. Surveyors' charges were very costly, and they constantly saw new buildings erected in the most wasteful style of architecture, which involved considerable annual expenditure in the shape of repairs. For instance, the style in which the Houses of Parliament had been erected rendered extravagant repairs necessary, in order to maintain them in a substantial condition; and the same mistake seemed to have been repeated in the New Law Courts. When they came to the question of design, he hoped all these matters would be carefully considered, because he believed that was where the saving could be effected. He hoped, also, there would be no waste of money in adopting a superfluously ornamental style of architecture.

MR. BIGGAR said, his hon. Friend the Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) had raised a question which had not been answered by the First Commissioner of Works—namely, why £100,000 should be paid for the purchase of the freehold now, and £65,000 be paid for the purchase of the leaseholders' interest next year? It appeared to him (Mr. Biggar) that there was no real ground why the freehold should be bought at one time and the leasehold at another. If they really required the ground, it would be better to ask not for £100,000, but for £165,000, which would enable them to purchase at once both the feeehold and the leasehold interest. He did not see why they should pay £100,000 for the freehold of the property, and leave the tenants still continuing upon it. The only practical result of adopting that course was that they would lose the interest upon £100,000 for one year without gaining any corresponding advantage. He agreed with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), that before purchasing new property it would be better to utilize the ground which already belonged to the Government. He remembered last year that the Government bought some land from somebody or other that was not clearly explained; but the House were told that by making the purchase the Government would save money at some future time, because property was increasing so much in value, and it was certain that this particular property would be required some time or other. He certainly thought it was a singular policy to buy land in one position and then to inform the House that it would be more satisfactory to erect the new public buildings in another. If it was absolutely essential to erect the new Public Offices for the War Department and the Admiralty upon this particular land, he thought the work should be proceeded with as rapidly as possible, and that instead of waiting for another year the Government should take the whole sum of £165,000 in one year, and go on with the work at once. He was afraid that what they were now doing would only afford an opportunity to the lawyers for manufacturing costs.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, there was one question which was a very important one—namely, what was the number of clerks that were to be reduced in the great Offices of the Army and Navy? The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had stated distinctly that if this money were granted he intended to issue tenders for the new buildings. But before he put out tenders he ought to show what accommodation would be required, and there was no one on the Treasury Bench, neither the Secretary of State for War nor the Secretary to the Admiralty, who was able to answer the question. The First Commissioner of Works stated that great reductions were contemplated, in the first place, in the War Office, which now contained about 900 clerks, and in the next in the Admiralty, in which there were also nearly 800 clerks. He thought the country ought to know what reductions were going to be made, for he had no doubt that to-morrow great dismay would be created in these two great Departments when it was found that it was intended to reduce the staff. He might go one step further, and would suggest that, together with these reductions in the staff, it would be advisable to get rid of some of that red-tapism which the recent investigation proved to exist to so large an extent in connection with the services of the Medical Department in Egypt.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, his hon. Friend the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) asked what the Government intended to do with the property they had acquired in Delahay Street? Now, the Government had acquired property in Parliament Street, in King Street, and in Charles Street, the total value of which was about £270,000. If the Admiralty and the War Office were placed on that site, it would be necessary to spend about £1,200,000 more, so that the cost of the site would be more than £1,400,000. In consequence, however, of the determination to rebuild the War Office and the Admiralty Office in Spring Gardens, the property just referred to, and which had cost about £270,000, would not be required for the purpose. He was informed by Sir Henry Hunt that the property had been bought upon reasonable terms, and was well worth the money given for it. A portion of the site was vacant, the rest being occupied by houses, which paid rent amounting to between £6,000 and £7,000 a-year. He was in the hope of being able to enter into an arrangement with the Metropolitan Board of Works, who were considering a scheme for the widening of Parliament Street, for the disposal of some part of the Government property. He was at present in negotiation with them in connection with the scheme, and he proposed to offer the property to the Board with a view of facilitating their operations. If the Board of Works should not enter into the arrangement, it would be necessary for the Government to realize the value of the property already acquired; and in either case the proceeds would go in aid of the cost of building the new Offices. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had repeated more than once that these buildings were to cost £1,000,000. Now, the outside cost which he anticipated at present would be £165,000 for the site, and £600,000 for the building, making a total of £765,000, the interest upon which would be £23,000. But, on the other hand, there would be a saving of £16,000 a-year from the rental of the buildings now occupied by the War Office and the Admiralty. The purchase money of the property in Parliament Street, King's Street, Charles Street, and Great George Street, was £270,000; and therefore, irrespective of the saving accruing from the diminution of the staff, he believed the operation would be financially a good one for the Government. The hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) asked what would be the saving in regard to the reduction of clerks? It was quite impossible at present to say what it would be. He had been in communication on the subject with Mr. Hamilton, the late Secretary to the Admiralty, who was for a long period Accountant General to the Admiralty. That Gentleman assured him that it would be possible to reduce the staff in the Accountant's Department very considerably when adequate and proper buildings were erected, and all the Offices were centered in one large building, instead of being spread over a number of small ones. He had asked Mr. Hamilton how many men would be saved, but Mr. Hamilton could not state the number. All he could say was that there were very good grounds for supposing the Government would not be deceived in this matter, and that when the entire staff was gathered together in one large building it would be easy to make considerable reductions. The reductions, of course, must be tentative, and he could not say in advance exactly what they would be; but all who knew anything about the subject must come to the conclusion that new buildings were required to meet the necessities of the case, and that when they were provided the staff of clerks could be considerably reduced.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he was astonished at the line taken by his right hon. Friend. He did not complain of what the right hon. Gentleman said; but he thought it indecent on the part of the Government to ask the Committee to spend this large sum of money when not a single Cabinet Minister had taken pains to be present during the discussion. All the Committee had before them was upon hearsay evidence. When he had put a Question upon the subject a short time ago, he had been told, in an off-hand, easy manner, by the Secretary to the Admiralty, that some economies would be insured by the Treasury. Why were not the Secretary of State for War and the Secretary to the Admiralty in their places to explain what the economies would be? He did not complain of the absence of the First Lord of the Treasury, because it was well known that that right hon. Gentleman did not interfere in these details; but there were other Members of the Government who certainly ought to have been in their places. The First Commissioner of Works told them that the estimated cost of the building of the new Public Offices was likely to be diminished by the sale of the property in Delahay Street; but that sale could be effected anyhow, whether this additional outlay were incurred or not. The right hon. Gentleman said the cost of the present proposal would be £600,000, in addition to the purchase of the site, which would bring the total cost to £750,000. He thought his right hon. Friend had had enough experience to enable him to know that a rough estimate of that kind was never kept within bounds, and that when the time came to pay the bill it would be found to have fully reached the £1,000,000 mentioned by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst). [The Marquess of HARTINGTON here entered the House.] He was glad to see the noble Marquess in his place, and he thought it was a pity that he had not been there sooner. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) agreed with the remarks of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Gorst) as to the manner in which the expenditure upon the Navy was stinted; and when they found the recruiting for the Army neglected, owing to the stinginess of the Government, and the shipbuilding of the Navy much below what it ought to be, it was perfectly monstrous that the Committee should be asked to incur this unnecessary and extravagant expenditure.

MR. GORST remarked, that now the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had condescended to give figures, he entirely failed to show that any economy at all would be produced by adopting the proposals of the Government. According to the right hon. Gentleman's own estimate, the interest upon the outlay would amount to £25,000 a-year, and towards that the Government would save the rental of the Admiralty and War Office, so far as the present buildings were concerned, and which amounted to £16,000 a-year. That left a sum of £9,000 still to be accounted for, and he wanted to know if it was to be saved by economies effected in reducing the staff of these two great Departments? Would the right hon. Gentleman show, or could he point out, what number of clerks would be dismissed, both in the Admiralty and in the War Office, because it was quite evident that it would come to that unless the Committee rejected the Vote?

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE said, he understood the First Commissioner of Works to say, in connection with the site in Delahay Street, that it was proposed to allow the Metropolitan Board of Works to have part of that site for the purpose of widening Parliament Street. [Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: No.] If that was not the case, it would not be necessary for him to go further into the question. He had certainly understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that he proposed to allow the Metropolitan Board of Works to have some portion of the site the Government had purchased in Delahay Street for the purpose of widening Parliament Street, and he thought it would be satisfactory for the country to have an assurance that no portion of that site would be parted with to the Metropolitan Board of Works unless they paid a sum equal to that which had been given for it. He did not think that the taxpayers of the country, who did not come up to London, and never set their foot in Parliament Street in the course of their lives, should be called upon to contribute any sum of money for the purpose of benefiting the property of that neighbourhood.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, there was no intention, on the part of the Government, of giving the property to the Metropolitan Board of Works. The only offer he had made was that the Metropolitan Board should purchase as much of the property as was thought necessary for the widening of Parliament Street at a fair valuation.

SIR HENRY PEEK said, he represented a division in which a great many of the gentlemen employed in the War Office lived, and he quite agreed that many of these gentlemen would be placed in a difficult position when they heard that it was proposed to reduce the staff of that Establishment. For instance, how many of the 900 clerks, which at present formed the strength of that Establishment, did the right hon. Gentleman anticipate he would be able to dispense with when the new building was completed? If the number to be reduced was at all large, it would be a matter of great interest and great importance to a good many of his (Sir Henry Peek's) constituents.

MR. DILLWYN said, he thought that a clear statement on these subjects from the Government, in the first instance, would save a great deal of time. He believed that in this instance a great deal of time would have been saved if the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had, when introducing the Vote, made some of the statements he had made subsequently. He was of opinion that, in all cases where the Government proposed any new expenditure, the House had a right to expect from them a fair explanation of the Vote. He thought, after the explanation which had been given by his right hon. Friend, that the Government had probably made the best arrangement they could, under the circumstances, in securing the property which it appeared would be required; and, of course, as it would be wanted, it was better to secure it at a reasonable rate. At the same time, he hoped his right hon. Friend would not take upon himself the responsibility of carrying out any plan in regard to the building proposed to be put upon this property without coming first to the House of Commons for its sanction. It would be hardly possible to discuss the matter before the plans and specifications were agreed upon; and he thought the House ought to insist upon all the plans being fully discussed. In this instance, in consequence of some words which fell from his right hon. Friend, he gathered that the property was looked upon as an artistic site. Now, for his own part, he had a perfect horror of artistic sites and buildings. What the country wanted was a utilitarian and not an artistic building. What they required was that which any good commercial house or railway company would provide—namely, a good commercial office, useful for the business it was intended to carry on in it, and not great lofty rooms, ill adapted for the transaction of public business in consequence of their height, and in consequence of their being constructed with the view to artistic effect. There was certainly too much artistic desire expressed by his right hon. Friend; and he hoped the Committee would receive the assurance that full and ample opportunity would be afforded to them of forming a judgment upon the plans, and of stating whether they approved of their artistic merits. He certainly hoped his right hon. Friend would qualify his artistic fancies before he eventually settled the plan. He should like to know whether the surveyors would be paid by salaries or by percentage? Having said so much, and his right hon. Friend having now given the explanation which he ought to have given in the first instance, he (Mr. Dillwyn) would, with the leave of the House, withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE remarked, that the surveyors would be paid by salaries.

Mr. WARTON said, he quite understood the meaning of the comments which had been made by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). He had no doubt that the hon. Member never intended to do anything by the Motion he had made; and he agreed with the hon. Member that it was an unfortunate fact that, whenever these Votes were brought on, the Ministers in charge of them did not condescend to afford any explanation, or even to answer the questions that were put to them. Cabinet Ministers seemed to think that it was quite sufficient for them to give the Committee the benefit of their presence, without condescending to answer questions that were put to them in regard to the matters under discussion. He suspected that the observations which had been made by the First Commissioner of Works were rather general observations in regard to future possibilities in the way of economy, rather than in connection with anything that had yet been decided upon. He did not think any Estimate had been made which involved the reduction of a single clerk in either of these two great Offices; but vague general statements were made, in order to induce them to believe that the Government were contemplating more economical measures. He failed to understand the principle upon which the Government prepared the Estimates. They appeared to make a great fuss about salaries paid to ratcatchers, amounting to £8 a-year, or to the washerwomen attached to the Public Offices, who received some 15*s*. a-week, while they lumped hundreds of thousands of pounds together without affording any information in regard to the purposes to which they were to be applied.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, that as he had not heard the beginning of the discussion, he was afraid he did not understand correctly the question which had been put by the hon. and gallant Baronet opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), and therefore he could not throw much light upon the matter. He believed, however, that some question had been addressed to him as to the number of clerks which it was thought it would be possible to dispense with at the War Office when the new building was erected. He thought it was obvious to the Committee that it was impossible at the present moment to form any correct estimate upon the matter. His right hon. Friend the First Commissioner of Works had already explained that the new building would take from eight to 10 years to complete; and it was difficult, if not altogether idle, to attempt to make any estimate as to the reductions it might be possible to effect at the end of that time. What he was able to state was that some years ago, when he was at the War Office, the accommodation was insufficient, and he believed that the inconvenience had been greatly added to since. It was well known that inconvenience and bad accommodation had involved a waste of money; and he had no doubt that if the War Office and the Admiralty were accommodated in buildings more suitable to their wants it would be quite possible to make a reduction in the number of clerks. At the same time, no reduction on that ground could possibly take place for a considerable time; but he was satisfied that whenever they increased the accommodation they would be able to secure greater economy in the Departments.

SIR HENRY PEEK said, that his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had asked a simple question upon the statement made by the Chief Commissioner of Works—namely, what reduction was contemplated in the number of clerks? He (Sir Henry Peek) was glad to find, from the remarks just made by the Secretary of State for War, that what the right hon. Gentleman had stated in regard to economy in the number of clerks was only one of those general statements which they all knew how to appreciate.

MR. BIGGAR wished to say one word in regard to economy in the Public Expenditure. The Chief Commissioner of Works submitted that these new buildings would be completed for £765,000, including the purchase of the site. Now, a somewhat similar Estimate was given in regard to the erection of the Law Courts. They were told, in the first instance, that the cost would be £600,000; but, instead of that sum, the expenditure had already amounted to £938,000. If the expenditure, in reference to the new Public Offices, was to be in anything like the same proportion to the Estimate, the total cost would be at least £1,000,000. There was also another item of which the right hon. Gentleman had not taken any account—namely, the interest accumulated from year to year on the total outlay as the work proceeded. It was stated that 10 years would elapse before the buildings were completed, so that the item of interest would in the end be a very considerable one. No doubt it was fairly argued that it would be much more convenient to substitute new buildings for the present defective accommodation; but the Government were not justified in alleging that the work proposed to be carried out would effect a saving of expenditure to the ratepayers. It was quite clear that there would be a heavy additional expenditure rather than a reduction.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE remarked that the Estimate for the Foreign Office was not exceeded.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2). £14,730, to complete the sum for Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he should like to have some information upon one small point in regard to this Vote. One of the items was for furniture for Diplomatic Buildings. But it appeared from the Estimates that there was another sum for that purpose included in Vote 27, and he did not quite see how it came to be inserted in the present Vote.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that it had been included in the second Vote by mistake.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, there was another item for furniture in connection with the Metropolitan Police Courts, which, as a matter of principle, he thought ought to be objected to. Many hon. Members were altogether opposed to the expenses of the Metropolitan Police Courts being paid for out of the Public Exchequer; but as he believed the expenditure provided for in the Vote amounted to a very small sum in regard to the Metropolitan Police Courts, it would, perhaps, be better to contest the principle upon Vote 11, which was a specific Vote for the Metropolitan Police Courts.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that if his hon. Friend would refer to the note attached to this Vote, he would see that the furniture included in other Votes did not form part of the present Vote.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR remarked, that this was a special Vote for furniture for all public buildings; but, nevertheless, under several other Votes there were items also for furniture. The practice adopted of including the cost of different items of furniture for public buildings in different Votes for the separate Departments, besides having this special Vote, was most inconvenient, and rendered it very difficult for hon. Members to understand the matter. In addition to the sum contained in this special Vote, there was about £166,000 spread over other Votes, next to the one now under consideration, and like charges for furniture were included in many Votes throughout the volume. In point of fact, no sort of system appeared to be adopted to enable the Committee to understand what the total expense of this one item really was. It would be better, he thought, to confine the whole expense for all furniture to one Departmental Vote, so that hon. Members might know what they were about. It was most objectionable to have two kinds of Estimates, one for one thing purely, and one set of Votes for another made up of a variety of items. He hoped the Government would in future endeavour to bring all the accounts into one Vote.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £279,312, to complete the sum for Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he wished to know the meaning of the large increase of expenditure on Inland Revenue Buildings. He found that the Vote included £10,000 for Glasgow, £3,000 for Sheffield, and £900 for Stockton-on-Tees. Was it contemplated that all this amount was to be expended in new works during the present year? The Vote showed an increase of £5,000 over that of last year. No explanation was given of the reason why they required new offices at Glasgow, Cardiff, or in connection with the Inland Revenue Department at Somerset House. He thought it was perfectly monstrous that they should be having new buildings erected in different parts of the country for the Inland Revenue Department, at a large increase of expenditure over that of last year, without any explanation being given to the Committee with regard to them.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR thought the charge in respect of new buildings for the Revenue Departments was this year again very large, and pointed out that it was increasing every year, nearly £500,000 having been expended on new buildings in the course of the last five years. In addition to that sum, a large sum, amounting to something like £300,000, had been expended in repairs. The Memorandum he held in his hand showed that, in 1879-80, the House voted £184,334 for the buildings, and in this year the amount was £334,412. No doubt, the Post Office and Telegraph Buildings needed enlargement to meet the wants of the increasing Service; but the necessity for new buildings for the Customs and Inland branches was not called for. The fact was that the Vote for the charges of the Postal and Telegraphic branches should be separated from the charges of the Inland and Customs. Instead of the practice of exhibiting the Postal and Telegraphic Charges, there should be a distinct account for each, showing the capital invested, and the results of the great trade so usefully and successfully carried on at a great profit.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, his hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) had drawn attention to certain items of increase in the expenditure for new buildings in connection with the Inland Revenue Department. He himself wished to make an observation in regard to a very large item of expenditure for new works at the back of the Post Office building. He believed that no less a sum than £75,000 was an increase due to alterations and additions in respect of the coming services for the delivery by the Post Office of parcels. He had been under the impression that the Committee would have had some special statement or some special Vote detailing the whole of the expenditure that would be required, in order to bring that very important change in the Post Office administration into practical operation. When he found that £75,000 was to be spent for buildings alone in carrying out the change, he regretted that it was simply given as a lump sum, because they all knew very well that a much larger expenditure would be required for delivery, carriage, horses, &c.; and, in addition, there must be a considerable amount for contracts and sub-agencies in populous places for the delivery of these parcels. There was a good deal of anxiety felt in the country as to whether the new scheme might not prejudicially affect the efficiency of the present Post Office Service in the punctual delivery of letters with which the public were happily familiar. He thought the Postmaster General had ample evidence of the feeling of the House and the country in that respect; and he (Mr. Sclater-Booth) was not disposed to take up the question in any carping spirit. He only wished to say that there was a considerable amount of anxiety felt out-of-doors lest the Post Office should have embarked on a too complicated business, which might endanger a Service they had all of them reason to be proud of, and in regard to which the greatest possible satisfaction was felt. The existing Post Office arrangements were not only satisfactory to Members in that House, but to every person who was engaged in business in the country. This sum of £75,000 was the increase due to the introduction of the new business in connection with the Parcels Post; but no details were given to show the way in which the money was to be expended. He wished to know, therefore, whether the amount was only a rough estimate of what was likely to be required all over the Kingdom, or whether it applied only to a limited number of Post Offices throughout the country; also, what proportion this sum bore to the whole cost of the Service, which could not but be very considerable. He thought the Committee were entitled to know a little more in detail what the opinion of the Postmaster General was. At present there was great celerity and regularity in the despatch and delivery of letters, and there was a fear that the Post Office might be about to enter upon an undertaking of too elaborate and complicated a nature.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir George Balfour) had complained of the continual increase of this Vote. All he could say was that it was likely to go on increasing as long as the Post Office business went on increasing at its present rate. The work of the Post Office could not go increasing without these charges increasing also. If the cost of telegrams was to be reduced to 6*d*., and the Post Office facilities of all kinds were to be increased, it would necessarily follow that there must be a larger staff and more extensive accommodation. The increase of the Vote this year was almost entirely due to the introduction of the Parcels Post, which amounted to £75,000. In addition to that, there was a further sum of £25,000 taken out of the savings of the Vote of the previous year, and which had been expended in consequence of the urgent necessity of making provision for carrying out the Parcels Post. Therefore, the total increase of expenditure in respect of the Parcels Post would amount to about £100,000. For that sum of money about 200 post offices were being added to, and there would be a greatly increased amount of work thrown upon the Department. In reference to the increase for buildings in connection with the Inland Revenue Department, there was a sum of £15,000 required for the new building at Glasgow. For some years past great complaints had been made in regard to the defective accommodations of the Revenue Offices in that city. It had been found necessary to obtain a new site; but when the new building was erected the old site would realize a large sum of money. There would, consequently, be a large sum of money coming in in aid of expenditure. Then, again, there was an item of £4,200 in respect of the Inland Revenue Building at Sheffield. Great complaints had been made of the insufficiency of the existing accommodation. [Sir H. Drummond Wolff asked who made the complaint?] The Government had certainly no interest in expending the public money in erecting buildings of this kind unless they were absolutely required; but so strong a case had been made out in these instances that it was felt impossible to refuse the claims pressed upon the Government.

Sir HENRY PEEK said, that for two Sessions he had sat upon the Water Supply Committee, to which was relegated the duty of inquiring into the question of the Metropolitan Theatres, and the best means of clearing them in case of fire. He mentioned that, because he understood that it was proposed to enlarge the telegraph accommodation at St. Martin's-le-Grand by putting an additional story on a building which was already excessively high. They were told by the Postmaster General that no less than 2,600 people were to be employed at an elevation of 60 feet above the level of the street.

Mr. FAWCETT said, the hon. Baronet was under a misapprehension. What he had said was that the whole number of persons employed in the building was 2,600; but he went on to explain that the whole of these persons were not employed at the same time, and they would not all of them be engaged at an elevation of 60 feet above the level of the ground.

Sir HENRY PEEK said, the fact was not altered by the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. He should like to tell the Committee what the Government proposed to carry out. Although the existing upper storey was 40 feet above the level of the street, the idea which the Government had of prudence and economy was to put another storey upon the top of that. If, by any accident, that building was destroyed by fire, as it was very nearly destroyed by a fire opposite in Paternoster Row a few weeks ago, the business of the country could hardly be carried on; and almost every person throughout the whole of the United Kingdom would be put to inconvenience by the interference in his every day transactions. He undertook to say that no sensible man carrying on such a business as the Telegraphic Department of the Post Office would have all his machinery in one place. If, by any accident, the telegraph floor were destroyed, he was satisfied the business of the country could hardly be carried on. No doubt, the Government would be able speedily to pull themselves together; but, for a very much longer time, they would be placing every person in the country in a position of inconvenience and disadvantage. He was speaking as a Member of the Select Committee to which the question of theatres was referred. They might or might not go to theatres, just as they thought fit; but a Government *employé* must go where he was sent, and if the telegraph clerks were sent in such large numbers—considerably over 2,000—into a lofty storey like this, in the event of fire, or a panic of fire, the loss of life would be immense. He had taken the liberty of writing to the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the subject, and had used these words, which he did not think one atom too strong—

> "That the proposal for economical, or, more tersely expressed, for cheeseparing reasons, to put another floor on the telegraphic headquarters, was, in his opinion, nothing more nor less than criminal."

He wanted to know if the cost of erecting this floor was covered by the present Vote?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the cost of this floor at the Post Office was included in the Vote now under discussion. It was not included in the sum of £75,000 required for the Parcels Post; but his hon. Friend would find it in another part of the Vote. The total cost of the additional story would be £30,000, and there was no doubt it was a most economical arrangement. It would provide great additional accommodation, and if the same extent of area had been secured by the purchase of another convenient site elsewhere the cost would have been enormous. He did not think his hon. Friend need be under any alarm as to danger from fire. That subject had been carefully gone into before the plans were decided upon, and all possible means had been taken to prevent danger. There were four very wide staircases leading up to this storey, and the whole storey could be cleared in the course of a few minutes. There would also be a bridge thrown across at the rear of the building to another block of buildings, which the Government had recently purchased. His hon. Friend, therefore, need be under no apprehension in regard to danger from fire; because, wherever a large body of persons were employed, there was much less danger from fire than where a building remained empty during the night time. Should there be any danger from fire there was not the slightest doubt that the whole of the telegraph staff could be cleared out in a very short time, without running the slightest risk. He would remind his hon. Friend that there were very few buildings in London where a large number of persons were employed that were not more than four stories in height.

Sir HENRY PEEK said, there might be buildings more than four stories high; but not one in which one-tenth of the numbers now mentioned were employed at such an altitude. He remembered a large fire on the other side of London Bridge, where there was stored a considerable amount of tea—an article in which he was personally interested. It had been positively stated that tea could not be destroyed by fire; but, notwithstanding, it was totally destroyed, and the fireproof building too. In regard to this particular telegraph building, the pressure of water was so much diminished for several hours each day by filling the cisterns in the East Central District, that at such time there could not be a sufficient supply of water to bear upon it, and he ventured to point that out as a great danger. No doubt, the building an additional floor was, in one sense, an economical proceeding; but there were such things as true economy and false economy, and he was certainly of opinion that so important a business as this ought to be duplicated in some way. No business man would have the whole of his machinery—in the case of the telegraphs of immense value—in one building, but he would have it in duplicate, in order to meet any emergency. He trusted that what he had said would be duly weighed by the Government. It was a very important matter. The addition of this storey would not be nearly sufficient to supply the whole of the wants of the Telegraph Department under the 6*d.* rate; and he thought the Government were committing a great mistake if they continued the construction of this floor. They might, of course, save money by adopting a cheese-paring policy; but they were not effecting that judicious economy which his right hon. Friend the Chief Commissioner of Works talked about in regard to a previous Vote.

Mr. RAMSAY said, that reference had been made to the new building at Glasgow. The old building had long been felt, by the merchants who went to conduct their business there, to be a disgrace to the city; and it was only due to the persons who required to go there that increased facilities should be provided. At present those who went there were detained for a considerable time, and it was frequently the case that anyone passing along the street saw many persons waiting, although their only business was to pay their Income Tax and get relieved of their money. He thought, in the absence of any other explanation of the Vote for the new Office at Glasgow, that it was only fair to say that it was due to the taxpayers to have proper facilities given them for the despatch of their business in connection with the Revenue Department. While he gave the Government credit for the efforts they had made to secure economy in carrying out the necessary arrangements in Glasgow he was bound to say that the old Office was a discredit to any Government.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Hampshire (Mr. Sclater-Booth) that, so far from objecting to any remarks he had made in reference to the Post Office, he thought they were not only extremely reasonable, but well timed. It was only due to the House and to the Committee that they should have, as far as could be prepared, a detailed Estimate of both the expected revenue and the expected expenditure in connection with the Parcel Post. That Estimate was being most carefully prepared at the present moment by the officials, on whom the preparation of the Parcels Post devolved; and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee that there would be no delay whatever in placing it on the Table. He must, however, say that although every care would be taken to give the Committee the very best Estimate possible, yet he felt that, after all, it must in certain respects be an Estimate only, because no two persons seemed to agree as to the amount of business that was likely to be done when the Parcels Post came into operation. He believed that business men generally considered the Post Office authorities had made an extremely moderate Estimate of the amount of business they would have to transact. The authorities had estimated so many parcels; but when they mentioned the number to men of commercial experience, like his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Surrey (Sir Henry Peek), it was generally allowed that they had much underrated the amount of business that would be done. He could only say that if it turned out that their Estimate was too moderate the financial result would be much better than they anticipated. He did not want to anticipate the Estimate which he hoped would shortly be laid before the House; but, as far as he was yet able to judge, he saw no reason to alter the opinion he had expressed, some time ago, in reply to a Question addressed to him by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), that in the first year the receipts from the Parcels Post would cover the expenditure. If that result was secured it would be, he thought, very satisfactory; because, as always happened in regard to the expenses of the Post Office, a great deal of expenditure would be incurred which, in an ordinary business, would be put down, not to income, but to capital. He would not now go into that question; but, no doubt, it was one of the utmost importance. It was, however, one which ought to be raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and not by himself. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Hampshire (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had referred to another question. The right hon. Gentleman said that a certain feeling of uneasiness was evinced as to the effect which the introduction of the Parcels Post would have upon the letter service of the country. Of course, it would be unreasonable not to anticipate that on the first introduction of a great change like this there might be difficulties to overcome. But he had been told that in other countries—in Germany, and even in India—experience did not justify the uneasiness referred to by the right hon. Gentleman. The Postmaster General of India told him, a few days ago, that in that Empire much heavier weights were carried than were proposed in this case; and in reply to a question the Postmaster General told him that the Parcels Post worked with the utmost smoothness, and without the slightest difficulty. In Germany, also, the system worked well; and if, both in Germany and in India, that was found to be the case, he saw no reason why it should not soon get into good working order in England. As far as the letter service in the rural districts was concerned, he could only say that he was of opinion—and he knew that that opinion was shared by many practical officers of the Post Office, who could speak with more authority on the point than he could lay claim to—so far from expecting that the introduction of the Parcels Post would interfere with the letter service in the rural districts, one of the chief advantages he anticipated from the new system was that in a short time after its introduction it would tend materially to improve the letter service in those districts. It was obvious that, in many instances, foot messengers would have to be replaced by mounted messengers; and the result would be that letters might arrive in the country districts one or two hours sooner, and be dispatched one or two hours later, than at present. This was one of the great reasons which had always made him so anxious to see the Parcels Post brought into working order.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he was gratified to hear the rosy anticipations of the right hon. Gentleman, and the conclusions he had drawn in regard to the advantages which would be derived in the rural districts in the shape of a quicker delivery of letters. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that a statement of the expenditure necessary to defray the cost of the introduction of the new system would shortly be laid upon the Table, and that he anticipated the receipts of the first year would be sufficient to cover the increased expenditure. That statement was satisfactory, and he hoped that the anticipations of the right hon. Gentleman would be realized. The estimated cost of providing for the new service in the present Vote for Buildings was £75,000; and the First Commissioner of Works told them that it would be necessary to enlarge some 200 Post Offices. Surely that was a very small number in comparison with the number of post offices existing throughout the country, and which must amount, he thought, to 20,000 or 30,000. Were they to understand that that was all the sum that would be taken this year for the construction and enlargement of Post Offices? [Mr. Shaw Lefevre: Yes.] Then he would say no more in regard to the Post Office question. In regard to the Inland Revenue Buildings, he should like to ask the Secretary to the Treasury a question he had put to him previously in the discussion of the Estimates—namely, a question in regard to the Vote for the River Shannon. They were told that the cost of new works to which attention had been drawn would be set off by the sale of old stores. Now, in the case of the Shannon, the Estimate was a very large one, and the Government said it would be met, to a great extent, by the sale of plant and machinery at the conclusion of the work. In the case of the new Inland Revenue Building at Glasgow, they were told that the cost would be met by the sale of the old building; and he wanted to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how he proposed to account for the sums receivable in diminution of them, and other like Votes in the Civil Service Estimates, and why the gross, instead of the net amount only was voted? A new system had been introduced into the Army and Navy Expenditure. The Government proposed to expend certain sums of money, and expected to receive over sums of money year by year; but the net amount only was inserted in the Votes. That was a considerable change from the old practice, and one against which he had lifted up his feeble voice, because he believed that it might interfere with the control which the Treasury ought to have over the Expenditure. He would not, however, raise that question now. It seemed to him that it would be consistent, on the part of the Government, either to ask for the net amount they required under the present Vote, or else to inform the Committee how they proposed to account for the outlay hereafter.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN said, he was sure the Committee would have received with satisfaction the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General with regard to the Parcels Post; any further discussion of the subject would, therefore, be unnecessary. He would, however, be glad to know whether the arrangements were so far advanced as to permit the carrying out of the scheme at an early date?

Mr. FAWCETT: It will begin to operate on the 1st of August.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN said, he was glad to hear the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. With respect to the buildings, it appeared to him and other hon. Friends, notwithstanding the sum of £100,000 was to be voted for this purpose, that the right hon. Gentleman had formed a very moderate estimate of the total sum which the country would be called upon to pay. He had himself some acquaintance with the system operating in Germany and other countries; and, in his opinion, the amount of the present Estimate would prove to be out of all proportion to the sum that would eventually be required. He said this, having regard particularly to the amount of building space that was found necessary in Germany, and he could not but think that the country must be prepared to meet a very much larger expenditure under this head. The Committee should bear in mind that the Parcels Post system was likely to extend much more rapidly than was the case with the ordinary letter post; and that was another reason which made him think that the right hon. Gentleman had altogether an inadequate conception of the outlay that would be required both for buildings and for other expenses. This, however, was a matter of speculation, and he would not detain the Committee at any greater length upon the subject. There was one point that had been raised when this subject was before the Committee last year to which he would again invite the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. As a matter of fact, a large number of letters were posted in the pillar-boxes after the hours of collection, and it very often happened that the subsequent collection took place later than it should do. He thought if a notice were placed upon the pillar-boxes showing when the box would be cleared, that this would prove of great service to the public. He believed that it had been done in some cases, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to having the hours of collection indicated on the pillar-boxes throughout the country generally.

Mr. FAWCETT said, it was his intention that all the letter-boxes should have the indication of the hour of collection to which his hon. Friend had referred. He was under the impression that it had already been done; but if his hon. Friend would direct his attention to any district in which this was not the case, he would give instructions to have the notices placed there at once.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had omitted to state that the £75,000 asked for under the present Vote did not represent the whole of the expenditure that would be necessary, inasmuch as a considerable amount would fall within the following financial year. Considerable increase of accommodation would be required in some of the London districts, and that would be the case, to a certain extent, in other parts of the country; but with respect to a large number of the rural post offices no alterations would be necessary.

Mr. WHITLEY said, he wished to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General to the fact that there was no place in the Kingdom where the Post Office accommodation was so utterly inadequate as it was in Liverpool. The portion of the building in which the girls did their work was, besides, in a most unsanitary condition; and representations had been made to the authorities, by deputation and in other ways, for the purpose of obtaining an improvement in the condition of that Department; but nothing had been done. He believed no one could be more convinced of the necessity of improvement than the Postmaster in Liverpool himself; and, that being the case, he was bound to say that he viewed with considerable regret the fact that the paltry sum of £5,000 was asked in the present Estimate for the purpose of the Post Office at Liverpool. He regarded this small expenditure as tending only to make things worse, and as being simply a waste of money. The Post Office arrangements at Liverpool had been for years in its present unsatisfactory condition; and this had been the subject of complaint on the part of merchants, shipowners, and, indeed, of every class. The present Post Office had been in existence for nearly 50 years, and its position was most inconvenient, having regard to the requirements of the classes to which he had referred. He observed, by the present Estimates, that the Post Office at Manchester was going to be rebuilt at a cost of £108,000; and he must express his regret that no ample provision had been made in the case of the Post Office at Liverpool. He repeated, that the outlay of this small sum of £5,000 would, as he feared, give great dissatisfaction, and lead to an extension of the present state of things. He appealed to the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury, because he believed that it was the Department which he represented that stopped the way, to take this matter into his consideration; and he ventured to express a hope that next year they might see upon the Estimates a Vote for a new Post Office at Liverpool.

Mr. GORST said, the interesting discussion that had taken place on the subject of Post Office Buildings had rather led the Committee to forget the question of the increased expenditure on account of the Customs and Inland Revenue Buildings. He rose for the purpose of reminding the right hon. Gentleman who was responsible for this Vote that he had not furnished any reply to the argument of his hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff). That hon. Member had asked for an explanation with regard to the new Inland Revenue Buildings that were being constructed at Stockton-on-Tees; and he (Mr. Gorst) considered that the item was certainly one which demanded a full explanation. The first item was — Stockton-on-Tees; moiety of cost of erection of new Inland Revenue and Customs Offices on land adjoining the County Court, and belonging to the Government, £900. It would appear from this statement as though the Government had suddenly found itself in possession of the land and thought it necessary to build some Offices upon it. But the question was, how did the Government come to be possessed of the land, and what necessity was there to erect new buildings on this vacant space at a cost of £1,800? Again, in the neighbouring town of Middlesbrough a precisely similar transaction had taken place; but here he found that the cost was £4,000 for the purchase of the Corporation Hall, and there was a further charge of £4,500 for the purpose of joint Customs and County Court officers. He and his hon. Friends would like to know why, with regard to these two places, this extraordinary zeal for new buildings should have manifested itself. There was another question that he would put to the right hon. Gentleman. How was it that in both the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments there was a greatly increased charge for the rents of premises? There was an increase of rent in the case of the Customs Department of £900 a-year, and in that of the Inland Revenue Department of £1,200 a-year, notwithstanding the fact that these Departments were not doing a greater, but, on the contrary, a less amount of business. Unlike the Post Office, there was a falling-off of trade, and consequently less activity in the two Departments. The point that he wished to bring clearly before the Committee was that, although the business of the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments was decreasing, the rents were increasing by a considerable amount—that was to say, by the amount of £900 a-year in the case of the Customs, and £1,200 in the case of the Inland Revenue Department. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury would be able to throw some light upon these points.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the explanation with regard to the proposed building at Stockton-on-Tees and Middlesbrough was very simple. In both places the Government had an opportunity of acquiring a site for the buildings in question, which had been availed of for purposes which were indispensable. The rent previously paid at Middlesbrough was something like £250 a-year. He could not at the moment give a full explanation with regard to the increase of rents in the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, to which the hon. and learned Gentleman had referred, but would inquire into the matter.

Mr. GORST said, he did not think that the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works was very satisfactory. The statement was that the rent previously paid for the premises at Middlesbrough was £100 a-year; but the Government were going to spend £4,500, which, according to his calculation at 3 per cent, amounted to £135 a-year, so that, in order to save £100 a-year, they were going to pay £135.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had omitted to state, in reply to the hon. and learned Gentleman, that the building now occupied by the Department at Middlesbrough was inadequate for the purposes for which it was intended.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, they had put their hands to the plough, so to speak, in adopting the Parcels Post system, with regard to which he did not feel it necessary at that moment to express any opinion. He might state, however, that it was usual, when the House of Commons was asked to commit itself to the alteration of any system, that full Estimates of the probable cost of the change to be carried out should be submitted to Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General intimated, in the course of his speech, that it would be premature to take the present opportunity of enlightening Parliament on this matter; and, in fact, he went on to say that this was a duty which more properly came within the province of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. FAWCETT: I was speaking with regard to the question raised by my hon. Friend behind me in connection with the capital expenditure of the Post Office. I said that required the attention of my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he was about to add, if he had been allowed to continue his sentence, that the right hon. Gentleman was quite right in the remark which he made; but that he thought the Committee was entitled to some authoritative statement on the part of the Government as to what would be the probable cost eventually incurred under the new system. The system might be an excellent one, and, probably, when they came to discuss it, it would be approved; but it was an almost unheard-of thing that they should be asked to involve themselves and the country in a serious expenditure, without having any intimation afforded them as to the ultimate limits they might be called upon to reach. He observed that the Estimate for Buildings in the present year was £75,000; and this, he understood, only to cover the necessary structural alterations in about 200 Offices. But he thought, from all that had transpired during the present discussion, and what they had heard on other occasions, that the Government could not possibly contemplate that this sum of £75,000 could be a very appreciable proportion of the amount they would eventually call upon Parliament to sanction. Now, the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had just now alluded to the item for hiring rooms and buildings, a subject which appeared to open up a very wide branch of expenditure for the future. They knew perfectly well that, in the ordinary transactions of life, anyone having temporarily to adapt a structure to a special use would have to incur an expenditure which represented no value to any future occupant, and therefore could not be considered to increase the letting value of the property. It would be seen that a good deal of expense must necessarily be incurred in connection with the Parcels Post; and this matter of hiring, to which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded, opened up, as he had already pointed out, a large question of expenditure, a good deal of which might hereafter be found to be due to the timidity of the Government in neglecting to come to Parliament with the whole of their scheme, and ask the House of Commons to sanction, in the first instance, an adequate Vote for the entire probable outlay to be incurred. It was of no use attempting the discussion of Estimates that were not upon the Table of the House; but he thought that the Committee would like to hear from some Member of the Government what this scheme would probably cost the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had intimated the substitution of mounted messengers and vehicles in place of the walking post in rural districts; and he understood the right hon. Gentleman to refer to that as constituting a probable addition to our present expenditure, although he had introduced it not in that way, but under the guise of a provision to increase the efficiency of the Postal Service for the accommodation of the public. He thought the whole system ought to be fully explained to the Committee at its inception, together with the probable total expenditure which Parliament, from time to time, would be called upon to incur; otherwise, when they again referred to and criticized the future Estimates in connection with the proposed system, they might be told that it had already been assented to and approved by the House of Commons; that it was then too late to ask what was the cause of the expenditure; and that such questions would have been more properly addressed to the Minister in charge of the original Estimate at the time when it was first introduced to the House of Commons. Therefore, merely by way of entering a *caveat* against being told on a future occasion that they were too late, he thought it right to make the few observations he had addressed to the Committee. He had listened with great satisfaction to one part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General. It was that in which he said that the Post Office administration of India was working with the most complete smoothness and without any appreciable difficulty, for he was extremely glad to hear that there was any Department in the Indian administration in that happy condition. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman had produced a very good effect upon his mind, and it would, no doubt, be received with great satisfaction by the country. He feared that the Post Office Department was, unfortunately, in that respect, unique amongst its fellows. He trusted that the debate would not be allowed to close without the Government affording some reasonable assurance as to the demand that would ultimately be made upon the public purse on account of the Parcels Post.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he would again ask the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General a question which had been put, but not answered, on a former occasion. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would be able to state whether any step had been taken to provide a system of insurance in connection with the Parcels Post. A great number of persons were very anxious that an arrangement of this kind should be carried out.

The CHAIRMAN said, he must point out to the hon. Member that the question of insurance was not included in the Vote before the Committee.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he thought the subject was quite relevant to the Vote for the Parcels Post.

The CHAIRMAN said, the Vote was entirely confined to the buildings required by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MOLLOY said, his remarks were precisely connected with this subject. He had no wish to disregard the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the hon. Gentleman will be in Order when a subsequent Vote is reached.

Mr. BIGGAR said he was surprised that the Government had not given the Committee some information with regard to the proposed new buildings—that was to say, they had not pointed out what were the defects in the present offices, and the reasons why new buildings were required. He would like to know why the present site had been selected, and the probable cost of the proposed alterations?

Sir ANDREW LUSK said, that as the system extended the number of parcels sent by railway would be very large, and for these warehouses would be required. He thought, if the Post Office authorities encouraged this kind of business, that they should be careful not to interfere too much with persons who were already engaged in the delivery of parcels. The tendency of the scheme would be, undoubtedly, to displace the business of a number of people; and he had a strong objection to anything like meddling with these interests on the part of the authorities. It was difficult to draw a line at any particular weight to be carried, because it was easy to advance by small steps—from, say, 7 lbs. to 14 lbs., and thence to 28 lbs. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General and the Government would keep within bounds in whatever they did for the establishment of the Parcels Post.

MR. RAMSAY said, that instead of joining with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-Booth) in urging upon the Government to give a definite Estimate in regard to the Parcels Post, he thought that, if the right hon. Gentleman would consider the magnitude of the subject, he would see it was impossible for the Government, on account of the lack of experience, to estimate, with any degree of accuracy, what the Parcels Post might cost. The Government were taking the best possible course they could take—namely, to provide the requisite sum for the current year. He (Mr. Ramsay) felt that, whatever might be the opinions of some Gentlemen, that the Parcels Post would be one of the greatest boons the public had received for a long time past. His right hon. Friend the Postmaster General was entitled to great credit for having brought this scheme so far to maturity; and the only mistake, in his (Mr. Ramsay's) judgment, which his right hon. Friend had made was, that he had agreed to pay the greater percentage of the total earnings to the Railway Companies for the carriage of the parcels. He thought that Parliament ought to have given power to the Postmaster General to have fixed the carriage at a much less rate; and he fully believed that at that moment the managing bodies of the different railways throughout the Kingdom would agree to carry the parcels for one-half of the present rates from the Land's End to John o' Groats. As a rule, parcels would only be conveyed short distances; and, although it was a wise principle to convey all parcels at a uniform rate, yet he could not conceive that the growth of the Parcels Post, and the development of the advantages that the country would derive from it, quite warranted the Postmaster General in the rate he had agreed to.

MR. COURTNEY said, a question was raised some time ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Hants (Mr. Sclater-Booth) to which he wished to make a reply. The right hon. Gentleman had asked why they had not introduced, in the case of the Civil Service Estimates, this system of voting money in the net, as was done in the case of the Army and Navy. The system of voting money in the net had been introduced into the Army and Navy Estimates after much deliberation. It would have to be watched, and they proposed to extend it, step by step, into the Civil Service Estimates. He was bound to say there would be considerable difficulty in introducing it into the Civil Service Estimates; for instance, in a case like the present, where the receipts could not be realized until the expenditure had been completed.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Whitley) had spoken about the desirability of erecting a new Post Office in the town he represented. The subject came under his (Mr. Shaw Lefevre's) attention some time ago; and, although there was a strong feeling in Liverpool in favour of a change of site, the Government had come to the conclusion that, looking at the great demands that had been made from other parts of the country—such as Bradford or Manchester, for instance—where there were much more serious causes for rebuilding the post offices, they could not hold out a hope that such a great undertaking would be commenced at Liverpool. The building at Liverpool was not, at present, inadequate for the service. It might not, perhaps, be so well placed as the people in Liverpool could wish; but the Government did not think that that was a sufficient cause for embarking upon such a large expenditure as the erection of a new post office would entail.

MR. GORST said, he thought that the Committee would like the right hon. Gentleman to say why the receipts anticipated by the sale of the Inland Revenue Office at Glasgow had not been formally inserted in the Estimates. The estimated extra receipts were put down at £3,000; but the right hon. Gentleman had said that it was estimated £20,000 would be realized by the sale of the present Inland Revenue Office at Glasgow. Why did not that appear on the Estimates?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it would not be possible to sell the Inland Revenue Office at Glasgow until the new Offices were completed; and, therefore, the proceeds of the sale of the new Offices would not come within the present financial year.

Mr. WARTON asked on what principle the Estimates for the Maintenance and Repairs of Buildings was made up; whether there was any inquiry in the case of the different buildings; and whether there was any Estimate made out as to what would be required? No matter what item they took, whether it was "B," or "H," or "N," or "T," and added them all up together, they found that they amounted, in the two years 1882 and 1883, to precisely the same figure—namely, £80,775. The maintenance of the Customs Buildings were estimated at £400 less this year; but that was balanced by the Estimate for the Revenue Buildings being £400 more than it was last year. For the Post Office and Telegraph Buildings, the sum required was the same for both years. The matter looked exceedingly suspicious. He desired to know whether any trouble was taken to check the accuracy of the Estimate? He would not go over the old ground, as to what money would be required by the alterations necessary in the Post Offices for the Parcels Post, although he should have thought that, in some places, the cost of alterations would have been much larger than they appeared to be. Maintenance and repairs were put down yearly at £51,000. He supposed they might gather that, whether the buildings increased or not in number, or size, the alterations and repairs would cost precisely the same amount year after year. It seemed to him as if no Estimate at all was made in the matter.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the Estimates were made up after careful calculation of the works it was actually intended to perform. Of course, as regarded maintenance and repairs, they could not make an Estimate in the usual way; but it must be done, to some extent, upon the basis of the Expenditure of the previous year. It was not reasonable to suppose that, on the average, the cost of repairs would be the same year after year.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General had not answered his question concerning the Parcels Post.

Mr. FAWCETT said, it would be extremely difficult and inconvenient if the House were to say that it would not sanction the Government entering into an arrangement until they knew what was likely to be wanted. He told the House at the time when the Parcels Post Bill was being passed into law that the reason that they did not give an Estimate then was that it was extremely difficult to frame one. It was an entirely new sort of business, and if they asked one person how many parcels they would be likely to carry in the course of a year, he would probably say 50,000,000, while another would say 100,000,000, and perhaps a third, 150,000,000. The Estimate for the Department was a very moderate one; and if it turned out that they were wrong, and that those who estimated that a very much larger number of parcels than the Post Office had calculated upon would be carried were right, he could only say that the result would be financially much more favourable than the Post Office had anticipated. The reason why he was not prepared to give such an Estimate as that asked for by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. Lowther) was this—that at the very moment the Parcels Post Bill was passed they commenced making preparations for it. Those preparations were necessarily of a complicated kind. In many instances they had to negotiate for the erection of fresh buildings; and they were not now in a position which would justify them in laying an Estimate before the House. He hoped, however, that before the close of the Session they would be able to give an Estimate, which, though it might contain many elements of doubt, would give to the House a good idea of the probable expenditure and revenue from the Parcels Post.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £29,150, to complete the sum for County Court Buildings.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF desired some explanation on this Vote. There was no explanation given of Subheads B, C, D, E, and F. They had only got the details as to the new works, additions, and purchases. Under the head "Birmingham, Purchase of Site," there was something which apparently required explanation. In the first place, the estimated total cost was £20,000, and the purchase of the site was estimated at £15,000. Last year £15,000 was voted for the site, and apparently £2,000 for the building. This year there was no Vote taken for the building at all. They had spent £15,000 apparently; but they were not going on with the building. The same thing occurred at Edmonton last year. £1,030 was then voted for the enlargements at Edmonton, and yet nothing was to be voted this year. What was the use of mentioning the sum in the Estimate at all? In the case of Middlesbrough they had, moreover, put down £2,000, and in the case of Nottingham £2,500.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that, in order to show the expenditure last year, it was necessary to put the amounts down in this year's Estimates, and to show what work had been done. It was not necessary to take any Vote this year.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF believed that they had put down £2,800 for a building, the estimated cost of which was £20,000.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the remainder of the sum had been voted in previous years.

SIR ANDREW LUSK desired to ask why they should be called upon to pay from the Consolidated Fund for County Court Buildings, as all his hon. Friends who found fault with the Metropolis said that the Metropolis should pay for itself? Presuming that that was the proper view to take, why should the County Courts not be kept up at the expense of the particular districts in which they were situated? Why was Birmingham to have £35,000 of the nation's money any more than London? The Committee would see that Metropolitan Members could find fault or pick holes just as well as Provincial Members. He hoped some authority would tell him on what grounds £35,000 was to be given to Birmingham, and a certain amount to Nottingham, a certain amount to Middlesbrough, and to other places as well.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the County Courts all over the country had been built and maintained at the cost of the Government. Exception had been taken to the Metropolitan Police Courts being paid for out of the National Exchequer, because the Police Courts in the other parts of the country were maintained by the local authority. He was, however, not aware that any objection had been taken to the payments made for County Court Buildings.

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he did not understand why Birmingham should have this Vote at all. The point raised by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) was a very legitimate one.

MR. GORST said, the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had not at all answered the question put by the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff). The question was one which certainly ought to be answered. The estimated total cost of the County Court at Birmingham was £20,000, in addition to the £15,000 for the site. The site was purchased, and then the Government proceeded to spend £20,000 in building. Were they to understand that the Government had paid £15,000 for the site, and had erected upon it a building estimated to cost £20,000, and that they had also spent £2,000 they estimated last year for work. As the matter stood at present it was totally unintelligible.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE explained that the £15,000 was spent last year. The expenditure for the cost of the building was paid for in previous years. It was a fact that the building had been commenced, and no more money was required this year.

MR. J. LOWTHER asked why, in that case, the amount appeared on the Votes?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it was put in to show how the money was spent last year.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it appeared to him that there was something that required explanation about this Vote. He heard, with very considerable surprise, that the estimate of £20,000 was so perfectly accurate that neither more nor less was spent on the building. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman if it was the intention of the Government to propose hereafter a Supplementary Vote for County Court Buildings, in consequence of the increased business which would be imposed upon County Courts by the new Bankruptcy Law?

Mr. WARTON asked why they were not favoured with an explanation of the other sub-heads of the Vote? For instance, under Sub-head "C," why should they not know what rents were paid for the different County Courts all over the Kingdom? There was not a single word said about rents, and yet, in other Estimates, they went into ridiculously minute particulars. In this instance, £14,000 was simply unaccounted for. He wished to ask the Law Officers of the Crown if there was any account of what the rents were that were paid for the County Courts of the Kingdom?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the item was composed of an enormous number of small figures. If the hon. Member wished to obtain details, there would be no objection to his having them.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £4,675, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Metropolitan Police Court Buildings."

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the estimated Extra Receipts included, for 1883-4, an item of over £3,000 payable by the Receiver of the Metropolitan Police, in respect of the new Bow Street Police Station. He should like to know whether this was a new receipt, or whether it had been received in previous years; because, if it was a customary one, it would more properly appear as a set-off against the gross sum.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he did not think it would be in accordance with practice to set this receipt off as against the gross sum. The item arose from the fact that the building in Bow Street was not merely a Police Court, but also a Police Station. The Police Court was provided for out of Imperial funds, whilst the Police Station was paid for out of the Police Fund of the Metropolis. This item was a repayment from the Police Fund, on account of the cost of the new station. The Police Fund was furnished partly by a rate levied over the Metropolitan area, and partly by a contribution from Government.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he proposed to take a division on this Vote, not on account of its specific amount, but on account of its principle. The hon. Baronet the Member for Finsbury (Sir Andrew Lusk) asked why the inhabitants of Finsbury should be called upon to pay for the Courts of Law in Birmingham? It might be as fairly asked —"Why should the inhabitants of Birmingham pay for the Courts of Law in Finsbury?" It was no use going into a discussion of any length upon the matter, as it had been frequently dealt with. No one on the Treasury Bench had pretended to give a satisfactory reason why the country generally should pay for the Police Courts in London. The Government had been frequently asked for a reason, but had never given one, although there had been an implied promise that they would look into the matter at some future time. The hands of the Government would probably be strengthened by a division.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it seemed to him that there was a great deal of disadvantage in the method of proceeding recommended by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) in this matter. The hon. Member seemed to propose that all hon. Members who were not Metropolitan should oppose this Vote for the Police Courts in the Metropolis, and that all the Metropolitan Members should oppose the Votes for Liverpool and other Provincial Police Courts. If that course were adopted, and the principle were carried out still further, by all the Scotch Members voting against the grant to England and Ireland, and the Irish Members against that to Scotland and England, and the English Members against that to Scotland and Ireland, it was difficult to say what would be gained. There was a Vote for County Court Buildings in the country, and one for Sheriffs' Court Houses in Scotland. It was hardly worth while to go to a division on this Vote; and he (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) would propose to the hon. Member for Northampton that he should reserve his energy and resources for some of the Votes which they would come to later on, which were much more objectionable, and would be found much more worthy of opposition.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, the hon. Member for the Queen's County (Mr.

Arthur O'Connor) had referred to the County Court Buildings, and these were all paid for by the country. That, however, was not the case in regard to Police Courts. The Courts in London were the only ones which were paid for by the State, and that was why he opposed the Vote.

MR. WARTON said, he desired to make two observations upon this Vote, which was one of a general character. One observation was that, though the rents of the Police Courts were given, those of the County Courts were not. This matter had been slurred over by the Government, as he had already pointed out. The other suggestion he wished to make was in regard to Wandsworth County Court. It had been his duty, year after year, to call the attention of the Ministry to the disgraceful state of this Court.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. and learned Member refer to the County Court?

MR. WARTON said, he had meant to say Police Court. The rental of the Court to which he referred was £50, and that appeared to him to be an exceedingly large amount for this most beggarly building which could ever be associated with the idea of a Court of Justice. This place was not a Court of Justice at all, but a very inferior house, worth nothing like £50 a-year. It was a wretched room, into which, with the greatest difficulty, some 15 or 20 persons could be stuffed at the peril of their lives. He used these words, "peril of their lives," advisedly, because people who were compelled to breathe the air of such a miserable place as this every day must soon find their vitality considerably vitiated. He had drawn the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works to this subject year after year; but, in spite of that, nothing had been done, the excuse tendered from time to time being that before long a commodious Court would be built somewhere else—at Clapham Junction, if he was not mistaken. On behalf of the magistrates, the dismal policemen, and the wretched criminals brought up there, he appealed to the Government to do something to improve the condition of this Court. He entreated the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works to visit the building, and ventured to say that, if he did so, he (Mr. Warton) would never have to open his mouth again on the subject. It was simply disgraceful that this miserable little cottage, than which hardly a mechanic in the country lived in a worse, and in which it was hardly possible for policeman, prisoner, and prosecutor to squeeze up together, should be used for the administration of justice. It was not only disgraceful, but disgusting—he was now obliged to use strong language, having used mild language without success. Were they, he asked, to be put off from year to year with these excuses? He found the rentals of other Police Courts came to such sums as £265 and £106—he was sure they would not find one so low as that at Wandsworth. It was surprising, seeing that they now lived under a reforming Ministry, that this miserable Police Court had not yet been reformed. He was under this difficulty—that, being a private Member, he could not move to increase the Vote. If he could do so, he should move an addition of at least £60 a-year, in order to provide something like a decent Court for business to be carried on with due regard to public health and public convenience. He would not move the reduction of the Vote, as a reduction was not what he wanted. All he could do was to urge the Government, in the interests of decency and of the lives of the policemen and the public, to provide a Police Court at Wandsworth large enough to accommodate two or three prisoners, a policeman or two, and a magistrate at the same time.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it was usual to send complaints on such matters to the Home Office; and he must say that no representation on the subject had been made to him from that Office. He would point out that the item for Hammersmith was only £40, and Hammersmith was a more important district.

MR. WARTON said, that last year £2,000 was spent on the Hammersmith district, and he would only ask that half as much should be spent on Wandsworth. The reply he had received was a fair sample of the official way of looking at these matters—it showed how carelessly officials treated the subject.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 50; Noes 15: Majority 35.—(Div. List, No. 94.)

(6.) £6,520, to complete the sum for the Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland.

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £42,013, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Purchase of a Site, Erection of Building, and other Expenses for the New Courts of Justice and Offices belonging thereto."

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, there were several points in connection with this Vote to which he wished to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works in regard to the items in the Vote, and some of the arrangements which had been made in the interior of the Law Courts. He would, in the first place, draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the item of furniture. In former days, he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had taken a great deal of interest in the arrangements made for the construction of a new building for the Law Courts. He had had many contests with the First Commissioner of Works on the subject, and had always ventured to point out that if it was thought fit to employ such an architect as Mr. Street, not only would the result be unsatisfactory as to cost and to the public at large, who viewed the building from the outside, but that it would be unsatisfactory to those who had to administer justice in the interior. With regard to cost, he was sorry to say that his prophecy had been realized, inasmuch as the cost had been half as much again as the original Estimate. It was not his intention to go into the question of the tastefulness of the design of the New Courts, as the time for the discussion of that matter had long gone by. They had only now to turn their attention to that which they saw before them, and to endeavour to make the best of it. With regard to the item for furniture, he did not say it was too much; but he would ask the right hon. Gentleman how it was obtained—that was to say, whether the furniture was obtained by contract; whether it was all new; upon whose recommendation were the contracts given; who furnished the designs? Would the right hon. Gentleman give them all these, and the other particulars which had not, up to the present time, been supplied? A short time ago, whilst returning to London from the country, he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had found himself in a railway carriage with a learned Judge, whose duty it was to administer justice in one of the New Courts. He had said to the learned gentleman—"How do you find the Court?" The reply was—"I feel very much as if I was on the top of one of the old-fashioned pulpits, and was preaching a sermon to the world below; and, as regards my own officials, the distance between us is so great, that it is with great difficulty that I can speak with them at all." That learned Judge was not the only person who had made such complaint. Complaints of this kind had been reported in the newspapers as having been made by many of the learned gentlemen who presided at the Courts. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works would, perhaps, explain to the Committee—and it would be to the advantage of the country generally if he would—who was responsible for the great defects in the New Courts. They all knew it was not the right hon. Gentleman who was to blame. Then, was it the deceased architect (Mr. Street), or, if not, who was it? Were the defects admitted? He had seen it stated in the public Press that the right hon. Gentleman had, with that courtesy and attention which always distinguished him, attended to some of the complaints which had been made. Some of the defects complained of he had remedied as well as he could, with the assistance of the able officers connected with his Department. There was no one more ready than he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) to acknowledge the ability of the officials of the Department, and especially to recognize the ability of the architect himself, who was referred to the other night, and whose opinions were, no doubt, worthy of more attention than were those of many of the people who found fault with him. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) did not wish to cast blame on this gentleman or on any other official; and he felt that the right hon. Gentleman would gladly avail himself of that opportunity of making a clear statement of the precise position in which the matter stood in regard to these defects—if the right hon. Gentleman admitted any defects to exist. He also desired the right hon. Gentleman to give them some explanation as to the furniture of the Courts. In the course of his life he had had a great deal to do with contracts for the purchase of furniture; and it had always seemed to him that in furnishing new offices a great deal of money was thrown away by the Government in always insisting upon buying new furniture. Old, thoroughly good, second-hand furniture might be obtained by the First Commissioner of Works on his own discretion. In this way a great deal of money might be saved. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might smile at the proposal; but it did not deserve to be dismissed without full consideration. With regard to free admission to the Great Hall of the New Law Courts, they had always been accustomed —he had been, from his earliest youth— to going into Westminster Hall as a sort of regular, he would not say lounge, but place of assembly or meeting for all those connected with the law. He did not like to use the French term; but they all knew there was a Hall in Paris— and, no doubt, the right hon. Gentleman was acquainted with it—where lawyers and their clients met and walked up and down discussing their business. Westminster Hall had been used in the same way for centuries, and admission to it had always been free. No one had been opposed; but all this had changed since the legal genius of the country had removed from Westminster to the Strand, The new Hall was practically sealed. He had read in a newspaper the other day that the Prime Minister himself, notwithstanding all his eminence, had had some difficulty in passing the Cerberus on guard at the entrance to the Hall. So it was with other persons; everyone who was not known had to give his name and business. The Hall of the Courts no longer remained a place of meeting for lawyers and their clients. Even on off-days, he was not sure that the public could get into the Hall with anything like ease. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether that was so; and he would also ask what were the orders as to admission to the Courts? Were the public to be always excluded? He could understand stringent regulations being laid down at first, for the Courts were like a new toy to a child. Everyone wished to go to them, merely for the sake of seeing them; but, now that the new gloss had worn off, he could not see why the public should not be admitted as freely as they used to be in Westminster Hall.

MR. MONK said, that, before the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works replied, he should like to ask him a question on another point. He did not agree with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) that the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works should have put second-hand furniture in the new Law Courts, but believed the wisest course had been adopted in obtaining new furniture.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK begged the hon. Member's (Mr. Monk's) pardon. He had not said that the Courts should have been supplied throughout with second-hand furniture, but that the right hon. Gentleman should have exercised his discretion in buying second-hand furniture if he saw a favourable opportunity.

MR. MONK said, he quite appreciated the æsthetic taste which had prompted the suggestion; but he would not pursue the matter further. He would call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to page 39 of the Estimates, where it would be seen that the expenditure on the New Courts—that was to say, the purchase money for the land, the direct and indirect compensation of the dispossessed owners of the property, and so forth, had been £835,000; and that, out of that, the charge for vendor's costs, legal expenditure, surveyor's charges, accountants and clerks, amounted to the enormous sum of £99,453. It was almost incredible that more than 12 per cent of the purchase money should have been spent in the legal work of acquiring the land on which the Law Courts were erected. He was afraid the right hon. Gentleman would not be able to give a satisfactory explanation of that circumstance; but the fact remained that nearly £100,000 had been paid for law expenses. He should be glad to know whether Her Majesty's Government had any reply to make on this subject.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, he wished to know what was the position, at the present time, of the contract made with the contractor for these buildings. Had he been paid in full — was the contract finally closed?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he thought his right hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had been rather harsh in the judgment he had passed upon the construction of the Law Courts. The right hon. and learned Gentleman quoted some learned Judge whom he appeared to have met in a railway carriage. Well, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had been in communication with a great many of the Judges on this matter; and although, at first, their criticisms were, in some respects, not altogether favourable—they having complained of draughts, of the absence of curtains, and other minor defects of that kind—he was bound to say that now, after they had had some experience of the Courts, their judgment was almost uniformly favourable. Some of the Judges had even gone out of their way to express to him a favourable opinion, and had said that they did not know any Courts in the country—including those of Manchester —which were supposed to be the best and most complete — which, on the whole, were so suitable for their purpose. As to the criticisms of the Bar, he could not say that they were quite so favourable. They complained of many little defects. They said their desks were not wide enough, that their papers slipped off, and he had had to authorize various improvements from time to time. He hoped that further complaints which might be made would not be serious. On the whole, from what he could gather from the Bench, the Bar, and the public, there could be no doubt that the Courts were suitable for the purpose for which they were designed, and the general verdict had been a favourable one; and he could only say that, so far as his Department was concerned, they were only too glad to make those alterations which were possible, and which would add to the comfort of the Bench and the Bar. When the alterations which were being made and were in contemplation had been completed, there would be no serious cause for complaint, and the Courts would be found to answer the purpose for which they were constructed, and compare favourably with any other Courts in the country. As to furniture, he agreed with the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk), that it would not have been desirable to purchase it second-hand for a building of this description. The furniture in the rooms occupied by the Judges, and in all the principal rooms, had been designed by Mr. Street, the architect, and had been made by several cabinet-makers of the Metropolis. The furniture of the Old Courts had been removed into the offices of the New Courts. It had been necessary to add to it, and there had been a great deal of new furniture bought. The hon. Member for Gloucester had also asked a question about the legal expenses of the purchase of the property. These expenses had been incurred many years ago, before he had had any control over the cost of the Courts; but, so far as he could make out, they had been occasioned by the purchase of the land and of the houses which were demolished to make way for the Courts. The land and houses were acquired compulsorily; and when such a course was adopted, and the properties taken were large in number, the legal expenses were always very heavy. He was not surprised, looking at the extent of the property purchased, the large number of the interests involved, and the various inquiries which had to be made, that the legal expenses were considerable. The interests involved, indeed, had been so diverse, that it had been extremely difficult to purchase them all up. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Maidstone (Captain Aylmer) had asked what was the present position of the contract. The question was one which it was rather difficult to answer. The contractor was not satisfied with the payments made, and had commenced legal proceedings against the Government. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had not, however, yet learnt what was the actual claim made. When the contractor recently got into commercial difficulties, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had seen that, at a meeting of his creditors, most exaggerated statements were made as to the probable claim; but, as yet, no definite demand had been made by the contractor or his assignees. They had commenced legal proceedings in respect of an item of £10,000, which, under the contract, was to have been paid on completion of the work; but the contention of the Government was that full payment had been made whilst the work had been going on, and that they were now under no legal liability whatever.

However, that was a legal question, which he did not think the House would expect him to enter into more minutely. All he could say was that, beyond this special demand to which he referred, they had no information of any definite claim of the exaggerated nature described in some of the newspapers. As to free admission into the Hall, on completion of the building it was handed over to the Lord Chancellor, ; and, as it was believed that a large number of persons would want to visit it, it was thought desirable to put the admission under some sort of regulation. Whether the regulations which had been laid down, however, would continue for the future, he could not say; but he thought it probable that when the novelty of the thing had worn off, and the discipline was more perfect, the regulations would be altered. The public were admitted to the Courts themselves by a separate entrance, and not through the Hall; therefore, there was not the same obvious reason for admitting the public into the new Hall which there had been in the case of Westminster Hall.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he wished to ask some question about the legal expenses, which appeared to him to be of a most exaggerated character. In the first place, there was the item, "Vendor's costs, £39,000." That amount, he supposed, represented legal expenses. The Government's own legal expenses were £29,000, the two sums making £68,000. Parliamentary expenses—that was to say, expenses of Parliamentary agents and of the Royal Commission — were £17,000. These, again, were legal expenses. Altogether, the legal expenses, with the surveyor's charges—which, he supposed, ought to be grouped with legal items—came to £94,000—a very large percentage upon an expenditure of, say, £2,000,000. Some explanation should be given on this subject. He could understand the vendor's costs coming to a large amount, irrespective of the costs of the Government; but when they came to the expenses of the purchasers, and when it was remembered what a large staff they had at the Treasury, it seemed to him that the charge which was made was beyond all reason, and ought to be closely looked into. He saw an item of £25,000 put down as the architect's commission. Did he get 5 per cent commission? [MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Yes.] How much more was he to get? He had got £25,000 already, and something out of Vote "B" this year which was not specified; and, as far as he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) could gather, he was entitled to £47,000, which would be the ordinary sum given to an architect, and they might have no right to complain about it. He did, however, think they had a right to complain of this enormous sum for the legal expenses of the Government, seeing that the Government had permanent officials, who were bound to carry on the work of the Government at a much lower rate than this. The legal items appeared to have swelled up enormously.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE pointed out that the legal expenses in question had been incurred 12 years ago, so that it was too late now to take exception to them. No doubt they had been commented upon year after year; but if any serious fault was to be found it should have been found years ago with the Government of the day.

MR. GREGORY said, he could give some explanation of the items for legal expenses. These arrangements—which were carried out years ago—were of a very complicated nature, the titles to the property being various, and every tenement having its owner, its occupier, and its lessee. Titles had to be investigated; claims for compensation for disturbance had to be gone into. A learned friend of his, and a large staff of clerks, were occupied for two years in going through the titles. The vendors' costs had to be paid by the purchaser, which accounted for the item of £29,000 referred to. [MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The vendors' costs were £39,000.] Well, £39,000. That amount had to be paid. All these expenses were necessary. Of course, they could be taxed, and he believed they had been taxed by his late friend, Mr. Field, who was not a man to admit extravagant claims against his clients. The claims for compensation were very numerous, and a large staff of clerks were engaged in investigating them. To make room for the Courts, a mass of small properties had to be acquired, and anyone who recollected these properties would not be surprised at the items for legal expenses. He himself had a very lively recollection of the properties, and their owners and occupiers, and of the immense number of assignments, leases, mortgages, and so on, which had to be considered. He could very easily understand that a large sum was required for investigating the titles and acquiring the properties. The transactions in respect of which these items were submitted took place years ago, and had been sanctioned by the House over and over again, although he had no doubt they could be well defended independently of any considerations of that kind. To his mind, the Government had got good value for the money they had expended. With regard to the furniture, he could not agree with the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) that there had been undue expenditure in that respect. All the old furniture which it was possible to take to the new building had been used. There was only one point to which he would venture to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, and that was the provision for accommodation in the Courts. The accommodation was not sufficient. The jury boxes, in particular, ought to have been more commodious, and better adapted to the proper performance of the duties of the jury. Juries had to be in attendance day after day, and while engaged in trying a case had to have all their faculties alive. They had to take notes of the evidence and observations of the conduct of a case; and, above all things, it was necessary that they should have a comfortable place in which to perform the duties they were called upon to discharge. In the jury boxes of the new, as well as of the old, Courts they found 12 men, in a narrow compass, sitting as close together as it was possible to sit, and with no means of writing or taking notes. He had hoped that when the New Courts were constructed, some better accommodation would have been provided for the juries than was given in the Old Courts. He could not help thinking that if the right hon. Gentleman gave a little consideration to the matter, he would find it possible, without much trouble, to greatly facilitate the administration of the duties of the juries—to give them that which was really their due in the performance of those duties which had to be gratuitously undertaken, and which, generally speaking, were so well performed.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, it appeared to him they had hardly had a sufficient explanation of the item "C," which was £15,000 for furniture. If hon. Gentlemen would turn to page 26, under Vote "8" for furniture of Public Offices of Great Britain, they would find a note to the effect that the Estimate "provided for the furniture of the Public Offices and the Courts of Law in London and Edinburgh, with some exceptions, as stated below." Amongst the exceptions "stated below" he did not find the New Law Courts and Offices; and it struck him as strange that after the Government had made a demand under Vote 8 for the cost of the furniture of the Offices and Courts, they should in this Vote make a separate demand for £15,000. When the question had been before the House on a previous occasion, he had endeavoured to elicit a certain amount of information from successive occupants of the Treasury Bench, either as officers of the Board of Works, or of the Treasury; but had never succeeded in obtaining anything of a satisfactory nature from them. He would move to reduce the Vote by £15,000, as a protest against the system under which this furniture service was conducted, and in order to enable the right hon. Gentleman to give them some information on the subject. He should like to know whether any furniture was made by the Board of Works; and, if it was, where it was stored? Had the Board of Works any store of furniture at all; if the furniture was not made by the Board of Works, how was it procured? Was it bought ready made, or was it made to order? They knew very well that some of the furniture of the House of Commons, particularly the small lockers, had been made to order at a most extravagant price. It was absolutely impossible to conceive how anyone could conscientiously have determined to spend so much on these lockers. It seemed to him very probable that the person who made the lockers for such an enormous sum had supplied some of the furniture to the New Law Courts. There was a great similarity of character in the furniture and the lockers. If the furniture had been bought ready made, from whom had it been procured; and, if it was made to order, who were the favoured individuals who, year after year, got the orders? Was the furniture made by contract; and, if so, were tenders invited by advertisement? If tenders were invited by advertisement, where could the advertisements be seen? He had inquired for advertisements inviting contracts published by the Government, but had never been able to find a single one; and he had more than once heard that there was a great deal of jobbery in connection with this matter. It was impossible for hon. Members to ascertain how much was spent on furniture. Furniture was charged for in driblets, under 20 or 30 Votes, besides Vote 8. The right hon. Gentleman said this Vote was to cover the whole charge for furniture for the Courts of Justice in London; but there seemed to be a separate charge of £15,000 under the Vote they were discussing. He could not say how many Votes there were which ought to be covered by Vote 8, but were not. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would give them some information on the point. He (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) had said enough to show that there was something ridiculous in the way the furniture system was administered at the present time. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £15,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £27,013, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the purchase of a Site, Erection of Building, and other expenses for the New Courts of Justice and Offices belonging thereto."—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it appeared to him that many of the observations to which the Committee had listened on this subject would have been more properly made on Vote 8, which was passed when the hon. Member who had just spoken (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) was not in the House. The present Vote simply had reference to the New Law Courts, and did not raise the question of the furniture. He had already stated that the furniture for the Law Courts was not bought ready made, but was designed by the late Mr. Street, the architect, and that for its supply tenders were asked for and received from the principal furniture makers in the Metropolis. It had not been thought desirable to invite all the world to tender. The ordinary rule was followed, which was to ask the leading members of the trade to tender. A great deal of furniture was repaired in premises attached to that House.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether the Government manufactured furniture for themselves anywhere else?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE replied, that furniture was also made in premises belonging to the Board of Works. All he had to say, in reply to the observations of the hon. Member on this subject was, that it was necessary to supply furniture for this enormous building. The sum of £6,000 was spent in December, £8,000 between January and March, and a further expenditure had become necessary. This money had been spent on furniture absolutely supplied. He could only say that any hon. Member who went round the Courts and examined the furniture in the Judges' Rooms, and in the other rooms of this great building, would go away thoroughly satisfied that the sum which had been spent was a reasonable one.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he was of opinion that all the sums required for the furniture of Public Offices should appear under one Vote—Vote 8—instead of being scattered over many Votes, or else that the whole charges for each Department for furniture and buildings should be arranged under the special Vote for the Departments concerned.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he ought to have stated that the new furniture supplied to the Law Courts was paid for under the present Vote. Next year there would be no occasion for repeating it, for when the building was complete the cost of maintaining and repairing old furniture and supplying new furniture would come under Vote 8.

Sir ANDREW LUSK said, he wished to know how they stood with the contractor—that was to say, he desired to have a little more information on the point than had been given by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Public Works. He had read in the newspapers—and they generally had some reason for what they stated—that the contractor was going to make a large claim. He was claiming £10,000, which was a very small sum in regard to such an enormous building. If the claim were for £100,000 or £200,000 it would be a different thing. Who was working on the building now—the old contractor or a new one? The Government, of course, had plenty of money to pay, although, naturally, they did not wish to pay unless they were morally and legally bound to do so.

Captain AYLMER said, he was glad the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Andrew Lusk) had introduced the question of contracts. He (Captain Aylmer) wished to refer to a subject which he believed was the cause of considerable difficulty to hon. Members, and certainly to himself—that was to say, the extraordinary manner in which the charges for similar items were spread over a number of Estimates. In Vote 8, which had been passed, there was a charge for the supply of furniture to the Courts of Law; and here again, under the present Vote, there was another charge for the supply of new furniture to the main building. To his (Captain Aylmer's) mind, there was no distinction whatever between the "supply of furniture" and the "supply of new furniture," as it was expressed in the Estimates, unless the former was intended to refer to second-hand furniture. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had explained that the maintenance of furniture would always appear under Vote 8. Now, he wished to know whether in the £30,000, the total sum asked for, was included the supply of furniture for the New Law Courts? It ought to be stated why there was a difference between the original Estimate column and the revised Estimate.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, Vote 8 related to the supply of furniture to the Courts of Law in every part of the country, the whole of it being included under that Vote. With regard to the furniture for the New Law Courts, that was treated as a special item, and was included in one Vote as "New Furniture." It was quite impossible that the supply of new furniture to such an enormous building as the New Law Courts could be included in the sum of £30,000 to which the hon. Member referred. He would repeat to the Committee what he had already stated upon the subject of the contracts. All he knew was that the contractor, at a meeting of his creditors, had made a statement of an exaggerated kind with regard to his claim upon the Government. It was only within the last two days that he learned that his demand amounted to £10,000. He was, however, advised that the Government had already paid the contractor the full value of the work done. He was bound to say that the late Mr. Street, one of the most careful men of business he had ever been in contact with, and who had made an estimate of the first cost of the building, which proved to be most correct, shortly before his death stated that the contractors were rather overpaid than underpaid. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had the greatest confidence in the opinion of Mr. Street, and had never seen any reason for altering that view. The main contract was completed; but he should point out that there were certain subsidiary contracts for fittings and other matters, which remained to be fulfilled. Some of those were being carried out by the assignees of the contractor, who would be paid for the work out of the sum now asked for. The view of the Government was that the main contractor had been fully paid, and that he had no further claim. That, however, was a legal question, and it might turn out that the contractor was entitled to something.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he was somewhat disappointed at not having succeeded in eliciting from the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works the information for which he had asked. The right hon. Gentleman had said, very truly, that the proper Vote upon which to raise the general question with regard to furniture was Vote 8; but, seeing that the furniture item for the Law Courts ought to have been included in Vote 8, but was not, it seemed to him that all the reasons which would have been pertinent upon that Vote were pertinent upon this. At any rate, this Vote was one which had gone on for several years, and even now it did not cover the total sum that would be asked for. Therefore, it would be continued next year. If it did exhaust the total amount, it was well that he should make such remarks as he wished to make upon it now, instead of deferring them till next year, when they might be too late. He would, therefore, repeat the question he had already put, as to furniture not having been supplied to the Law Courts. Where was the stock of furniture which was under the control of the Board of Works? If there was no such store, what became of the enormous quantities of furniture which year after year became unfit for further use? What would become of the refuse furniture from the Old Law Courts? Where would it be stored, and into whose hands would it fall? Did the right hon. Gentleman not know perfectly well that there was a great deal of public money spent over furniture, year after year, which ought not to be spent; and that there was a great deal of public money wasted—that tradesmen had, year after year, got power to supply furniture to Public Offices, and then charged monstrously high sums for what could have been got in the open market very much cheaper? There was a monstrous waste of public money, and no adequate check was exercised. Unless he got a more satisfactory answer he must persist in his Motion.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he must decline to be drawn into a general discussion on furniture. The Committee had, a short time ago, had this question before it; but the hon. Member was not present, and he was now attempting to raise the whole question of the general furnishing Department of the Government. Into that he must decline to follow the hon. Member, the only question before the Committee being the furniture for the Law Courts; and he had explained, over and over again, that that had been supplied by contract from designs by Mr. Street.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman was a reason why he should vote for the reduction of the Estimate, although he thought the reduction proposed was rather too large. By the admission of the right hon. Gentleman the Department had made a great mistake. They had made a mistake—first, by allowing Mr. Street to have anything to do with the furniture. He was not an upholsterer; but he was well known to have peculiar ideas on Art, and he had endeavoured to carry out those ideas in furnishing this new building. The notion that an architect was to furnish the building which he himself had erected and designed according to his own view was entirely opposed to all the ideas of the olden masters, however much it might be in harmony with modern ideas. No case was known of in which the old masters in architecture furnished the buildings they erected. Sir Charles Barry had erected and furnished the Houses of Parliament; but he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) should say the furniture was decidedly uncomfortable. It was enormously expensive; but it was not more sightly or comfortable than much less expensive furniture would have been. Another point was that when an architect was allowed to design the furniture he had to receive commission upon it; and the right hon. Gentleman would not say that Mr. Street had not received commission upon the designs for furniture. Much more comfortable and better furniture might have been bought, and by that he did not mean that the furniture should not be ornamental. Then he wished to know whether chimney pieces were included in this Vote, because they were formidable items? During the construction of the Law Courts, he had ventured to point out that there were a number of fine chimney pieces, 250 years old, coming into the market, which could be bought cheap; and he had suggested to the right hon. Gentleman's Predecessor that they would be a very desirable purchase, as they were in every way suited to these Courts. The then First Commissioner said he would inquire into the matter; but, of course, if he spoke to Mr. Street, that gentleman would naturally throw cold water upon the suggestion. He would naturally object to putting old things into a new building, for the simple reason that he would not receive any commission. By keeping a constant look out, the First Commissioner might save a great deal of money; and there was surely nothing so extravagant as giving commission to an architect to design any furniture he pleased, and then have it made by somebody else. It was because he thought that system was entirely erroneous that, although he thought the reduction was too large, he should vote for it as a protest.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he should like to state, in reference to the remarks just made, that in the Law Courts at Manchester, the largest legal building in the country, next to these New Law Courts, the furniture was designed by the architect, Mr. Waterhouse, and the furnishing was carried out by him in the same manner as that here proposed. He regretted that the general question of furniture could not be now raised, for here was a proposal to take nearly £50,000; and he was sure that if that question could be gone into it would be found that the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works might reasonably be asked to effect considerable economy. But, as they were now on the furniture for the New Law Courts, and those Courts must, of course, have furniture, he hoped the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) would not press his Amendment.

Mr. WARTON said, he greatly regretted to see that the Government seemed to treat the Committee in a see-saw manner, for when one hon. Member asked for a general explanation no answer was given him; and then, when furniture came up again in another Vote, hon. Members were told they were too late. They were always either too soon or too late; and the moral to be drawn was that they must not pass Votes hastily. He was certain, however, that he was not too late to raise the question of the architect's commission. They were told that the architect was paid 5 per cent; but there were still £22,000 or £23,000 more to be paid him, and why had that not been cleared off? They hoped to come to an end of these Law Court expenses some day, and there ought to have been some estimate for the architect's commission. Why was there no Estimate this year? When was the commission to be paid off? With regard to the furniture, it seemed to him to be dangerous to trust an architect, who had peculiar ideas with respect to furniture, with the designing of furniture in such a case as this. It would have been far better to have some of the good old sound sort of furniture, which would have been a good deal more useful than any that would now be supplied. He should have liked some opportunity of protesting against this system; and he hoped that next year there would be a far more exhaustive discussion on this point.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the architect in this case was paid 5 per cent up to £35,000 on a total estimate of £700,000; but it was arranged that he should not receive more than that amount in any case. Mr. Street had been paid already £25,000, and about £10,000 remained to be paid. He had received one-third of the amount when one-third of the buildings was complete, and that accounted for the small amount paid; but the total would not exceed £35,000, and that included the commission on the furniture and everything else.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he was always reluctant to differ with his right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck); but, without laying claim to being an expert in these matters, he must say that he was very much disposed to agree with the policy of allowing the responsible architect, in cases of this kind, to undertake the furnishing. The question of commission might, perhaps, fairly be a subject for comment; but commission was obtained by someone, whether it took the nominal form of commission, or of profit to the upholsterer. He thought the Government would greatly facilitate Business if they would afford full information at the earliest possible moment. The hon. Gentleman behind him (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) had endeavoured to elicit some information with regard to this Vote; but the Government had omitted to supply information which was very properly demanded, and what was the result? The same questions had been repeated; and, no doubt, during the present Session, frequent occasion would arise for the same questions being again asked. The right hon. Gentleman said the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) was out of Order in asking for information involving the whole question of furniture on the Vote now under discussion; but he (Mr. J. Lowther) misunderstood the hon. Member to distinctly limit his remarks to this particular Vote—simply to the arrangements made for the renewal of furniture, and for storage of the old furniture. It seemed to him that the Government could have disposed of that matter in a couple of sentences. According to his experience of public buildings, when any article of furniture became unfit for use therein, it was high time that it was finally disposed of. He thought the Government would expedite Business if they gave full information at the earliest possible moment, and would answer the questions put to them, and so clear up points of difference, instead of leaving them to be repeated over and over again.

MR. FIRTH said, he could not support the Amendment, because the question of storage had not yet arisen.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, it seemed to him that it was admitted that this furniture had cost a good deal too much; but then, he imagined, from what he had seen in that House, that furniture almost always did cost too much. He would suggest to the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) to reduce his Amendment to £5,000. Even £10,000 would be too large an amount; but the hon. Member went too far when he proposed to strike out the whole amount. Even a prisoner had a chair and table in his cell; and, of course, there must be some furniture for the Law Courts. The question was not whether the Courts should have been furnished, but whether the amount was more than it should have been. He had no doubt it was in excess, and the Government knew that the furniture might have been bought by a private individual for very much less. What he wanted to bring to their minds was that, as public officials, they must practise the economy they would practise in their own houses. He did not object to paying for furniture; but he did object to paying too much for it. There was one other item to which he wished to call attention, and that was the commission, amounting to £35,000, for the architect. They were about to have some further large buildings erected; and, therefore, it was desirable that they should come to an understanding that the architect was not to have a commission of 5 per cent upon the amount spent. In the case of private buildings, when an architect received 5 per cent he was required to find his own clerks of works; but, in this instance, clerks of works were provided for the architect by the State. The architect, therefore, received 5 per cent clear. Moreover, in the case of an erection of a large private building, the person building it invariably made a bargain with the architect for some lump sum. Five per cent was very seldom given, and then only in the case of small buildings. His right hon. Friend the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) knew quite well that if he himself were building a house which was estimated to cost £1,000,000 sterling, he would not give to an architect anything like 5 per cent commission. He (Mr. Labouchere) hoped his hon. Friend (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) would assent to his suggestion, and, instead of proposing so large a reduction as £15,000, would propose a reduction only of £5,000.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had not been in the House during the whole of the discussion, and, therefore, had not heard what he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had said during the earlier part of the evening. It was necessary, therefore, that he should repeat that, in the case of furnishing the New Law Courts, tenders were invited from all the leading members of the trade, and what was considered the most satisfactory tender was accepted. With regard to the architect's commission, the hon. Member further appeared not to have heard what he had said, which was that a limitation was put upon the amount of the commission. The architect did not receive 5 per cent upon the total amount—his commission was 5 per cent up to the sum of £35,000. Had he received 5 per cent upon the whole amount, his commission would have amounted to something like £42,000 or £43,000.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that, under Sub-head C, page 38, there appeared for the supply of new furniture for new buildings the sum of £30,000, of which £15,000 was voted last year. On page 39 there was another item for fittings and furniture of £15,093. Might he inquire whether the latter sum was in addition to the £30,000, or was it included in that item?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said, the sum mentioned on page 39 was part of the sum voted in the past year.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF doubted the accuracy of the figures, and thought that the amount ought to be £45,000 instead of £30,000.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR thought there was a good deal of force in what the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had said; and, therefore, he would ask leave to withdraw his Motion to reduce the Vote by £15,000. He, however, considered that £15,000 was too much to pay for furniture; and, therefore, he should propose to reduce the sum by £1,500.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £40,513, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Purchase of a Site, Erection of Building, and other Expenses for the New Courts of Justice and Offices belonging thereto."—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 30; Noes 79: Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 95.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £192,500, to complete the sum for Surveys of the United Kingdom.

Mr. WARTON, rising to Order, said, this was a Vote which related to Ireland as well as to England; and he believed it was generally understood by the Committee that Irish matters would not be taken that night, in consequence of the absence of Irish Members.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Member for Bridport raises a question of Order. It appears to me no question of Order is involved at all.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he felt bound to raise his annual objection to the Vote, which provided for a portion of pay and allowance of the military officers and men employed on the Survey being borne by the Army Estimates. So long as the Survey was carried on under the War Office, and the whole expense borne by the Army Votes, this mode of showing the pay of officers and men was unobjectionable; but, now that the Survey was under the Chief Commissioner of Works, it was only just that the Army should be freed from this financial demand. There were 500 men of the Army employed in the surveying of the United Kingdom; and he objected to any charge in regard to Surveys being placed on the Army.

Captain AYLMER said, that, having pressed on the Government last year the necessity of hurrying on the Survey of Great Britain, he was glad to observe there was an increase in the Estimates. He thought the Committee would be glad to hear what advance had been made in the Survey; they would be pleased, he was sure, to be told that more had been done during the past year than in the previous year. There was one point particularly to which he was anxious to call attention, and it was a very important matter indeed to the Service. The amount of money voted for extra pay and allowance for non-commissioned officers and sappers had remained the same—that was, £17,500; but the amount for the pay, &c., of civil assistants, meresmen, and labourers had been increased from £167,307 to £190,637—an increase of £23,330. There were 323 sappers employed, and during the year their number had not been increased, though they did not cost per head more, or even as much as the civil labourers, in regard to whom the Vote had been increased by £23,330. He desired to know why the Government had not employed more sappers in the Survey? They, no doubt, would be told that the war in Egypt had taken a good many sappers away; but he believed that nothing so much promoted recruiting or respect for the Army as the way the sappers had behaved in the surveying of land all over the country. The civil assistants had been increased in number from 2,600 to 2,920. In his opinion, it would have been a very wise step had the greater part of the increase consisted of sappers.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he wished to revert to the point of Order raised by the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton). It was distinctly understood, on the assurance of the Prime Minister, that no question would be taken that day which referred to Ireland. Now, this Vote was quite as much an Irish one as an English one. There was an increase in the Vote, and that increase was undoubtedly caused by the proceedings before the Land Judges in Ireland; and he would merely put it to the Government whether, considering the strict pledge given by the Prime Minister that no Irish question would be taken until next Monday, they were still inclined to proceed with this Vote that night?

Mr. COURTNEY said, the promise made was that no purely Irish Vote would be taken that night, and that promise would be observed. This Vote was not an Irish Vote, although, certainly, it had some reference to Ireland. If any Irish Member were to get up and object to the Vote being taken, there would be no objection whatever to its postponement.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he fully agreed that this Vote hardly came under the category of an Irish Vote; but he would observe it contained an item referring to a matter of an extremely controversial character in connection with Irish affairs —namely, an item for maps used by a tribunal which certainly did not stand very high in the estimation of a large number of hon. Gentlemen in the House, nor, he believed, in the estimation of a large majority of the people of the country. He referred to the Land Court. The Government were running considerable risk of unfavourable comments being made upon the unsatisfactory character of that tribunal, though he (Mr. J. Lowther) did not intend to go into that matter. What, however, he wished to ask was, whether the Government could afford them any reliable information as to the progress which had been made in the Survey? The Survey had now extended over a very long period of time; and he must own to having some doubt as to whether any practical progress had been made. He had himself seen small bodies of men—no doubt very industrious persons—engaged in endeavouring to carry out these Surveys. A great portion of the Survey of the United Kingdom was still incomplete; and he was sure the Committee would like to learn exactly what progress had been made, in what counties the Survey was complete, in how many it was in progress, and in how many counties a practical commencement had been made. Perhaps, if an answer could be made to these questions, the discussion would be very much shortened.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. Lowther) could not have taken the trouble to read the Report very recently laid before the House by Colonel Cooke, who was at the head of the Survey Department. In that Report there was a detailed statement of the progress made in consequence of the acceleration in the Survey in the last two years. During the last two years there had been surveyed 2,174,000 acres, as compared with 1,070,000 acres in the two previous years. That was a very great acceleration of work, and he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) considered it fully accounted for the increase of the Vote. The fact was, the Vote was increased in consequence of a general desire expressed by the House two years ago. He believed that the Survey would, under the altered circumstances, be completed by 1890, 10 years sooner than was originally contemplated. That would be a satisfactory return for the large increase of money which had been voted in the last few years. He could not give much information regarding the employment of sappers; but he thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Captain Aylmer) would discover that the War Office could not, during the past year, spare a larger number of sappers for surveying than had been employed. He thought there had been some difficulty in obtaining sappers; but he would inquire further into the matter, and acquaint the hon. and gallant Gentleman with the result. As to the work of Survey in the particular counties, the right hon. Gentleman opposite would find a full and detailed account in the Report of the Survey Department, which was laid last year on the Table of the House. That Report showed when the work would be commenced and completed in each county. He was sorry to say that the county which the right hon. Gentleman himself represented was one of the last on the list—that was to say, the completion of the Survey for Lincolnshire would be somewhat late. He believed that, on the whole, it was wise to leave the determination of such matters to the head of the Department. The work had been regulated entirely with reference to the public interest, every regard being had to economy as well as to the efficiency of the work. He could not let this Vote pass without expressing his regret that Colonel Cooke had ceased to be head of the Survey Department, and to say how much the Public Service had benefited by that gentleman's labours. He had effected great reforms in the Department itself, which had led to a great saving of the money of the country.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that unlike the hon. Members to whom the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had just replied, he had taken the trouble to read the Report of the Ordnance Survey Department; and on page 10 he found that for the uncultivated districts of Wales, Scotland, and Dartmouth, the larger scale on which the maps were drawn was six inches per mile, and for the rest of Great Britain the scale was 25 inches. The latter scale was one which was exceedingly useful. Unfortunately for Ireland, he observed that the large scale they had was 6 inches per mile. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works would inform Irish Members how large the scale would be for Ireland? There were other questions with regard to the price of the maps, which might be taken up; but he would not go into such details at the present time. With regard to the Land Courts, he asked last year what the Government intended to do, in order to secure the repayment by the Land Court of the expenses which they threw on the surveying parties; and he was told—he believed by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury—that though there had been reason to complain of arrears of payment, the amount of arrears was very considerably reduced. Now, since that time, he found that the arrears had arisen from £10,700 on the 31st of March, 1881, to £11,300 on the 31st of March, 1882. That was to say that, at the very time the hon. Gentleman stated the amount of arrears was considerably reduced, the reverse was the fact. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could inform the Committee how the accounts stood between the Landed Estates Court and the Treasury?

Mr. COURTNEY, in reply, was understood to say that he could give no satisfactory answer to the question of the hon. Member. In spite of the utmost pressure they had been unable to obtain payment from the solicitors to whom the maps were supplied; and he should be very glad if any hon. Member could tell them how they could obtain payment.

Mr. BIGGAR thought that the maps, so far as Ireland was concerned, should be on as large a scale as possible. Many of the properties were very small; and, seeing that now a large number of the tenants held their farms for 15 years certain, it was desirable that there should be no controversy as to the extent and boundaries of the different holdings. If the maps were on a small scale the result must be that the boundaries could not be clearly defined, and a large amount of litigation and difficulty would arise. A map on a small scale might do very well for a year or two, when the parties to an arrangement who knew the facts of the case were still alive; but at the end of 15 or 30 years, as the case might be, the fact of having no map on a large scale might lead to a great deal of inconvenience and controversy. One peculiarity of the Irish Landed Estates Court was this—it held that the last title was the best; so that if a mistake was made in the transfer, and notice was not given of it by one party to the other, there was no opportunity subsequently of rectifying it. There were some cases in which it had been clearly shown that land had been conveyed to people who had no right to it.

Mr. MOLLOY said, the answer of the hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury was most extraordinary. Last year the hon. Member stated that the arrears were actually being collected; but to-night he informed the Committee that, so far from that being the case, the information he then gave—and which it was to be presumed he obtained from the officials of his Department—was incorrect. At the moment the hon. Member made his statement last year the amount was being increased by £1,000; and the hon. Gentleman now stated that they had made every endeavour to obtain the arrears, but without success, and that he would be glad if any hon. Member would tell him how to get the money. Surely, it was a most extraordinary thing for a Financial Secretary to ask the House to help him to recover debts of this kind, not from poor persons, not from tenantry in a starving condition, but from gentlemen who belonged to what was generally believed to be a lucrative Profession — namely lawyers. Surely it was most extraordinary for him to be obliged to say that he had given these gentlemen credit to the extent of £11,000, and was unable to collect a farthing of money. He (Mr. Molloy) did not wish to say anything discourteous about the hon. Member's Office; but it was obvious that there must be something rotten in his state of Denmark. Did the Financial Secretary mean to abandon this claim altogether? If so, and the attorneys of Ireland were to be allowed to take £11,000 of Government money without objection, the precedent was one which would be followed to a very large extent. The attorneys should be compelled to repay to the Government the money they had received in the shape of maps. He (Mr. Molloy) would put this to the Financial Secretary distinctly—Was it the fact that he abandoned his claim to the £11,000, and his

Office was in such a state that he was obliged to appeal to the Committee for advice as to how he could collect the money?

Mr. COURTNEY was understood to say that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Molloy) had added a good deal to his statement. He did not remember having made the observations attributed to him last year, at which time he was new in his present Office, and could have known very little about the matter. He had been in communication with the authorities in Ireland on the subject of recovering the money; but he was bound to admit he did not see any prospect of obtaining payment. The matter had been on foot for some years, the debts having arisen through the supply of maps to litigants, on the order of the Judges, to facilitate the decision of cases in the Land Court. The maps were to be paid for by the parties interested; but the lawyers had been unable to obtain the money from their clients, and said, when applied to to discharge the obligation—"It is hard to expect us to pay, when we cannot get the money from our clients." He admitted the force of the observations of the hon. Member opposite as to the policy of recovering the money; but it must always be borne in mind that, in many cases in which maps had been supplied, there had been no sale, and that, therefore, there was no one to pay the cost.

Mr. J. LOWTHER considered this a most extraordinary statement. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Courtney) told them that an order had been given by a so-called judicial tribunal for maps to be supplied to litigants before these Courts.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he had not referred to political litigants. He knew what the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. J. Lowther) had in his mind; but these maps were not supplied to litigants in the Land Court constituted a few years ago, but to litigants in the Landed Estates Court.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the hon. Gentleman had said "the Land Court;" and it was, therefore, to be presumed that he referred to the political Court constituted a short time ago, as, if he had used the term Landed Estates Court, everybody would have at once known what tribunal he alluded to. The Committee, then, were given to understand that the Landed Estates Court ordered the maps, without holding out any prospect that they would be paid for. Surely that was a most extraordinary method of procedure; and he hoped that in the future no similar order would be allowed to issue from the Land Court, or, at any rate, that the public Treasury would not allow any maps to be distributed in that way. He (Mr. J. Lowther) cordially re-echoed what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, as to the claim on the public consideration of the late Director of the Ordnance Survey, and in his expression of regret that the public were about to be deprived of the active services of that gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman would afford valuable information to the Committee and the public if he would state the arrangement which had been made to fill the place of the Director of the Ordnance Survey.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: Colonel Stoddart has been appointed by the War Office to supply the place of the late Director of the Ordnance Survey.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that, apparently, this Vote not only applied to the Landed Estates Court in Ireland, but seemingly to the surveys in connection with the Land Commission. In the Report that had been referred to on page 23 there was an item referring to that Commission for the survey of two estates containing 916 acres, and of three glebes. Seemingly, a great many maps were supplied last year to the Land Commission; therefore, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in this year's Estimate, anything had been included for the surveys supplied to the Land Commission; if these surveys had been supplied; had they been paid for; and, was there any further provision made in the Estimates for this year's expenses for surveys of the same kind? It appeared to him that if there were no Estimate for similar surveys, it was a thoroughly Irish question which should be considered under an Irish Vote.

Mr. MOLLOY said, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Courtney) declared that he had been unable to get the money from the lawyers, because they had been unsuccessful in their endeavours to obtain it from their clients. At any rate, some hon. Members had had experience of the Landed Estates Court, and they knew perfectly well that the lawyers had secured their costs. No doubt, if any expense had been incurred in regard to maps, the lawyers had been recouped; and that was the reason why the Government should insist upon the full payment of these arrears. If the arrears were not paid, then the names of those solicitors who were in default should be made public, so that people who had had dealings with the Landed Estates Court might know whether or not the attorneys they had employed had handed over to the Government the money which they had received from their clients.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the hon. Member (Mr. Courtney) had stated that these maps were only supplied on the order of the Judge in the Landed Estates Court; but it now appeared that they had also been supplied in connection with the Land Commission. Well, the two cases seemed to him to be entirely different. The Judges in the Land Court, under the Act of 1881, had had pressure brought to bear upon them, in order that they might discharge their duty as rapidly as possible; and if they had had recourse to the maps of the Government Survey they might be excused, and excuse might also be made to those who, in this matter, had given credit to the solicitors. There might be some cases in which the solicitors had not yet received their costs; but none of these arguments would apply in the case of the Landed Estates Court. In regard to that tribunal things were very different, because clients had had to pay their full costs. Whoever went short, the costs had to be paid; it being necessary to pay the purchase money into Court, and the Court having power to charge these individual amounts with any costs which had accrued, owing to the order of the Court itself. The costs were fixed before the money was paid. It seemed to him that the suggestion of his hon. Friend (Mr. Molloy) was an exceedingly reasonable one—namely, that the names of those attorneys who had not paid for the maps that had been supplied to them should be made public; because, in that way, the litigants who had paid for maps would see whether or not the money they had parted with for that purpose had been refunded to the Court. Under the circumstances, seeing that these maps were supplied by order of the Judges of the Landed Estates Court, if the attorneys refused to pay, the Courts should be empowered to strike their names off the rolls.

Mr. COURTNEY was understood to say that, as he had already stated, where there were no results—that was to say, where no sale followed upon the proceedings in the Landed Estates Court—no money passed; and, therefore, the attorneys had nothing wherewith to pay for the maps supplied by order of the Court.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that in the document the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had called his attention to a short time ago, he saw an item under the head "The Land Commission," which the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) had just pointed out, in which details were given as to the supply of plans and reports relating to the survey of two estates. Could the hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury give them an assurance that if maps in the future were required by the Land Commission they would not be supplied without fee?

Mr. COURTNEY was understood to say that he did not believe any maps had been supplied to the Land Commission; but he would make inquiries to ascertain whether that really was so or not. If maps had been supplied without being paid for, the practice ought to be discontinued.

Mr. BIGGAR pointed out that if all the arrears to which reference had been made were due some three years ago, debts might be accruing in respect of these cases even now, because, as they were aware, the Landed Estates Court was a very tedious tribunal. Debts might even yet be accumulating.

Vote *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £21,379, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1884, for erecting and maintaining new Buildings, including Rents, &c., for the Department of Science and Art."

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished to be furnished with some explanation of an Estimate of £3,000 for frescoes.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that of the item of £3,000 only £1,000 was to be paid this year. The Estimate was in regard to a fresco, *The Arts of Peace,* which was to occupy a position in South Kensington Museum, similar to that occupied by Sir Frederick Leighton's fresco, *The Arts as Applied to War.* This last-named fresco was a most valuable one, and was placed on one of the principal walls of the Science and Art Exhibition; and the new fresco, which would also be by Sir Frederick Leighton, would be a fellow one on the opposite wall, and when it was finished the decoration of the building would be complete.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, that, after the statement the right hon. Gentleman made the other day with regard to mosaics, it was extraordinary that the Government should rush into an expenditure of this kind. It appeared to him that if it was inexpedient to spend money in the embellishments of the House of Commons, it was equally wrong to do so in the "Brompton Boilers." He would not disparage the South Kensington Museum of Works, which would not only do honour to this country, but to any country; but if their object was to instruct the people —if, indeed, they were capable of doing so—in the Arts and Sciences, they should be satisfied with as good a Museum as it was possible for them to create, and without wasting money upon extravagant embellishments of master work. The Museum, as he had said, had been established at an economical cost to the country; but when they embarked in an expenditure for frescoes of this kind, they seemed to him to have launched upon a perilous adventure. In proof of that, it was only necessary to call the right hon. Gentleman's attention to matters of fact; and facts, as every one knew, were stubborn things. The hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) had accused him (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) of being an æsthete; but that impeachment he must repudiate. He knew nothing about these matters from an æsthetic point of view; but there were certain truths which were brought home to him, as to anybody else who was interested in this matter, by experience, and one of these was the perishable nature of frescoes. Thirty years ago it was proposed to decorate the House of Commons with frescoes, and some attempt had been made to carry out that proposal; and he would ask any hon. Member present, whether, as shown by the result, that attempt had not been a complete failure? What had become of the frescoes? Many of them could hardly be said to exist. In the House of Lords they were in a deplorable state; it was found out that the frescoes would not do within the building, consequently the water-glass system was adopted. In Lincoln's Inn Hall there was a fine design, executed by Mr. Watts; but that had begun to fade. In Carlton House Terrace some excellent frescoes had been put up, also by Mr. Watts; but they, too, were perishing. A Committee of experts was appointed by the House to consider this question; and they, he believed, unanimously pronounced against frescoes, declaring that they could not be successfully executed in the trying atmosphere of London. The other day, when the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works addressed the House in answer to a speech in which the use of mosaics was advocated by the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Schreiber), the right hon. Gentleman had admitted that frescoes were a failure. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) did not think the right hon. Gentleman would depart from that opinion now, although, notwithstanding all these expressions of opinion, the House of Commons was now asked to vote £3,000 for a fresco to be painted in the "Brompton Boilers." He did not wish to say a word as to the merits of the designs by Sir Frederick Leighton, because, as he had frequently said, these things were merely matters of taste. No one could say what taste was; it was an abstract idea; therefore, he would not express any view as to the merits of this work by Sir Frederick Leighton, which, for aught he knew, might be superior to a similar work by the late Mr. Raphael, Mr. Michael Angelo, or Mr. Pordenone, or anybody else. There was also a large expenditure taken out of the pockets of the British taxpayer for Art purchasers; he did not say the amount was too large; but he did believe that they had arrived at a time when it was desirable to bear in mind that these extraordinary expenditures were always incurred when they had an advanced Liberal Government in power. He did not wish to say anything derogatory to Sir Frederick Leighton's work; but, before embarking on investments of this kind, they ought to seriously pause; and, in the interests of economy, he would urge the Government not to purchase this second fresco. Last year he had asked whether it was the intention of the Government to propose a Vote for a painting by Mr. Herbert, R.A., and the answer was "No;" and if the right hon. Gentleman had declined to spend that for completing the Chamber in which Lord Redesdale now sat, he ought not to have asked the Committee to embark in the expense now proposed. He did not intend to propose a reduction of the Vote; but he protested against this policy.

Mr. DILLWYN wished to know what the total cost was likely to be?

Mr. MONK said, there were not many occasions on which he agreed with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck); but on this occasion he did agree with him entirely. He did not think frescoes were suitable for this climate. There were very few frescoes in this country which had not faded within a few years. The right hon. and learned Member had said a great deal about these frescoes; but why did he not move to reduce the Vote by £1,000? He considered it undesirable to give £3,000 for a fresco which, in 20 years, nobody would be able to make anything of; but as the right hon. and learned Member did not intend to move a reduction of the Vote, he did not in any way know that he was called upon to do so. If, however, the right hon. and learned Member had moved a reduction he would have supported him.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he thought there was a strong feeling in the House in favour of a reduction of this Vote; but there was considerable delicacy in regard to proposing a reduction. Under these circumstances, he would himself move the reduction. It seemed to him that there were two items in this Vote which were altogether objectionable. One was the sum for the fresco by Sir Frederick Leighton. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works said he had ordered that, because there was some sort of conditional promise when Sir Frederick Leighton painted *The Arts of War*. He supposed that gentleman received £3,000 for that fresco as its value; and he did not see why, because that gentleman received £3,000 for that painting, he should receive £3,000 for another fresco. He himself did not profess to be an authority on this subject; but those who were authorities entertained a strong feeling as to whether these frescoes were adapted for this climate, and therefore he thought it would be as well not to order this new fresco. The other item to which he objected was that for the erection of a south-east wing, for which the cost was not ascertained. The Department seemed to be always building something at South Kensington. The Vice President of the Council, if he had been present, would have told the Committee that there never was an establishment so well managed and so economically constructed; but, whether the building was cheap or dear, there was not only always a large sum of money wanted for repairs, but also for building something new. He should, therefore, propose the reduction of the Vote by £6,000—£1,000 in respect of Sir Frederick Leighton's fresco, and £5,000 for the new wing, the total cost of which was not ascertained. The cost ought to be ascertained before any expenditure was entered upon.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £15,379, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for erecting and maintaining new Buildings, including Rents, &c., for the Department of Science and Art."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Viscount FOLKESTONE asked whether the new fresco had been ordered or not? If it had been decided that these frescoes were not suitable to this climate he should say the Vote ought to be struck out. He observed that in Scotland the Geological Survey cost £45 per annum, while fuel and lighting cost £820. That seemed to him to be an extraordinary contrast.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said, he thought that the proposed Vote for a new wing at South Kensington might be fairly questioned, as the cost had not been ascertained; but it was undesirable to mix that up with the question of the fresco. The fresco could stand upon its own merits. The hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) had taken exception to any Vote for the fresco, because frescoes could not stand the weather in this country. He did not at all think that that was proved; and the only frescoes to which the hon. Member had referred were those in this House. He ventured to call attention to the fresco painted by Sir Frederick Leighton at Lyndhurst House in the New Forest, which had stood the test of many years' wear and tear.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he quite agreed with the hon. Member that it was inconvenient to mix up two questions of such a different nature. With regard to the first of these items—the fresco—he hoped the Committee would vote the money. The right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had endeavoured to show that he had been inconsistent in this matter; but he had never expressed any opinion against frescoes. He certainly had stated that he did not propose to give Mr. Herbert a commission for another fresco in the room in the House of Lords. Mr. Herbert had already painted two pictures which had each cost £5,000; but it did not appear to him necessary to give that gentleman another order. With regard to the frescoes in the Central Hall of the House, the question was not as to frescoes, but as to mosaics. He had never expressed any opinion against frescoes; and when the right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of experts having condemned frescoes, he was entirely mistaken. They had approved of the frescoes in this House, but had condemned the mosaics, and proposed that frescoes should be placed in lieu of the mosaics. It might be a question whether it was desirable to have frescoes in the Central Hall. He had consulted the authorities at South Kensington, and they said there was no doubt that the fresco painted by Sir Frederick Leighton would last. Sir Frederick Leighton originally produced two designs, the "Arts of War" and the "Arts of Peace." The "Arts of War" had been completed, and it appeared to be reasonable to give Sir Frederick Leighton the other commission. With regard to the other matter—the south-east wing—he was unable to give the further details for which the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) asked. It was not certain yet what the nature of the new addition at South Kensington would be; and, considering the views expressed by hon. Members on a recent occasion, he did not think it would be wise to press that part of the Vote. He should, therefore, withdraw the item for the new wing now, and bring it forward later in the Session, when he might be in a position to state what the cost would be. He would withdraw that item of £5,000, and he hoped the Committee would agree to the other Vote.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought the Committee were indebted to the right hon. Gentleman for the candour with which he had met their wishes with regard to the new wing. With regard to the fresco, he had been very much disappointed with the non-success of previous experiments, and he could not conscientiously advocate the expenditure of any more money for frescoes. It was true that Sir Frederick Leighton's picture at Lyndhurst was in good condition; but the atmosphere of the New Forest was very different from the atmosphere of London. When the hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright) twitted the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) with his imperfect appreciation of these frescoes, he was not aware that the hon. Member for Gloucester had, perhaps, the most painful experience in regard to frescoes of any hon. Gentleman in the House, on account of some famous frescoes executed by relatives of his own in a church in Westminster, which had become obliterated in 25 years. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had not said how far the works of Sir Frederick Leighton had progressed. Frescoes were expected to last 400 or 500 years; but there was no reason to believe that there was a single fresco in London which would last for anything like that time.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, that after the statement of the right hon. Gentleman he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment, and would move to reduce the Vote by £1,000. There had not been time to judge whether frescoes in this part of the town would stand not the atmosphere, but the air at South Kensington. The "Arts of War" had only been painted four or five years; but everybody expected a fresco to last longer than that.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(9.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £16,379, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for erecting and maintaining new Buildings, including Rents, &c., for the Department of Science and Art."

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £15,379, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for erecting and maintaining new Buildings, including Rents, &c., for the Department of Science and Art." —(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Mr. R. BIDDULPH MARTIN said, he was aware that modern frescoes did not last long as a rule; but that was not always the case, for anyone inspecting the frescoes in some of our old churches would, beneath the whitewash, find the colour as brilliant as if they had been painted only a few days. Therefore, there was no reason to suppose that the art of fresco painting could not be revived. There was a great deal to be said in favour of making an experiment with this £5,000 at Kensington. If, in the course of a few years, it was found that the colours had faded it would be shown that it was useless to apply frescoes to any public building. It must be remembered that the whole use of South Kensington was to give a commercial value to the Art of the country, and money laid out there must be regarded as an investment for the good of the country, and not as expended in an amusement for the benefit of a few sightseers. He entirely disagreed with what had been said as to mosaics, because he believed mosaics had not been sufficiently cultivated, and that a good deal of useful decorative work might be done with mosaics; and he therefore hoped to see mosaics executed in public buildings, so that they should become an acknowledged form of decoration. It was not only that the thing itself was of use and value to the country in an economical sense, but these frescoes and mosaics would tend to improve the general Art of the country. He hoped the Committee would not reject this Vote for the fresco, simply because the fresco itself might not be of ready money value.

Mr. GEORGE HOWARD said, he believed this picture was not a fresco in the true sense, and was not executed as frescoes usually were. There was no reason at all, therefore, to assume that it would be a failure. It was painted, he understood, on dry walls, and not on wet plaster; and he believed there was no reason to suppose that it would fade. It was an interesting experiment, and for that reason he thought the Vote should be granted.

Mr. DILLWYN asked whether the contract had been settled with Sir Frederick Leighton? [Mr. Shaw Lefevre: No.] He was glad to hear that; but he could not agree in the view that because Sir Frederick Leighton had had another commission, he should, therefore, have this, and he should support the Amendment.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, Sir Frederick Leighton had been asked to prepare two designs, and when an artist was requested to make designs for two pictures, it was generally understood that he would paint both; but no promise had been given to Sir Frederick Leighton that he would receive an order for the second. If, however, there was reason to believe that the work would not perish, it was reasonable to give him the order for the second picture. The £3,000 asked for was very much less than the picture would fetch in the open market. If the "Arts of War" were sold in the market, it would fetch at least twice what the Government had given for it.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he did not wish to use any un-Parliamentary expressions; but hon. Members had been asked to vote a sum of money for a fresco, and then the hon. Member (Mr. George Howard) stated that the picture was not a fresco at all. Why did not the First Commissioner of Works know that? He thought the Vote should be either withdrawn or postponed. His objection was that, having regard to the state of public finances, the Committee should not be asked to embark in this extravagant expenditure. He believed the First Commissioner of Works would agree with him that the value of an article was exactly that which it would fetch in the market; and if this interesting experiment, the "Arts of War," were taken down and exposed for sale in any public auction room, the picture, on account of its size, would not be very saleable, and would probably be knocked down at a very low price. He had known that to occur often during recent years. The question they had to consider was whether the Committee should devote a definite sum of money for an indefinite experiment; and whether, having regard to the extraordinary Expenditure of the present Government, it was desirable that an outlay should be incurred for anything that was not absolutely necessary.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works whether any arrangement had been made with Sir Frederick Leighton with regard to the copyright? Was this to remain with the Government, or with Sir Frederick Leighton? [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite seemed somewhat amused at this inquiry, probably because they did not understand the question involved. He reminded the Committee that, at the present time, there was a Bill before the House of Commons for the purpose of securing copyrights to the owners.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had not supposed that any arrangement of the kind was necessary in this case. It would be hardly possible to take the fresco down and frame it.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: That is perfectly true; but it might be copied.

MR. BIGGAR said, the present instance of patronage on the part of the Government would have appeared to more advantage before they became mixed up with the military operations in Egypt. For his part, he thought that the Government should take time to reconsider the question, and bring forward a Vote at a future time—that was to say, when the experiment had been brought to a conclusion. He regarded the whole outlay as perfectly useless, because all the authorities were agreed that frescoes would not endure in this climate. The Committee, however, were told that this was a very interesting experiment on the part of Sir Frederick Leighton to ascertain the durability of frescoes; and he could not help thinking, if that was so, that it would be well if Sir Frederick Leighton conducted the experiment at his own expense. He certainly disapproved of the course taken by the Government in coming to Parliament to ask for a sum of money in order to carry out doubtful experiments of the kind in question. It might be that this new experiment on the part of Sir Frederick Leighton would prove to be a great deal worse than the last. He was strongly of opinion that they should wait for a few years to see whether the "Arts of War" would stand the test of the English climate before they involved themselves in any further expense, because, if the first went wrong, it was only natural to suppose that the second picture would be a failure also.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, the Committee were asked to vote a sum of money for a fresco; but the hon. Member for Cumberland (Mr. George Howard) had just stated to the Committee that the work in question was not a fresco in the true sense of the term. Under these circumstances, he thought that the Committee were entitled to know from the Government whether it was or it was not a fresco for which the money was now asked. If the latter were the case, then he thought that the Government ought to withdraw the Vote.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 53; Noes 104: Majority 51.—(Div. List, No. 96.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK asked whether the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works would be able to state the exact nature of this experiment on Report?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was unable to state whether the painting was executed upon a dry or wet wall.

MR. MOLLOY said, the Government had, year after year, stated that they were going to do something towards the enlargement of the Patents Museum at South Kensington. The building was uttlerly useless for the purpose for which it was originated. It was, undoubtedly, the worst Museum of its kind in Europe; it contained scarcely an example of a modern invention, and the cost of it to the nation was so much money wasted. Whenever the question of expenditure upon this useless building had been raised in that House, the Government had met it by the promise that something should be done at another time; that they were waiting for the passing of the new Patents Bill; then, that they had not time to consider it; and, finally, that the matter should receive their attention in the course of the coming year. Nothing, however, had been done, and this room, filled with old lumber, remained unaltered at a considerable expense to the country. Perhaps, the right hon. Gentleman could state how many people visited the Patents Museum, which cost the country so much money; because, unless he were wrongly informed, no more than 50 persons entered it on the last public holiday? He trusted the Committee would not suppose that he was objecting to the principle of providing a Patents Museum for the instruction of the people; on the contrary, he believed that nothing would be more beneficial than an honest expenditure upon such an Institution. He believed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) would agree with him, whether he approved of the course he was now taking or not, that a Museum of a practical character was much required. He should move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £500, in order to give the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works an opportunity of assuring the Committee that effective steps would be taken, without delay, to make this old lumber room of some use to the nation; and unless the right hon. Gentleman was able to make a satisfactory statement upon the subject, he should feel it his duty to take a division upon that Motion.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I cannot find any item having reference to the Patents Museum in this Estimate.

Mr. MOLLOY said, it came under the item for Fuel, Rates, Taxes, and other charges. But if the question could not be raised under the Vote now before the Committee, he ventured to ask the right hon. Gentleman under what Estimate the question could be raised?

The CHAIRMAN said, it had been already pointed out to the hon. Member that the discussion on the Patents Museum was not relevant to the Vote before the Committee.

Mr. GORST said, the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had remarked that the Vote had nothing to do with the Patents Museum; but he (Mr. Gorst) pointed out that the Patents Museum was a part of the buildings at South Kensington. It was a public building, and, therefore, the Vote for its maintenance ought to be amongst the Votes for Public Buildings.

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR said, if hon. Members would turn to Vote 19, they would find the general charges for the Patents Office included therein.

Captain AYLMER asked the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works, under what head they would find the cost of the Geological Survey in Ireland?

Mr. GORST asked under which Vote for the maintenance of Public Works and Buildings in the United Kingdom they would find the charge for the maintenance of the Patents Museum at South Kensington? Unless he received a satisfactory answer he should feel it his duty to move the withdrawal of the Vote.

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR: The hon. and learned Member will find it in Class II., page 19.

Mr. BIGGAR said, it was satisfactory to see the right hon. Gentleman coming to the rescue of the Government on this question of the Patents Museum; but he wished to point out that no reply had been given to the question of the hon. and gallant Member for Maidstone (Captain Aylmer) on the subject of the Geological Survey of Ireland. As the Government appeared indisposed to give any explanation, he should move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £220, the charge for the Geological Museum in Jermyn Street. The contention of himself and hon. Gentlemen near him was that some provision ought to be made in the Estimates for extending the Geological Survey now going on in England and Scotland to Ireland. They thought it would only be fair that some public money should be paid for the purpose of ascertaining whether there was any hope of support for the people of Ireland in the undeveloped resources of that country.

Mr. GORST said, he had referred to Vote 19, and he ventured to say that not a single item related to the maintenance of the Patents Museum at South Kensington. There were items for salaries and expenses, and for the purchase of models for the Museum, but not for the maintenance of the building.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gorst) was perfectly correct in what he had just stated. Vote 19 provided for the *personnel* of the Patents Office, and was charged upon the Patents Office. But the arrangement for the Museum was, as perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman was aware, an entirely temporary one; and so long as the present arrangement continued the Patents Exhibition might be regarded as part and parcel of South Kensington. The Patents Commissioners had, however, received notice that the building could not be permanently devoted to the exhibition of patents; and in the Patents Bill, which had passed the second reading, there was a provision that the Patents Museum should in future be intrusted entirely to the charge of the South Kensington authorities, and should be worked in connection with the Industrial Exhibition. He hoped that when that arrangement was made, much better provision would be found than at present for the Exhibition of Patents.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he thought it right to point out that the absence of Ministers during the evening had led to considerable difficulty. His right hon. Friend the First Commissioner of Works knew nothing about this Vote, the Secretary to the Treasury knew nothing about it, and when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Edinburgh University (Sir Lyon Playfair) came forward to the rescue of the Government he made a mistake; and unless the President of the Board of Trade had dropped in, having neglected his duties for the whole afternoon—["Oh, oh!"] He would not repeat the words if they were offensive, but their sense he certainly should maintain. It was clear that unless the President of the Board of Trade had dropped in when he did, the Committee would have been kept in ignorance of the real facts of the case. It was impossible for the Committee to transact its Business properly when subordinate Ministers of the Crown did not know the Estimates they were defending, and were obliged to depend upon the assistance of private Members until a real Minister turned up.

MR. MOLLOY asked if it was correct in supposing that the Patents Museum came under this particular Vote? If it came under another Vote, of course he need not now press his point. He did not desire to miss his chance of raising his objection; and therefore he desired to be informed as to whether this was the proper Vote or not upon which to discuss matters regarding the Patents Museum?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, the hon. Member was correct in supposing that, at all events, any cost of repairs for the Patents Museum was involved in this Vote; but there was another Vote in which provision was made for the whole of the *personnel* of the Exhibition. The hon. Gentleman desired to raise the question of what future provision would be made for the Patents Exhibition; and he (Mr. Chamberlain) had already replied that in the Patents Bill a clause had been introduced transferring the control and the whole management of the Patents Museum at South Kensington. It was intended, he had already explained, that the Patents Exhibition should be worked in connection with the Industrial Exhibition of the Science and Art Department.

MR. MOLLOY said, that if the Patents Museum was to be made more useful for the inventive faculties of the people, that was all that he desired to obtain. If it was to be understood that the Exhibition would be of some value to the country he should not press the matter further.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, it was a matter of degree. All he could assure the hon. Gentleman was that if the proposed transfer of control were approved of by the House, it was intended by the Government that there should be a better provision made for the Exhibition of Patents, and an attempt would be made to secure that the Collection should be much more thoroughly representative than at the present time.

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE said, that supposing the Patents Bill did not pass this year, would the right hon. Gentleman take some steps that the Patents Exhibition would be improved; because, under the circumstances, it would be strictly unfair to call upon the people to wait until the passing of the Bill.

MR. GORST said, his noble Friend had asked a very proper question, and if they allowed it to pass without receiving any answer, they might just as well take up their hats and go to bed. ["Hear!"] That was evidently the idea the Liberal Party had in discussing the Estimates; but he and his hon. Friends considered that they ought, in duty bound to their constituents, to ask questions upon the Estimates, and to receive explanations and replies from Her Majesty's Government. It had been pointed out by the hon. Member (Mr. Molloy) that the Patents Exhibition as it existed was wholly useless, and that was not denied by the Government. Public money was being spent upon an Exhibition which the Government admitted was absotutely useless. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had said that if the Patents Bill became law an alteration would be made by Government, by which this expenditure of public money would become useful; and then the noble Lord asked, supposing the Government Bill did not pass, were they going to spend the money which they were now asking the House of Commons to vote in the maintenance of a building which they themselves admitted to be useless? Surely they were entitled to an answer to that question before they voted the money. Of course, it might be a part of the Liberal creed that they ought to vote money blindly. Such, however, was not part of the creed of the Opposition.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken, whose objects were perfectly intelligible to the House, had put into his (Mr. Chamberlain's) mouth language which he entirely disclaimed. He did not say, on behalf of the Government, that the present Patents Museum was useless. On the contrary, he believed that in its present form it was extremely useful, although it might be improved and made more complete. He really thought the noble Viscount (Viscount Folkestone) was hardly serious in the question he put; but he was anxious to reply, if it was considered necessary he should do so. The noble Viscount asked what the Government would do in the event of the Patents Bill not being carried? The Government had introduced the Patents Bill, and he did not think they were called upon to answer hypothetical questions, and say what they would do if one of the great Bills of the Session—which the Government had introduced, and which had passed its second reading—were not carried. He hoped it would go forward, in common with all the other measures of the Government which they had introduced.

Mr. BIGGAR said, it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade was rather hot in the replies he made. It was stated, over and over again, by Members on the Opposition side of the House, that the Patents Museum, as it existed at present, was perfectly useless, and no Member of the Government, so far as he had heard, had expressed any contrary opinion. In fact, they allowed judgment to go by default. The noble Viscount (Viscount Folkestone) had a perfect right to put his question to the Government, and it seemed to him perfectly reasonable to ask the Government whether any attempt would be made to improve the Exhibition, supposing the Patents Bill did not pass into law this Session? They all knew that it was by no means certain that that Bill would pass this year. Indeed, it was very probable that the Patents Bill would not pass into law during the remainder of the present Session.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(10.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £6,338, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Maintenance and Repair of the British Museum and Natural History Museum Buildings, for Rents of Premises, supply of Water, Fuel, &c., and other Charges attendant thereon."

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY desired to move a reduction of the Vote, and his object in doing so was to get rid, if possible, of the unsightly railings and walls which now surrounded the British Museum. He did not know any city in the world in which such magnificent buildings were surrounded by such unsightly stone walls and hideous railings as London. He supposed the railings and walls surrounding the British Museum were intended to give more security to the building. But St. Peter's, at Rome, was not surrounded in the same way, neither was the Louvre in Paris, nor the great Museum at Berlin. England alone made its Museum positively unsightly, because of an over-wrought alarm about its safety. He had long had a strong objection to this way of spoiling public buildings. He wanted to level the railings if he could; and he would move to reduce the Vote by £500, being roughly the cost of keeping in repair the hideous and useless walls and railings around the Museum.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £5,838, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Maintenance and Repair of the British Museum and Natural History Museum Buildings, for Rents of Premises, Supply of Water, Fuel, &c., and other Charges attendant thereon."—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy.*)

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that that was the first time the question had been mooted. ["No!"] He certainly had never heard of it before; and he could hardly express an opinion upon such an important subject without consulting the Trustees of the Museum. If they had regard to the value of the property in the Museum, it was only reasonable and proper that they should be properly protected; and he presumed it would be necessary, in the opinion of the Trustees, that the walls and railings should be allowed to stand.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER said, he thought the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman must remind the Committee of the very unfortunate position in which they stood. On many former occasions a right hon. Friend of his—Mr. Spencer Walpole — whose retirement from the House they all regretted, was always ready to give the House any information on the Estimates concerning the British Museum. The British Museum was still represented by a very eminent man —the hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock)—and it would have been for the advantage of the Committee if the hon. Baronet had been in his place to have assisted the right hon. Gentleman in giving the Committee his views with regard to this question. He did not know whether it was a matter of sufficient importance to postpone the Vote; but, certainly, the Committee was placed in an unfortunate position owing to the retirement of one Gentleman and the absence of the other.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he happened to be one of the Trustees of the British Museum, and therefore it was not altogether unrepresented in the House. He did not know whether Mr. Walpole, or the hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), was now in charge of the Estimates for the Museum; but whichever of the two might have this honourable office cast upon him, he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) did not think it was necessary he should be present on this occasion. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had not the slightest hesitation in giving an answer, on behalf of the Trustees, to the question raised by the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy). He could conceive no circumstance under which it would be desirable to remove the railings and walls around the British Museum. He had already said that night twice, that he did not pretend to be a man of taste; and, therefore, when he offered the opinion that the railings were not so unsightly as had been made out, the assertion would be taken for what it was worth. Apart from the question of taste, he ventured to submit to the Committee that the observation of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works was absolutely conclusive. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the British Museum contained important and valuable property, therefore it was absolutely necessary that it should be properly protected. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) did not think the Trustees of the British Museum would for one moment agree to the removal of the railings.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that buildings quite as important as the British Museum were left unprotected. He did not know that Westminster Abbey was protected by railings. Even some very important parts of the Houses of Parliament were not protected; and he was not aware that they had ever suffered any substantial injury from the action of the public. He (Mr. Biggar), like the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck), did not pretend to be a man of taste; he did not know whether or not the taking away of these railings would be advantageous from an artistic point of view; but he could not understand why the railings should not be removed, because public buildings having quite as valuable contents as the British Museum were as unprotected as the Museum would be if the railings were removed.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. BIGGAR asked for some explanation of the item "C"—rent of rooms. It appeared to him that it would be as well if those antiquities were packed up in boxes. If a house were taken in the neighbourhood of the British Museum, there might be some excuse; but the system carried out appeared to him to be a waste of money. Either the British Museum should be extended, or premises should be taken near it.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that, as soon as the geological specimens were removed to the Natural History Museum, these specimens would be taken to the British Museum.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, that, as it was now half-past 12, the Government ought to agree to Progress being reported.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE agreed that Progress should be reported.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

CONSTABULARY AND POLICE (IRELAND) (PAY AND PENSIONS) BILL.

(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

[BILL 171.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Mr. BIGGAR said, he begged to ask, as a matter of Order, whether this Bill could be brought in after half-past 12, when Notice of opposition had been given to it? He knew there was money in the Bill; but there were also a great many other matters in it, and he therefore submitted that it did not come within the definition of a Money Bill, and was, consequently, under the Half-past Twelve o'clock Rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a Bill to provide for the pay and pensions of the Constabulary and Police of Ireland, and, no doubt, it is a Money Bill, and, therefore, exempted from the operation of the Half-past Twelve o'clock Rule.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he had no wish whatever to delay the progress of the measure, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Trevelyan) would take the second reading with the general assent of the House; but he could not allow this opportunity to pass without entering, he would not say a protest, but a *caveat*, with regard to a principle laid down in the Bill which it might be proposed to extend to the police of counties and boroughs in England. He was well aware of the critical condition of the Government in Ireland, and of the absolute necessity there was for supporting them in any measure they might think important or necessary for the satisfaction of the Constabulary in Ireland, which had behaved so well under very trying circumstances, to which every Member of the House felt they owed so much, which had been for some time past so dissatisfied, and into whose position the Government had made inquiries, satisfying themselves that it ought to be improved. He had, therefore, no objection to take to the Bill, applying, as it did, to Ireland; but, under other circumstances, he might have been inclined to take exception to it. However, in assenting to the Bill, he must not be understood as assenting to the principle of absolute right to pension on retirement after 25 years' service. That was a principle of compensation given for the first time to the Irish Constabulary, and it was a principle which by-and-bye, perhaps, it would be proposed to extend to England. If he assented to it now, he must claim the right to object to it when it was proposed to apply it to counties and boroughs at the cost of the ratepayers, in respect of which it was his belief, in accordance with his experience, it would be a bad system. The Police Force in England should continue as it had been heretofore. In making these concessions to the Irish Constabulary, the Government had adopted what appeared to him to be a somewhat dangerous course, and one for which, so far as he knew, there was no precedent either in the Military, Naval, or Civil Services. The system of superannuation upon approved service was, of course, a most valuable one, which he should always readily support. It had always been held that, except on certain conditions of length of service or of a certain age being arrived at, there should be no right to demand compensation. In the Civil Service of this country the age was 60, and the period of service 40 years; but in the Bill it was proposed to give the Irish Constabulary pensions after 25 years of approved service. In the remarks which the right hon. Gentleman might make he should like very much to hear him explain more fully the meaning of the 11th clause, which had regard to the contributions towards the superannuation fund of the members of the Constabulary Force themselves. It seemed that the constables were no longer to contribute to the fund. Not very long ago the whole Civil Service of the country was required to contribute towards the expenses of its own retiring allowances; and it was owing to an unfortunate combination of Parties in that House that that payment of a contribution of 5 per cent was abolished. He understood that, at present, the Irish Constabulary paid a contribution of that kind to their superannuation fund, but that, in future, they were not to do so; and he would therefore ask whether it was the fact that two descriptions of payment would be going on at one and the same time —that was to say, whether one class of constables would be contributing towards the fund, whilst another employed side by side with them were not? He should very much like to have that point cleared up, in order to enable him to form his judgment as to the other measure which the Government would shortly introduce. One felt that the Constabulary in Ireland was a *quasi*-military force; and that, under the circumstances of the country, the Government must be held responsible for placing it in a satisfactory condition. If it was found necessary to increase the salaries of the constables or their pensions, or improve their position, the Government came with a very strong case to recommend the alteration, which was at the cost of the public funds; and those who might object to the principle of the proposal of the Ministry had very weak hands to resist them. For his own part, he could not accept the responsibility of adversely criticizing the Government proposal or of opposing it; therefore, he had not a word to say against the second reading of the Bill, and he would therefore, as he had said, only enter a *caveat* with regard to some of the contents of the Bill, so that he might be able to oppose the principle when it was brought forward in the case of England.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he would move the adjournment of the debate for two reasons—first, because he had been under the impression not only that this measure was not a Money Bill, but that the right hon. Gentleman did not intend to treat it as such——

MR. TREVELYAN said, he had given a distinct pledge to bring the Bill on at whatever time the Order might be reached.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, that, at any rate, many of those who best understood the Bill had remained away under the impression that no Irish Business was to be taken for the first few days after the re-assembling of Parliament. It had been distinctly understood that no Irish Estimates would be taken for some days after the Whitsuntide Holidays; and, surely, if the absence of Irish Members was a reason for putting off the Estimates, it was an equally powerful reason for putting off this important question of the pay and pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary. He would strongly appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to postpone the second reading; and if he would not do that, he (Mr. M'Carthy) should be bound to persist in his Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member second the Motion?

MR. BIGGAR intimated his willingness to second the Motion, and said, he did so for the reason that no Irish Member had believed that this question would come on that night, the Prime Minister having intimated some time ago that no Irish Estimates would be taken in the beginning of the week. The result of the understanding on the part of the Irish Members was that some of the most active Members of the Party were absent from London; and, more than that, that some of those who had been present that night had gone away under the impression that no Irish Business would come on. The hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been present half-an-hour ago; but he had gone away, as had also the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) and the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). Both Members for Queen's County had also gone away; and all these absences were owing to the fact that the Irish Members had not expected that this Bill, which they had intended to oppose very strongly, would come on this evening. Those hon. Members had implied, from the pledge of the Prime Minister, that the Estimates would not be taken, that no other Irish Business could come on. They never dreamed that such an attempt as the present would be made to steal a march on the Irish Members—they had never expected that the Government would push on this Bill at such an hour, when there was no possibility of discussing it, even supposing there had been anyone present who understood the question to talk about it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Justin M'Carthy.*)

MR. CALLAN said, he trusted that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant would give the House an assurance that if the second reading was taken that night that the Committee stage would be postponed for some time—that he would defer it for at least a week, so as to give hon. Members from Ireland, who took an interest in the subject, time to be present. If the right hon. Gentleman would give that pledge all purposes would be served, and the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. M'Carthy) might withdraw his Motion. There was a general feeling in favour of the Bill—he did not know what proportion, but probably five-sixths of the Irish Members were in favour of the principle of the measure. [Mr. BIGGAR: No, no!] He maintained that, whatever the Irish Members might think about it, there was a general feeling in Ireland that the Bill, slightly amended and improved, should be passed into law. He did not often differ from his hon. Friends; but he took the liberty of doing so on a question in which he believed much interest for a very deserving class was felt.

MR. TREVELYAN said, it was extremely important, with the growing difficulties which they found, for various reasons, many of them almost the natural growth, in carrying on the Business of that House, that while pledges that were given should be religiously adhered to, none which had not been given should be imagined. Reference had been made to a pledge of his that this Bill, though a Money Bill, should not be brought on after half-past 12 o'clock. Well, that pledge had been given most distinctly with regard to the Poor Relief Bill, which was a Money Bill, and very little more than a Money Bill, but, at the same time, a measure which raised a question of great interest to Irish Members. With regard to that Bill, he had given a pledge that it should not be brought on after half-past 12 o'clock; but as to the present Bill, he had given no pledge of the sort, nor could he have consented to give any pledge that would seriously delay the consideration of the Bill by the House. On a previous occasion, when the Bill was read a first time, the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), a most representative Irish Member, had specially urged him to bring it in at half-past 1 in the morning, because, as the hon. Member stated, the subject created such an interest in Ireland that speeches upon it would be reported, even at that late hour. The hon. Member for Carlow had made a speech of great weight and importance on that occasion, and he (Mr. Trevelyan) had tendered an explanation of the Bill, which had been listened to very attentively by hon. Members. He should not have thought of bringing forward the second reading at this moment if it had been necessary for him to make a lengthened statement. Then he came to the pledge of the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. It was said the right hon. Gentleman had promised that no Irish Estimates should be taken that night, and undoubtedly that was the case; but during the same evening, and, if he recollected right, in the very same brief discourse, the Prime Minister stated that the Government looked upon this measure as one of absolutely primary importance, and considered that it should be put in front of all Bills, not so much on account of its intrinsic importance, as of the enormous importance of turning it into law with all possible despatch. He (Mr. Trevelyan) did not wish to enter into the question of the urgency of the Bill. This matter was familiar to many hon. Gentlemen, and perhaps to the Whole House; but one reason for the urgency was that the very large Service whose interest the Bill touched had waited and waited for a very long time, and had waited, too, very patiently, and in a manner that did them very great credit, for a change in their condition. Under these circumstances, he earnestly appealed to the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Adjournment not to press the Motion. The condition upon which the Bill should be read a second time, mentioned by the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan), was one which, after consulting with the noble Marquess on his left (the Marquess of Hartington), he considered he should be justified in accepting. It was important that the Bill should be pressed forward; but it was most important that the House should have an opportunity of discussing its details in Committee. The Government were, therefore, prepared to pledge themselves that if they got a second reading that night the Bill should not be proceeded with further this week. His impression of the disposition of hon. Members, when the Bill was read a first times, differed from that of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar); his impression was that the Bill was received with almost universal acceptance. [Mr. Biggar: No, no!] He only gave his own impression, and the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Biggar) seemed to dissent. He believed the principle was accepted, although some hon. Members might consider that the measure would require discussion in Committee. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sclater-Booth) seemed to object to the principle of the system of pensions proposed in the Bill; but it should be remembered that pensions in Ireland, at the present moment, might be given after 30 years' service, and this Bill only enabled those pensions to be bestowed after 25 years' service. The provisions of the Bill would require examination to see whether the advantages given to the Irish Police were such as to alarm economists; but these were questions into which he had no right to go, seeing the Motion before the House was only for Adjournment.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he should withdraw the Motion; but he must say that his impression had been that the assurance of the Prime Minister referred to this Bill as well as to the Estimates.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

CANAL BOATS ACT (1877) AMENDMENT BILL.—[Bill 139.]

(*Mr. Burt, Mr. Samuel Morley, Mr. John Corbett, Mr. Pell, Mr. Broadhurst.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. BROADHURST said, he begged to move the second reading of the Bill, which stood in the name of an hon. Friend of his; and as there was no Notice of opposition he should also move that it be referred to the Select Committee on Canals. He would not detain the House with any further explanation.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time, and *referred* to the Select Committee on Canals."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Motion *agreed to*.

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 22nd *May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [May 21] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Ordered—First Reading*—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) (Birmingham and Lambeth) * [192]; Local Government Provisional Order (Highways) (County of Dorset) * [193]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) (Ashton-in-Makerfield) * [194]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) (Barnet Union, &c.) * [195]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) (Bognor, &c.) * [196].

Second Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) * [170]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) * [176]; Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (Extension of Time) * [181]; Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [168]; Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment * [183]; Poor Law Conferences * [187]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (No. 2) [51] [House counted out].

Select Committee—New Forest (Highways) * [135] *nominated.*

Third Reading—Customs and Inland Revenue [140], and *passed.*

MOTIONS.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) (NO. 3) (BIRMINGHAM AND LAMBETH) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board, under the provisions of "The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867," as amended by "The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868," and extended by "The Poor Law Act, 1879," relating to the Parishes of Birmingham and Lambeth, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 192.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (HIGHWAYS) (COUNTY OF DORSET) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board, under "The Highways and Locomotives (Amendment) Act, 1878," relating to the County of Dorset, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 193.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 5) (ASHTON-IN-MAKERFIELD, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government District of Ashton-in-Makerfield, the Borough of Ashton-under-Lyne, and the Local Government Districts of Dukinfield and Hurst, the Boroughs of Burnley and Doncaster, the Town of Hove, the Local Government District of Hucknall-under-Huthwaite, the Improvement Act District of Llandudno, the Borough of Middlesbrough, the Port of Newport (Mon.), the Borough of Rochdale, and the Local Government Districts of Sutton-in-Ashfield and West Ham, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 194.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 6) (BARNET UNION, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Rural Sanitary District of the Barnet Union, the Local Government Districts of Brentford, Chilvers Coton, and Nuneaton, the Stourbridge Main Drainage District, the Borough of Stratford-upon-Avon, the Rural Sanitary District of the Stroud Union, and the Local Government District of Wellington (Somerset), *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 195.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 7) (BOGNOR, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Local Government District of Bognor, the Borough of Cheltenham, the Improvement Act District of Chiswick, the Borough of Plymouth, the Local Government District of Skipton, the Borough of Stockton and the Local Government District of South Stockton, and the Local Government Districts of Stroud and Wallasey, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 196.]

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES (LONDON) BILL.

Ordered, That the Report of the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty to inquire into the Parochial Charities of the City of London, which was presented to this House in the year 1880, be referred to the Select Committee on the Parochial Charities (London) Bill.

Ordered, That the Report of the Select Committee on the London Parochial Charities (London) Bills, together with the Minutes of Evidence presented to this House in the year 1882, be referred to the Select Committee on the Parochial Charities (London) Bill.—(*Mr. Lefevre.*)

NEW FOREST (HIGHWAYS) BILL.

Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DAVEY, Lord HENRY SCOTT, Mr. BUXTON, and Mr. COMPTON *nominated* Members of the Committee:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

QUESTIONS.

BURIAL ACTS — CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES — RHOS, DENBIGHSHIRE.

SIR ROBERT CUNLIFFE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that, notwithstanding that both the Burial Board and the vestry of the parish of Rhos, Denbighshire, had resolved that no part of the cemetery provided for the parish should be consecrated, one half of such cemetery was, on the 24th of April, at the instance of the vicar, and without the authority or knowledge of the Burial Board, consecrated by the Bishop of St. Asaph, who was also kept in ignorance of the facts of the case; and, whether he will lay before Parliament a Copy of any Correspondence which may have passed on the subject between him and the vicar or other parties, together with a Copy of the sentence or deed of consecration executed by the Bishop on the occasion of such consecration, as well as take other steps to ascertain the legality of such proceedings, and to prevent their recurrence elsewhere?

MR. BRODRICK said, that before that Question was answered, he should like to ask, Whether it was not a fact that on the 18th of July last the Burial Board in question passed a resolution for the consecration of a portion of the ground?

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said, he also had a Question to ask, of which he had given private Notice—namely, Whether a Burial Board, formed under the 15 & 16 *Vict.* c. 85, and the 16 & 17 *Vict.* c. 134, for the purpose of providing a burial-ground for the parish, was not acting illegally in passing a resolution that no portion of the ground should be consecrated; and whether a bare majority of the Burial Board of the parish of Rhos Llanerchrugog had not committed this illegality; and what steps he would take to prevent similar parochial infringements of the Statute Law in the future?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: A Board does not necessarily commit an illegal act by passing a resolution beyond its powers. I must answer the Question of the hon. Member for West Surrey (Mr. Brodrick) in the affirmative. With regard to the Question on the Paper, the resolution referred to does not appear to have been made known to my right hon. and learned Friend. Application was made by the Vicar, who is Chairman of the Burial Board, for the sanction of the Secretary of State to the division into equal portions—consecrated and unconsecrated. The Vicar added that this proportion had been approved by a resolution of the Board passed on the 18th of last July. The sanction of the Secretary of State was given on the 31st of August last. My right hon. and learned Friend is not aware that any useful purpose would be served by laying the Correspondence on the Table—especially as he is advised that the obligation to divide into consecrated and unconsecrated portions imposed by 16 & 17 *Vict.* c. 134, still continues.

VACCINATION ACTS—CALF LYMPH.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether a Memorial has been received by him from Mr. Henry Allen, of Holloway, respecting the death of his child, Mabel Emma, on the 19th April 1883, alleging that she died from the effects of vaccination with calf lymph from the Marylebone Institution; whether, as the inquest was held without a post-mortem or other evidence available to prove the cause of death, he will grant the prayer of the Memorialist for an official inquiry; and, whether it be the fact that calf lymph is usually followed by more inflammatory and severe effects than even human lymph?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: The Memorial has been received, and the Coroner has been communicated with, who informs me that the jury, in view of the evidence given at the inquest, gave as their verdict that the child died—

> "From the mortal effects of pneumonia, following septicœmia from a labial abscess, and the jurors further say that the death was from natural causes."

I have had before me the depositions in this case; and I have been advised that the course of the disease in this child, beginning in an altogether different part of the body from the vaccinated arm, and extending to altogether different parts of the body, while the vaccinated arm showed no undue inflammation, was not such as to suggest any connection whatever between the disease and the vaccination. The Board have accordingly replied that they have no power to review the decision of the Coroner's Court; and that, after fully considering the circumstances of the case, they are unable to satisfy themselves that there exists any sufficient ground for an inquiry, such as the Memorialist suggests. It is a fact that calf lymph does produce somewhat more decided constitutional symptoms than are produced by averaged humanized lymph.

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX (IRELAND)—DRUMDUFF, CO. LEITRIM.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. SEXTON) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is true that nine tenant farmers in the townland of Drumduff, barony of Dromalsuir, county Leitrim, have been proceeded against for Income Tax (for the first time this year) by a bailiff; whether, in the case of one of the tenants, who, acting on legal advice, refused to pay the tax, the bailiff seized a beast belonging to the tenant, the tenant resisted the seizure of his property, and has now been summoned for resisting the execution of a warrant; and, whether those proceedings in respect of this Income Tax are lawful?

MR. COURTNEY: The facts stated are substantially correct. The resistance to payment seems to have arisen from a misunderstanding, the tax having previously been collected under a special arrangement. Eight of the nine men concerned paid at once; the other, who had to be summoned, paid the tax and costs, and the summons has been withdrawn. The amount of the tax in these cases can be deducted, in the usual manner, from the next payment of rent. The collector appears to have acted strictly within his right.

MERCANTILE MARINE—THE PASSING TOLLS ACT—COLLECTION OF THE LIGHT DUES.

MR. WARTON (for Captain AYLMER) asked the President of the Board of Trade, If any change in the collection of the Light Dues is to be made; and, if so, whether he proposes to obtain Parliamentary sanction for the same?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: There has been no alteration in the collection of the Light Dues. There has been some alteration in the method of accounting for them; but that is a Departmental matter, and I do not think any legislation will be required to give effect to the change.

FISHERY REPORTS.

LORD ELCHO asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether, in view of the deputation on the Trawling question which he had consented to receive on Thursday next, he had any objection to lay upon the Table the Reports which had been addressed to the Government by the Fishery officers?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have made inquiries, and I cannot find that any Reports whatever have been received from the Fishery officers. We have no such Reports at the Board of Trade.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—CLONMANY, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY (for Mr. SEXTON) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant for Ireland, Whether he has caused inquiry to be made respecting the conduct of the constable of Royal Irish Constabulary at Clonmany, county Donegal, in preventing by threats a tenant farmer named Doherty from allowing huts for the shelter of evicted tenants to be erected on his farm; whether the tenants referred to were evicted at such a time that their periods of redemption had expired before the Arrears Act became Law; whether in consequence twenty-three families, numbering one hundred and eight souls, are huddled together in the village of Clonmany, as many as four families being crammed into one small house of three apartments, and fever having already broken out in one family, and threatening the rest of the population; whether materials for wooden huts to shelter them were supplied by public benevolence, and a tenant farmer named Doherty gave leave to have the huts erected on his holding, but the local constable, alleging instructions from his superiors, warned Doherty not to permit the erection of the huts, and told him that if they were erected a force of extra police would be quartered in the locality and charged upon the people; whether, consequently, the families of the evicted tenants are left in a condition dangerous to life; and, whether the Executive will instruct the police to desist from preventing the provision of healthy shelter?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have made inquiry into this matter, and find that the hon. Member for Sligo has been greatly misinformed as to the facts. Six evicted tenants with their families, numbering in all 27 persons, are at present residing in Clonmany. In these cases proceedings were commenced as long ago as 1880, and the period of redemption expired in May of last year. One of these persons, a man named P. Tubbins, has, since his eviction, lived in a two-storied six-roomed house, his own property, and with him resides another of the evicted tenants, a relative of his own. For this man Tubbins it was proposed to erect a hut, and materials for the purpose arrived at Clonmany in January last. The site selected was a piece of waste land overlooking several evicted farms. The constable in charge of the station feeling persuaded that, from the site chosen, intimidation was intended, warned the owner of the land, Doherty, that the probable result would be the erection of a police hut, which would involve a charge on the neighbourhood. Doherty then told the constable that he had not consented to the erection of the hut on his land. I am informed that it is not the case that four of the evicted families are huddled together in a three-roomed house, or that there is any fever in Clonmany.

EGYPT—THE MASSACRE AT ALEXANDRIA.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received any communication from Lord Dufferin, stating that he has refused to receive evidence, which was ready, implicating the Khedive in promoting the massacre at Alexandria on the 11th June, on the ground that he could not place the Khedive on his trial; and, whether the Government will now guarantee the protection of the witnesses who are prepared to give testimony connecting the Khedive with the massacre?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No communication of the kind referred to by my hon. Friend has been received by Her Majesty's Government from Lord Dufferin, and the eventuality contemplated in the second part of the Question has, consequently, not arisen.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: Has no communication been received at all as to the action of Lord Dufferin?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I have said that no communication has been received.

MOTIONS.

—•:0:•—

PARLIAMENT—ADJOURNMENT—THE DERBY DAY.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL, in moving "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday," said, he would have been very glad had he been able to discharge the duty he had undertaken by submitting that Motion in the most formal and briefest manner possible; but he did not know if that course would be considered respectful by the House, and it might be supposed that the Motion which he had to propose was lacking in arguments by which it could be supported. He would willingly spare the House, if he could, "the damnable iteration" of arguments which had been used over and over again on the subject. He should have thought that by this time the continual dropping would have worn away the stony hearts of those who had hitherto shown themselves opposed to the very slight relaxation in their duties for which he was asking; but he was given to understand that that was not the case, and that opposition would be shown to the proposal, arising in the same quarter of the House in which they had been accustomed to see it. In moving the Resolution, he would undertake, in the first place, to be very brief; and, in the second place, to spare the House any attempts on his part to be facetious. As a citizen of, perhaps, the most serious nation under the sun, he should be very much at a disadvantage if he attempted to enter the lists with the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. R. Power), in those sallies of a delightful humour which was supposed to be the inheritance of his race. In the third place, he would undertake that whatever he might say should contain nothing approaching to political acrimony or calculated to stir up Party acerbity. He proposed to rest his appeal on the truly liberal sense of the House, and on the ground of expediency. He asked hon. Members on both sides whether it was expedient to depart on this occasion from the general custom initiated at a period of the history of that House which was not the least illustrious in its annals, and by one to whom the Party now in power owed a great part of the credit they had acquired in times past? He was told it was a pleasant sight in days of yore—those days of yore to which they had been often referred of late as being days when the debates and procedure of the House were conducted with greater decorum and dignity—to see the Prime Minister come down and move the adjournment of the House without exciting any hostile comment. He could not help thinking that it was unfortunate that it should now fall to the lot of a private Member to do that which used to be so well done by the Leader of Her Majesty's Government. He had no wish, especially in the absence of the Prime Minister, to draw any invidious comparison between the right hon. Gentleman and his distinguished Predecessor; but he thought it was to be regretted that that portion of the mantle of Elijah had not descended upon the right hon. Gentleman which would have inspired him with a true and honourable sympathy with the legitimate pastime of the people. It would be in the recollection of hon. Members that last year the custom to which he had alluded had been broken through; but the circumstances then were most exceptional. In the first place, the country had been plunged into an abyss of grief and shame by recent occurrences in Ireland; in the second place, the House was under the necessity of proceeding from day to day with the arduous and unpleasant duty of passing legislation of a most unprecedented character; and, in the third place, they were on the eve of a war which had now happily terminated. Last year it was understood that the fact of the Adjournment not being moved should not create a precedent; and now that the circumstances were normal he asked the House to revert to its old practice. The arguments by which this Adjournment had been supported had never failed to commend themselves to the House, and especially to the present Parliament, which in 1880 carried the Motion by 285 to 115, and in 1881 by 246 to 119. He should be surprised and disappointed if the numbers for the Adjournment were lower this year. A special reason why he expected the House to adjourn this year was that the Private Bill and other Select Committees had not yet re-assembled after the Whitsun Recess, so that there would be no expense incurred in that way through deferring the Business of these Committees. The Government last night were able to make some progress in Supply, and the Bills down for to-morrow were of an insignificant and even of an undesirable description. If the Speaker were prepared to take the Chair shortly after 12 to-morrow, there was not the slightest chance of a House being made, and the only result would be that the right hon. Gentleman and the officials of the House would be imprisoned there until late in the afternoon. Therefore, he could not conceive any real or genuine opposition to the proposal he had to make. He supposed the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) would vote against it; but he believed that the hon. Member would do so more from ignorance than interest. Perhaps the hon. Baronet was never at the Derby. ["Yes."] Well, then, he only went there to see what sort of a place it was, and very likely came back and said he was filled with shame and remorse. But he (Sir Henry Maxwell) had seen more Derbies, and more recent Derbies, than the hon. Baronet, and could assure him that it was by no means the rule for gentlemen to return from the Derby in a state of inebriation, or wearing false noses and sticking dolls in their hats. The hon. Baronet had already had a double innings this year. In the first place, a horse called Zoedone won the Grand National; and, in the second place, the hon. Baronet himself had secured a first place for Local Option. Then the hon. Member could not object to the Motion on the ground that the Derby led to an undue consumption of intoxicating liquors, for if he did he would assuredly receive no support from his own side of the House. Example was better than any amount of precept, and he was credibly informed that at the great Liberal *réunion* which took place the other night at the Aquarium it took 2,500 bottles of champagne to assuage the thirst of 1,800 members of the Liberal Party. He had no doubt that many Members would go down to the Derby whether this Motion were carried or not, in spite of the maledictions of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. The hon. Baronet was a master of malediction; but the House had got so accustomed to his condemning innocent recreations that he did not think anyone could compete with him in the lists, unless it was the Cardinal of whom we read in the *Jackdaw of Rheims*, that he treated his enemies in much the same way as the hon. Baronet treated those who went to the racecourse—

> "He cursed him in sleeping, that every night
> He should dream of the devil, and wake in a fright;
> He cursed him in eating, he cursed him in drinking,
> He cursed him in coughing, in sneezing, in winking;
> He cursed him in sitting, in standing, in lying;
> He cursed him in walking, in riding, in flying,
> He cursed him in living, he cursed him in dying!—
> Never was heard such a terrible curse!
> But what gave rise to no little surprise,
> Nobody seem'd one penny the worse!"

He would not detain the House any longer, but would merely remind them that although the safty-valve was apparently but a small and insignificant portion of the steam-engine, and did not increase its power, yet it was a portion which could not be wisely dispensed with; and he thought that by assenting to this Motion the House would find that the legislative engine would work more smoothly and more effectively when they re-assembled after the short release which he asked for by this Motion.

Mr. HENEAGE rose to second the Motion. He approved the proposal to adjourn, because the Wednesday on which the Derby was run was the one day in the Session on which every Member expected to be able to do whatever he might please. They could never be certain of any other day. They might have a Morning Sitting, or a Sitting on Saturday; but the Derby Day had always been a holiday, and was so treated in balloting for a Wednesday at the beginning of the Session. No one but a novice would think of taking that day for bringing forward any Motion. They ought not, all of a sudden, to refuse to give this holiday; and if in future years they were not to adjourn on the Derby Day, let it be settled at the beginning of the Session by a substantive Motion, so that they might all know what they had to expect. Many Members, it should be remembered, had made special arrangements in the belief that the House would adjourn. More than one hon. Member, for example, might wish to visit an eccentric relation from whom he had expectations; and it should be observed that if the House sat the eccentric relation would not know whether the Member was in the House, or at the Derby. Others had arranged to visit their constituents. ["Name!"] Last year the noble Lord the late Vice President of the Council (Lord George Hamilton) made one of his greatest speeches to his constituents at Middlesex on the Derby Day. [Mr. Monk: Yes; but the House sat on that day.] That was an accident, and the noble Lord could not have known the House would sit when he made his arrangements weeks before. He understood that a right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) intended to-morrow to criticize the Government at Wolverhampton. That showed that there was a prevalent belief that there would be a holiday on the Derby Day. Some hon. Member said—"Let those go to the Derby who wish; but let the House sit for those who are willing to work." That was all very well; but hon. Members who expressed that opinion ought not to forget how difficult it might be to make a House. A fortnight ago the Speaker had to sit for an hour before a House could be made on a Wednesday; and to-morrow he might have to sit for four hours, for the Adjournment could not be moved before 4 o'clock, nor could a "Count" be effective. It would not be fair to render the Speaker and the officials of the House liable to such weary waiting. He would appeal to his hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle—because he was a strong supporter of Local Option; and would ask him if the course he intended to pursue was not against all the principles of Local Option—if it was not opposed to all those principles that a small and obstinate minority—he did not say it offensively—should try and force their views upon the majority? That, he thought, was a strong argument why his hon. Friend should change his mind, and vote for the proposal on this occasion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday."—(*Sir Herbert Maxwell.*)

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he could assure his hon. Friend, who made the Motion in a very good humoured spirit, that he did not intend to talk about drink at all, and he did not wish to curse anybody either, as the hon. Gentleman seemed afraid he should do. He did not want to attack anybody; but he wished to attack the evil system of that House giving its sanction to a great gambling festival. For some years past this Motion had been moved by different private Members—by the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) two or three years ago, and after that it fell into the hands of the Irish Members. He was not at all surprised that this Motion fell into the hands of Irish Members, because they made no secret of their opinions. They were straightforward, open, and honest. They cared nothing for the credit of that House; they would be glad to bring it into disrepute. ["No, no!"] That was what they had actually said. They said that they were not there of their own wish, and that they were brought there. Therefore, he was not surprised that they supported a Motion of this kind, for they knew it made the House ridiculous. But he was surprised that the Motion should have fallen into the hands of one who had described himself as a Representative of the "most serious nation under the sun." His hon. Friend on his left (Mr. Heneage) said just now that horse-racing was very popular, and he (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) was not going to stand up and say that horse-racing, and all its concomitants, was not a most popular thing with the people of this country, because he knew it was popular with the aristocracy and the democracy, with Princes and peasants; and as to the newspapers, there was not even a family paper that did not devote columns and columns to the state of the "odds" every day. He was pleading to-day for the minority. Of course, it was the system in this country that the majority should rule, and on questions of public good the minority must give way; but he did not think anyone could say this was a question in which the public good was very much involved. It was only a question of their own convenience and amusement; and he thought it would be more generous and candid if the majority of that House, strong as it was, had a little consideration for the feelings of others in this matter. They might call them prejudices; but it was one of those cases in which a strong majority would be justified in taking the honourable course of paying attention to the views of the minority. He objected to this Motion, as he had often done before, on this ground—that if they took a national step it should be for a national object; and he did not think they were justified in saying that horse-racing was a national object which should receive the sanction and *imprimatur* of that House. He should oppose any steps of this sort. He should oppose the Adjournment, even if it had nothing to do with horse-racing. A great public entertainment under the auspices of the "Blue Ribbon Army" would win his hearty approval; but if anyone were to propose the Adjournment of the House in connection with that entertainment, he should oppose the Motion. He should say—"No; let us respect the feelings of the drunkards." That would not be a national question, and he should object to the Adjournment for that, just as much as he did for the Derby. His hon. Friend opposite (Sir Herbert Maxwell) was afraid he would come down on racing men. He was not going to do anything of the kind; for he knew that many racing men were as honourable as many Members of that House; and the late Baron Rothschild, who knew a good deal about them, had said that racing men were as honest as gentlemen in the City—and he was inclined to agree with him in that. He would ask the House to remember what the law said about the gambling to which they would give their sanction if they should adjourn. From the time of William III. until now, in all legislation concerning gambling, betting had been described as—

> "Unlawful and deceitful, contributing very much to the encouragement of idleness and impoverishment of the people;"

and the law, as laid down in the Act passed in the year 1868, was as follows:—

> "Every person playing or betting by way of wagering in any street, road, highway, or other open or public place, or in any place to which the public have or are permitted to have access, shall be deemed a rogue and vagabond within the true intent and meaning of the recited Act, and as such may be convicted and punished under the provisions of that Act."

He did not think that the House ought to adjourn in recognition of a sport which attracted "rogues and vagabonds," to use the words of their own Act of Parliament. In a celebrated article which appeared in *The Quarterly Review* in 1833, giving a most wonderful account of the Turf in those days, the writer said—

> "Woe betide the day when Englishmen look lightly on such desperate inroads on public morals as have lately passed under their eyes on racecourses. Can this familiarity with robbers and robbing be without its influence on a rising generation? We say it cannot."

He challenged anyone who knew anything about horse-racing—and there were plenty of them in the House—to say that the Turf was any better now than it was in 1833, when that article was written. He would be greatly surprised if those who knew it best did not say it was worse. It was in 1847 that this proposition to adjourn was first made in the House. Lord Palmerston was the first man who made it a Ministerial question; and it so went on until the great and good Tory Administration which was overthrown in 1880 came forward and said it would be no longer responsible for moving the Adjournment, that it must be left to private Members to move the Adjournment for the Derby, if it was to be moved at all. Now, he hoped they were going backwards in the right direction. They had got back to the time when it was moved by private Members, and he hoped to-night they should get to the time when it would be upset altogether. It was now out of the hands of the Government and the Leaders of the Opposition, and the House itself was responsible for what it did in the matter. His hon. Friend opposite (Sir Herbert Maxwell) touched very lightly upon one point of considerable importance. He hardly gave sufficient weight to the fact that last year the House did not adjourn. They broke through the evil practice, and what happened? They spent the day satisfactorily in discussing an Irish Bill. He saw the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) shake his head; but it was an Irish Bill he assured him. And who was any the worse? Those who wanted to go to the Derby went, and those who did not wish to go stayed here and attended to the Irish Bill, and they got on perfectly well without those Gentlemen who went to the race. The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire did not go to the Derby last year. He (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) remembered him sitting on that Bench opposite like a martyr. He remembered the expression of his face. He looked as if he said—"Here am I, a patriot, attending to my duties;" but he did not say where the right hon. Member for North Lincolnshire (Mr. J. Lowther) had gone. He (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) was sure that from that day to this the hon. Member had felt a better man for attending to his duty instead of his pleasure. There was also another reason why they should not adjourn on this occasion. They could not use the old argument about legislative lassitude, because they only came back last night, and they were sure to have a "Count out" to-night. Therefore it was absolutely impossible for hon. Members, with any face, to get up and say they were worn out, and really wanted a holiday. Another argument for adjournment was absent this year. It was usually said there was no Business. But this year there were 21 Orders on the Paper. Most of them were of great importance, although not, perhaps, extremely interesting. One of them was an Ecclesiastical Bill. He saw the right hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Beresford Hope) present. He was sure that right hon. Gentleman would rather come down to the House and attend to an Ecclesiastical Bill than pass the day sitting on the Grand Stand. He was told the right hon. Gentleman had signed the "Whip" in favour of the Adjournment. That was utterly incredible, and he could not believe it until the right hon. Gentleman got up in his place and stated that it was so. There was another reason why they should not adjourn. He supposed that they were all, except the Irish Members, interested in the usefulness and dignity of the House, and wished the House to be respected in the country. Did they think they could be said to be taking a step which would increase the respect of the country for the House, if they spent their time in passing Gambling Acts for the purpose of putting down suburban races, and punishing boys for playing pitch-and-toss on the streets, and then, by a large majority, adjourn for the purpose of taking part in the greatest gambling celebration in the whole world? He thought it would be more dignified to discourage all the gambling and rowdyism that went on at Epsom, and that they would show the greater moral courage in breaking through rather than in following a custom which in the course of a few years they were bound to regard as "more honoured in the breach than in the observance."

MR. ST. AUBYN appealed to both sides of the House whether they were not wasting the time of the House by continuing that discussion, because he did not suppose that any Member's vote would be influenced one way or the other, if they talked on that subject till midnight. The hon. Baronet had alluded to the Derby as a great gambling transaction; but if he were to go to the Stock Exchange he would find more gambling there every day than on the racecourse. He thought it would be much better that the House should at once proceed to a division.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he should not have risen to take part in the discussion, had it not been that the opposition to the Adjournment came from the side of the House in which "Radicals most do congregate." It seemed to him most undesirable that the idea should go forth that a supercilious disregard for the red letter days of the people's almanack should be a cardinal matter in the Radical creed. His hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) seemed to have an extraordinary opinion respecting the Derby. He really was under the impression that people did not drink down there; but that they engaged in gambling. [Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I did not say that they did not drink.] He confessed he was surprised that the hon. Baronet should have made a speech on the subject without saying that they did drink. The hon. Baronet seemed to have evolved out of his moral consciousness the notion that the Derby, Drink, and the Devil were convertible terms. Now, some persons, no doubt, might go to the Derby to gamble; but everybody knew that, as a matter of fact, the occasion was regarded as a species of national picnic in the fresh air. And the hon. Baronet should support it because it was essentially a democratic picnic; because, for that one day at least, and in that one place in the Island, equality ruled supreme—high and low, rich and poor, going out to enjoy the fresh air; and if there was any boisterous hilarity among them, it was owing rather to natural good spirits than to alcoholic spirits. The hon. Baronet said that in adjourning over to-morrow they would be preferring pleasure to duty. No doubt there was a Cato-like air of rugged virtue in voting against the Adjournment; but the constituencies were not quite such fools as some people in that—the Radical—part of the House took them to be. The constituencies were sure to take a pretty accurate measure of the fussy and spasmodic zeal of the Catos in that quarter of the House, who came down and voted on parade occasions like that, and thus attempted to assume a virtue though they knew they had it not. He asked hon. Gentlemen to look into the past. How many "Counts out" had there been? There had been at least a dozen this year. ["No, no!"] Well, then, say half-a-dozen. Where were his hon. Friends then? Where was their zeal for the public cause then? He supposed they were dining, or engaged in some equally futile occupation—those eminent patriots! On the last Wednesday when the House met the Speaker sat in his Chair more than an hour before a sufficient number of Members came down to make a House, and when he himself dropped in about 2 o'clock things were not much better. Only about a dozen Members were present, and there was not a single zealous Cato among them; they were composed of Whigs, Conservatives, and such like triflers; and the discussion was upon something relating to theatres. Even the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold)—perhaps one of the most diligent Members—would admit that they could hardly waste their time more if they all went to the Derby to-morrow than if a few of them sat, as they did on the occasion to which he had referred, when they carried on an idle discussion about places of amusement, though he himself took part in it. He was told that they had passed two Bills; but even then he did not think the day had been very usefully spent. He did not think, therefore, that they would gain much by not adjourning for the Derby. He would vote for the Motion, not that he himself contemplated going to Epsom; but many others might wish to go there, and might prefer that the House should not sit. There ought to be a sufficient amount of good-fellowship among them to induce them to adjourn if there was a feeling in its favour, even on the part of a minority, and if there was no particular Business likely to be done, as nobody supposed would be the case to-morrow. The hon. Member for Beaumaris (Mr. Morgan Lloyd) proposed to ask them to-morrow to look after the discipline of the Church; but that was hardly Business of a character to conflict with the desire to adjourn over to-morrow. Sometimes they adjourned because some Members wished to go to church; others wished to adjourn to go to the Derby; and surely those were matters in which they should give and take a little. He supported the Adjournment on its own merits, because it recognized the sound principle that life was not to consist entirely of toiling and moiling. All work and no play was a fallacious and pernicious doctrine, and one which, if preached by Radicals, would alienate from them support throughout the country. He viewed the Motion in the light of a graceful recognition of the people. It was not a question of rich men, but of all men going to the Derby; and it was a recognition, also, of the equally sound principle that life had its pleasures as well as its duties.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he would not detain the House. He merely wished to throw out a suggestion which might be worthy of consideration in another year. When he first entered Parliament there was no Adjournment over the Derby Day, because the House always met in the evening. It did not always follow that the House met in the evening; but he remembered that on one occasion Sir Robert Peel passed, on the evening of a Derby Day, many of the clauses of one of his Commercial Bills. He suggested that in another year the Government might arrange for the House to meet in the same way, to expedite one of the measures on which they, or some private Members, had set their hearts. He thought this practice of Adjournment was discreditable to the House. It ought to be remembered that important Business had to be done in Private Bill Committees. There was no other Court in London which adjourned on the Derby Day; and why should the House of Commons not sit also? If they did not wish to sit at 12 o'clock they could meet at 4. He thought it might be considered whether there should not be such an alteration of the Standing Orders as would allow Committees to sit even if the House adjourned.

Mr. JAMES HOWARD said, he simply rose to point out that the argument of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) rested upon an unsound basis, for he had assumed that the majority of the people of this country indulged in the pastime of horse-racing; but neither he, nor any other speaker, had proved, or had attempted to prove, this position. He (Mr. James Howard) utterly denied its existence. He had, for 30 years, lived near to a racecourse, and could say that not one-tenth of the people of the neighbourhood ever attended the races; nor did a fiftieth, and, perhaps, not one in a hundred of the people of the Metropolis, had ever attended the Derby. Nor were the supporters of the Adjournment the sole lovers of sport or amusements, as they imagined. Like hundreds of other men fond of horses and genuine sport, he had a great contempt for racing, and for the specimens of men it produced. He saw no reason for the Adjournment of the House, more especially upon a false assumption. He should certainly vote against the Motion for the Adjournment.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 185; Noes 85: Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 97.)

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).

RESOLUTION.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER, in rising to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the statement of the financial affairs of India should be made at a period of the Session when it can be fully discussed,"

said, he wished to point out that it had been the habit of successive Governments, for a long course of years, except upon the occurrence of some particularly urgent circumstances, to put off the introduction of the Indian Budget until the Appropriation Bill was brought forward just before the close of the Session, when it was impossible to afford any adequate opportunity for its discussion. He had made the same Motion in 1873, when he was supported by the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) and the Postmaster General (Mr. Fawcett). At that time he stated to the House that the Budget had been constantly brought forward in the Dog Days. He quoted from *Hansard* the dates between 1858, when the Company was abolished, and 1873, when he addressed the House. Since then there had been no improvement. In 1873 the Budget was brought in on July 31, the Prorogation being on August 5; in 1874, August 3, the Prorogation being August 7; in 1875, August 9, the Prorogation being the 13th; in 1876, August 10, the Prorogation being the 15th; 1877 was an improvement, as it was brought in on June 21; but in 1878 it was August 13, the Prorogation being on the 16th; 1879 was, again, an improvement, as it came on on May 22, and was twice adjourned; 1880 was the Dissolution, and it was brought in on August 17, three weeks before the end of the Session; but in 1881 it was August 21, the Prorogation being on the 27th; and in 1882, August 14, the Prorogation being the 18th. Against that system protests had been made over and over again, without effect, by the right hon. Gentleman the present Postmaster General (Mr. Fawcett), and by other eminent authorities in that House, who were deeply interested in the affairs of India; and he would, therefore, appeal most earnestly to Her Majesty's Government to seriously consider whether something could not be done to remedy what appeared to him to be a scandal. The existing system not only prevented the House from taking that interest which it ought to take in the affairs of India, but it was a direct violation of the pledges given by many eminent men, when the Government of India was transferred from the East India Company to the Crown. Great as was the importance of the Business pressed upon that House, he could not help feeling that it owed almost as great a duty to the people of India; and it was for that reason he ventured most humbly to submit the Resolution, of which he had given Notice, to the judgment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the statement of the financial affairs of India should be made at a period of the Session when it can be fully discussed."—(*Mr. R. N. Fowler.*)

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, in rising to move, as an Amendment, that the Indian Budget should be "referred to a Select Committee, and after examination properly discussed by the House," said, he very much sympathized with the views of the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. R. N. Fowler), and heartily wished it were possible to attain the end desired by him; but, in the present state of the Business of the House, he did not think there was any prospect of inducing the House at large to apply itself to the difficult question of Indian finance. Most certainly there was no hope of such an eventuality occurring during the present Session; and, therefore, his (Sir George Campbell's) Amendment was moved with a view to reducing the hon. Member's Motion to a more practical form. It was very desirable that there should be, in this country, some authority charged with the duty of reviewing, to a certain extent, the Indian Budget. There was one authority to whom that function might be considered to appertain, and that was the Council of the Secretary of State; but that body worked in the dark, and under an extremely dubious Act, and he did not think they exercised any sufficient control over the finances of India. But there were also other reasons why it was impossible for the House at large to deal satisfactorily with the finances of India. He was of opinion that Parliament had too much centralized the affairs of that great Empire in one Legislative Chamber; the House was consequently overburdened with work, and if it was to undertake the duty now proposed, that work could not possibly be adequately performed. That House, moreover, was not competent to deal with many of the questions involved in Indian finance. It was not desirable, in his opinion, that a very minute and active control should be exercised over the finances of India by that House; but, on the other hand, he did think it was desirable that, as Parliament had the duty of controlling the finances of the Empire, the review of the Indian finances should not be reduced to an utter farce, as it usually was. It should be real and useful in some shape; and the only way to make it so would be to refer it to a Select Committee of capable men, to whom those accounts could be submitted, and thoroughly reviewed, so that there might be an effective and useful debate upon a Report to be presented to the House. It was necessary that something of that kind should be done in justice to the Government of India, who, carrying on their functions a long way off, were subject to misrepresentation; and it was desirable that there should be an impartial tribunal which would deal with the accounts, and would shield the Government of India from the injury and injustice occasioned by unintelligent debates in the House and comments in the Press. The recent Motion of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope) was, in his opinion, of the nature of an attack upon Lord Ripon, although it was not framed with that view. [*Cries of* "Order!"] It was a Motion which spoke of Lord Ripon as the most extravagant Governor General we ever had; and, in a speech the other night, the hon. Member again charged Lord Ripon with extravagance. It seemed to him (Sir George Campbell) that charges of extravagance in regard to India were the burden of all the speeches in that House upon India; but such charges were founded not upon details, but upon generalities, and totals in matters of finance were exceedingly misleading. If the Indian Budget were considered by a Select Committee, it seemed to him that it would be shown that in Lord Ripon's Government there had been no extravagance whatever, and that the charge was totally unfounded; and that not only in finance, but in other matters, Lord Ripon had been a most careful man, and that he had been supported by a most careful Financial Minister, Major Baring.

Mr. E. STANHOPE rose to Order,, and said, he understood that the debate on his Motion had been adjourned. He asked whether the hon. Member was in Order in discussing that Motion?

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member (Sir George Campbell) was clearly out of Order in referring to a former debate in the present Session. He could not do that. The administration of Lord Ripon was not now the Question before the House.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he must apologize for trespassing against the Rules of the House. He believed, if the Motion before the House was amended as he suggested, the House would be in a position to judge more fairly of the conduct of the Government of India.

Mr. R. T. REID seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "fully," and insert the words "referred to a Select Committee, and after examination properly." — (*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fully' stand part of the Question."

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he thought both proposals to bring on an Indian debate at an earlier period of the Session, and to refer the Budget of India to a Select Committee, were well deserving the attention of the House, and that they were simply required in fairness to India. They had too long allowed the Indian Budget to be taken at the end of the Session; and he thought the proposal of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. R. N. Fowler) ought to be carried. The materials needed for considering the financial state of India had been in this country ever since the beginning of April, so that ample time existed long before the end of the Session to discuss the affairs of India in connection with finance. He also thought, before the House was asked to consider the complicated and often-changed systems of Indian accounts, that it would be a wise measure to appoint a Standing Committee to examine the Indian accounts every year, and report to the House. At present, in consequence of the changes which had been effected in the accounts of India, it was impossible to compare the present figures with those of former years. He hoped the House would adopt both Motions.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, he doubted whether that House could be said, in any sense, to be a proper tribunal to consider the finances of India, for the officials in India were the proper persons to do that; but if it were to be resolved that it should do so at all, the Indian Budget ought to be laid before it early in the Session, in order that the discussion upon them might be a real and a practical one. He was afraid, however, that the Expenditure of India would never receive critical revision at the hands of that House, because any change in it must, of necessity, increase the charges borne by this country. There were very few hon. Members who were acquainted with India; and if they took to cutting down the expenditure they would cut down in the wrong place. It was the expenditure in England, on account of India, that required to be looked into. He believed that a great deal too much was charged for the support of depôts of the Army, which should be an Imperial charge. The Indian people were not represented in that House; and what he would like to see would be a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the relative portions borne by India and this country of the charges made at home for India. If competent financial officials were brought from India and put on the Commission, who would carefully scrutinize the charges upon the Army, India Office, and the contracts for stores sent out to India, a very substantial reduction would, he believed, be made, especially in regard to stores, and the India Office, a Department in which the people of India did not believe.

Mr. J. K. CROSS said, he was afraid that, judging from the appearance of the House at that moment, when the House began to discuss Indian questions on the eve of the Derby, India stood a bad chance against the Derby. They talked about India being a matter of great interest to the House of Commons; but no one who looked round the House an hour ago, and would look round it now, would consider that the 600 English Members who adorned the House had any connection with the great Dependency 7,000 or 8,000 miles away. He was very much obliged to the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. R. N. Fowler), however, for bringing forward the Motion, as it gave them the opportunity of being able to say how much some of the Members of Her Majesty's Government, at any rate, wished the Resolution could be put in force practically, and at once. He was not at all sure that it would not have been the best plan, and that they would have made some practical progress, if they had taken up that Tuesday evening with a preliminary discussion on two or three questions relating to the Indian Budget. They could thus, at any rate, have got through some of the work which would come before them at a later period of the Session; but if the Indian Budget had been proposed that night, he was afraid there would not have been more hon. Members present than there now were. The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Macfarlane) had advocated the appointment of a Royal Commission for the purpose of examining, amongst other things, into the stores, and had recommended the appointment of Indian officials on the Commission. But the Indian Council was composed of the most eminent members of the Indian Civil Service; and they, and the authorities at the India Office, were the purchasers of the stores. If they were to do away with the India Office, the total saving would be only £218,000 a-year, which would not make any material difference to the finances of India. With regard to stores, he very much doubted, if they were bought otherwise than by the India Office, they could be got at anything like the same price, for the loss on the metallic exchange would have to be added to the price. The date of the Indian Budget being brought forward in the House depended on three things—first, on the time the Statement was made in India, and, consequently, when it reached this country; secondly, on the progress of Public Business in the House; and, thirdly, on the financial necessities of India. They might, so far as regarded the time the Budget was presented in India, have the Statement laid before the House by the 20th or 25th of May, for he had already revised it; and he hoped that such portions of it as had reached this country would be in the hands of Members within the next three days, as it was in the hands of the printer. With regard to the progress of Business in the House, if hon. Members would devote themselves to getting through the Business as fast as they could, and if the hon. Gentleman opposite would use his utmost influence with his Friends to persuade them to assist the Government in expediting the Business, and not to delay, more than they could possibly help, any of the questions which were immediately pressing for settlement, there was no doubt that the Government would be able to fix a day not later than the middle of July for the discussion of the Indian Budget; and no one would be more rejoiced to have it discussed at that time than he should himself. But, unless that were done, he was afraid the Indian Budget would naturally go the way it had gone before. He was in hopes, however, that the Standing Committees would enable them to get through with the work more quickly than hitherto, and, if they kept in the temper in which they appeared to be to-night, that the Indian Budget would come on at an earlier period than had been the case for some considerable time. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) wished a Select Committee appointed, which should examine into the accounts as they were presented to the House of Commons. The question naturally arose—What could that Committee do? What would be the use of appointing such a Committee? It would really be a Committee of Examination and Record, without effective or practical powers, and, therefore, not of much service. It would examine the accounts; but it could not, as the Public Accounts Committee did now, send for those who framed the Estimates. It would be obliged to take the accounts as they were presented, and give a sort of record of them—a sanction, as it were, to the accounts; and if, by that means, they were to arrive at a much better state of feeling in that House with regard to Indian matters, there was no doubt it would be a very considerable advantage. But it did not seem to him that that would be the result. With regard to the Amendment, if the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy was not satisfied with the accounts as they would shortly be presented, he (Mr. J. K. Cross) should then, on the part of the Government, have no objection to consider whether it would not be desirable to appoint a Select Committee, as was proposed, in the hope that it might make some suggestions with regard to the framing of the accounts; although he did not believe that such a Committee would result in good to India, or in advantage to the House of Commons generally. The accounts this year certainly showed a very great change in form, but little change in matter; and the Expenditure did not appear to have grown very materially. There was only one point he should like to mention to the House. There was a great deal of misapprehension in the way hon. Members looked at the question of Indian Expenditure. It was said—"Look at your Indian Expenditure; it is going up at an enormous rate. The Statistical Abstract of 10 years ago shows that it was £46,000,000, and now it is £76,000,000." Hon. Members might just as well point to the increased expenditure of the great Railway Companies. From the way they spoke of Indian Expenditure they left people to understand that the taxation had gone up in the same ratio; but he maintained that there was no ground for such an inference. It was a mistake to divorce expenditure and taxation, as was frequently done. He would just put before the House the principal heads of Revenue in India during the last few years—Land, Salt, Assessed Taxes, Provincial Rates, Customs, Stamps, and Registration. Instead of being £76,000,000, the total amount raised yearly by taxation from these sources in the three years ending 1874 was £37,000,000 sterling; in the three years ending 1882 it was £41,000,000; the revised Estimate of 1882-3 gave a taxation of £39,600,000; and the Budget Estimate for 1883-4 was £39,700,000. These figures showed a distinct reduction, as compared with 1881-2, of about £2,000,000 a-year. When hon. Members came to look a little further into these figures, and to examine them fully and impartially, they would find that Indian finance was not in the miserable condition in which it was supposed to be. When these accounts were put before them in the way in which they would be put before them in the future, he did not think they should need any Committee to explain them. He was very happy to be able to accept, in a practical sense, so far as he could, the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. R. N. Fowler); but he did not think it was necessary to accept that of his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy, because, as he had indicated, he believed the accounts, when presented, would be found perfectly intelligible and satisfactory. He was sure that when these accounts found their way into the hands of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy he would be ready to compliment the Indian authorities, and thank those who were present at the India Office for the change which had been effected.

Mr. E. STANHOPE said, he had heard, with very great regret, the observation of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. J. K. Cross), that the House was not interested in Indian affairs. He (Mr. E. Stanhope) had always entertained the belief that this country felt deeply interested in Indian affairs, and that it desired its Representatives in that House to show a much greater interest in them than had been the case hitherto; and one reason why the House did not evince more interest in them was, because the Government itself gave the House so little encouragement. He would remind hon. Members that when, a day or two since, an hon. Member endeavoured to bring forward a subject of great importance to India, two attempts were made on the opposite side to count out the House. He thought the House was deeply indebted to his hon. Friend who had moved the Resolution (Mr. R. N. Fowler) for bringing this matter before it, because the way in which the House dealt with the affairs of India was nothing short of a scandal. Although he was ready to admit that blame attached to both Parties of the House in this matter, yet it was of great importance that both should co-operate in the future in an endeavour to get the Indian Budget discussed at an earlier period of the Session; and on this point he was glad to hear what had fallen from the Under Secretary of State for India; but it was idle for him to say that anything which hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House could do would secure this object; because, if all the Government measures now under consideration were disposed of, others would be brought forward; and he feared that unless the Government showed a determination to act differently than they had done hitherto, the Indian Budget would again be postponed to the end of the Session. As to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), he confessed he did not like the idea of a Committee, because it would take the responsibility off the House. The only way to reduce Indian Expenditure was for the House resolutely and continually to say that economy should be observed; and then the Governor General, whoever he might be, would undoubtedly turn his attention to the subject and carry it out by a firm and consistent policy. He welcomed, however, with great satisfaction, what the Government had said in regard to the original Motion—that they did accept it in a desire to bring the Indian Budget forward at a time when it could be properly discussed; and he trusted that an effort would be made this year to carry it out.

Mr. R. T. REID said, he deeply regretted that the Government did not see their way to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), because there were, he conceived, many points, not only with regard to finance, but to policy, in which a Select Committee on this question could do useful service. It was only in that way that they could arrive at the reasons why certain items had been unduly swelled. A great and growing interest was felt in this matter, both in the House and in the country; and the Government would doubtless see that it was wise and prudent to encourage discussion upon it. He also thought it important that ample time should be given for the discussion of the Indian Budget, as underlying Indian finance were many questions of policy which required to be dealt with in detail. He trusted the new method of keeping the accounts would prove more satisfactory than those which had preceded it.

Mr. WARTON said, he should be sorry if an impression prevailed that no hon. Member of the House was entitled to say anything about Indian questions unless he was an expert, because it was the duty of hon. Members to make themselves acquainted with all the Business that came before the House; and the best way in which they could make themselves acquainted with Indian Business was for the Government to bring forward the Indian Budget at an earlier date. Both Parties were to blame, to a certain extent, in this matter. His experience extended no further than the present Parliament; but he knew that in 1881 and 1882 repeated promises were made to bring on the subject earlier, and were not fulfilled. Although the Government had accepted the Resolution of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. R. N. Fowler), yet the manner in which they had done so seemed to convey the fact that there was an impression on their minds that their first duty was to push forward certain measures of legislation, to the neglect of their real duty, the consideration of English and then Indian taxation and finance; and they seemed to throw blame and reproach on hon. Members on that side of the House because, in opposing such measures, they were delaying the bringing forward of the Indian Budget. He protested against that, and contended that the course pursued in regard to those matters should be reversed. He thought the Government should do the real Business of the country before they engaged in those wonderful schemes of legislation which broke down year after year.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he could wish that the House took a greater interest than it did in Indian affairs. The difficulty in the way of the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) was that the number of Members of this House having knowledge of Indian affairs was so small, that it would be quite impossible for the Indian Budget to undergo the survey which the hon. Member proposed, without taking evidence on the points that might be raised. An inquiry had been conducted, some time ago, by the right hon. Gentleman who now presided over the Postal Department (Mr. Fawcett). That Committee had laid some valuable information before the House, but no practical result had followed; and if there was to be any inquiry again, it ought to be gone into with some definite object. He, for one, was very anxious that some light should be thrown upon the checks that existed upon Indian Expenditure at home. He did not think any adequate check could be imposed by the House of Commons, which was so much occupied with home affairs; and the Indian Council worked in the dark, so that the country really did not know what was the nature of its labours. For that reason, inquiry into Indian taxation and finance was certainly necessary, and the time had arrived when it should be made into the check at home. It was now more than 20 years since a great change was carried out in the Government of India. Before that, there was a very efficient check upon expenditure. The East India Company, from their business habits, and from motives of interest—for their dividend depended upon it—kept a very keen eye upon the expenditure of every rupee in the country, and that with great effect. At the same time, it must be admitted that, in those days, the public works were starved, while the result was now rather the other way. He concurred in the hope that the Indian accounts would yet be presented to the House in a manner that all could understand. Formerly they were intelligible; but they were not so now, partly, perhaps, because the capital and annual accounts were not given together in a clear way. He also thought it was most desirable that, after the interval that had elapsed since the great change to which he referred, the public should be informed as to the manner in which it had worked.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he was glad that a promise had been given that this very important subject would be brought on as early as possible. The only way to insure the matter of Indian finance and Estimates being brought forward earlier in the Session was for the Indian people to take up the matter themselves, and, by expressing their opinions upon it, to make it of sufficient importance that the House of Commons would not neglect to do so. He believed that, if that were done, before five years elapsed questions relative to India and Indian finance would be dominant topics in the House of Commons.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he would withdraw his Amendment in consideration of the promise that had been made by the Government.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the statement of the financial affairs of India should be made at a period of the Session when it can be fully discussed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE BILL.—[Bill 140.]

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he wished to point out that the Bill provided for a larger expenditure than had ever been known for the Civil Service within recent years. On the second reading notice had been taken of that fact; but no information had been given by any Member of the Government, nor had any indication been afforded of the intention of the Government seriously to consider the very great growth of the public national expenditure as regarded the Civil Service Estimates. He did not know whether the House and country were to understand that the Government admitted that it was not in their power to reduce the expenditure, and that there was no defence to be made for the continuous and steady growth that had taken place within the last three years. If that was the case, he had nothing more to say. He had himself ventured to draw attention to the circumstances under which that increase had occurred. Such an increase was not consistent with the professions with which the Government took Office—professions of economy and retrenchment. The allegations which had been advanced to this effect, and which had met with no response from the Government, were of a grave character, and deserved the serious consideration of the Government and of the country. But no such consideration had been given by the Government. At any rate, he thought it was his duty to enter a protest against that continued increase of expenditure, and against what he considered the unusual course of refraining in that House from giving any explanation of the cause of the expenditure, or any assurance that the Government would endeavour to prevent its growth. These Estimates, which found their expression in the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, were not the Estimates of Parliament and the country, but the Estimates of the Government—the Estimates presented to the British Parliament by the Government on their responsibility, and therefore they had a right to hold the Government, wholly and individually, responsible for them; and it was only on that footing that he made an appeal once more to the Government to state whether it was their intention to exercise the control which ought to be exercised over the public finances; and whether it was their intention to resist the demands which had been made upon them from various sources for increased expenditure; or whether they proposed to court popularity by allowing the lavish expenditure of public money which appeared now to be made?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that the Bill had come on at a very unexpected hour; and it was unfortunate that neither his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) nor his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Courtney) were in their places to answer the right hon. Gentleman. He (the Marquess of Hartington) was under the impression that, both on the Financial Statement and on the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), the views of the Government, as regarded expenditure, had been very fully stated; and he thought that, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman was hardly justified in saying that the House had been left in the dark as regarded the opinion of the Government on the matter. The observations of the right hon. Gentleman were of so general a character, that he thought he was scarcely able at that time to make any fitting reply to them. As to the increase of expenditure in the country, there was no doubt that, in many Departments of the State, which corresponded with the growth of the nation, a reduction in the expenditure was not possible; and, as regarded another class of expenditure, no doubt the Government had admitted that it was possible and desirable that economy should be effected, and had taken into consideration the possibility of the House and the Government being assisted in that object. But he must point out that the Government required the support not only from those on his side of the House, but from those on both sides; and he was sorry the Government had not always received the assistance of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, as was shown by the fact that a recent proposal in favour of economy was almost unanimously rejected on the other side of the House. After what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. H. Smith), he had hopes that such a proceeding would not occur again. He did not enter into the merits of the question; but this Bill did go in the direction of economy, and there were proposals which had emanated from the other side of the House which would tend very greatly to increase the Public Expenditure. It would be impossible for him, entirely unprepared as he was, to enter with any advantage into the important subject raised; and he only regretted that this Bill had not come forward at a time when those in charge of it could have answered any observation made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR contended that the Government, and the Government alone, must be held responsible for the Expenditure of the country, and that the House of Commons should make it a principle that the Government of the day, from whichever side it came, should themselves be responsible for the Expenditure. The Expenditure of the late Government might have been reckless, as had been alleged by hon. Members on the opposite side of the House; but it was far exceeded by their Successors; and he must protest against the Government taking such an opportunity of throwing upon the Opposition some of the responsibility that rested, and must rest, entirely upon themselves.

MR. WARTON also repudiated the attempt to fix this responsibility upon Conservative Members.

MR. BIGGAR said, that, seeing neither of the Members of Her Majesty's Government present who were most concerned in the Bill, in order to give them an opportunity of replying to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) he would move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

The House proceeded to a Division, and Mr. Speaker stated he thought the Noes had it; and, his decision being challenged, he directed the Ayes to stand up in their places, and nine Members only having stood up, the Speaker declared the Noes had it.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Birley, Sir William M'Arthur, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Charles Ross.*)

[BILL 51.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Stevenson.*)

MR. WARTON, in opposing the Motion, said, he had to complain that it came upon the House by surprise, inasmuch as hon. Members knew not, as yet, how the Government were going to vote on the question; whether they were, as a whole, going to support, or whether one-half of them were going to support, and the other half to vote against it, just to show to the country that there was no strength or backbone whatever in the present Administration. In fact, no one could tell on what principle they acted. They knew not from what Her Majesty's Ministers would abstain, in order to secure the votes of a fanatical section of the House of Commons. They were, as a weak Government, ready to give way to everything that was forced upon them. Although that was the case with the Government, he hoped the House would stand firm, and not let the whole administration of the country get into the hands of the fanatical Party. The Bill itself was a short one, but its object was very large. It meant this—that every place in England for the sale by retail of intoxicating liquors should be shut up for the whole day upon Sunday, except for the accommodation of the *bonâ fide* traveller. No proposal could be more monstrous than that. It amounted to this—that the whole population of the country should be prevented from tasting a glass of beer upon Sunday, because a set of men, who knew neither their wants nor their habits, were of opinion it was not good for them. Surely that was a question which each man ought to have the right of deciding for himself, without being dictated to by anyone else. However, as he said before, it was unnecessary to go into the merits of the Bill at any length until they saw what course Her Majesty's Government intended to adopt. He firmly believed that, if they gave a proposal so absurd and so monstrous the least countenance or support, their conduct would be received with an indignant spirit by the country, and the consequences might be of a serious character. They had all seen how the Government, on a recent occasion, gave way to mob law. He had no wish to see them subjected a second time to the same degradation; and, therefore, he hoped they would recollect what a mob did some years ago, in Hyde Park, in consequence of the passing of what was called Lord Robert Grosvenor's Act. For his own part, he could not see what right any man, or any set of men, had to prevent their fellow-citizens from taking their refreshments whenever they required them. Take the opposite side, and suppose the advocates of the licensed victuallers' trade brought in a Bill, making it compulsory on every teetotaller to drink a quart of whisky each day, what an outcry would be made about it. It would not be one whit more monstrous or absurd than this proposal. Still, they deserved it, and he, for one, would have no commiseration for them. What he complained of was, that this was class legislation of the bitterest and most cruel kind. Those who proposed it, however, knew neither the rights nor the necessities of hard-working men. There were, in London, thousands of men in the position of clerks, living in lodgings, who had no cellars to which to resort, like the advocates of this measure, for a supply of generous wine, which they drank to keep their own spirits up, while they denied those hard-working men the right of living like ordinary Christians. It should be recollected that these men rented only one or two rooms, where it was impossible they could have a supply of beverage in store. If, then, one of these men wanted a glass of beer on Sunday, they drove him to get it on Saturday evening and keep it overnight, and drink it stale upon Sunday.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after Seven o'clock till Thursday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 24th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Customs and Inland Revenue*; Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Fraserburgh Waterworks)* (63).

Second Reading—Legitimacy Declaration Act, 1858, Amendment* (38), Order *discharged*.

Committee—Report—Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act (1882) Amendment (Audience of Solicitors)* (34); Medical Act (1858) Amendment* (52).

Third Reading—Glebe Loans (Ireland) Acts Amendment* (35), and *passed*.

Their Lordships met;—And having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 24th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—ARMY ESTIMATES, Votes 2 to 6.

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—East and West India Dock.

Considered as amended—Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway; Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 4) (South Shields, &c.)*.

First Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (Limerick Waterworks)* [197].

Second Reading — Medals [188]; Copyright* [141].

Select Committee—First Report—Crown Lands*.

Committee — Report — Poor Law Conferences* [187].

Mr. Warton

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

⁂

EXETER, TEIGN VALLEY, AND CHAGFORD RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now considered."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE said, he begged to move the re-committal of the Bill. The House would remember that, when the Bill was before them on the second reading, he had opposed it, on the ground that it contained provisions enabling the Company to charge excessive and differential rates for the carriage of artificial manures, and a higher classification for such manures in comparison with that in which manures were classed generally as "dung, compost, and all other kinds of manures." His opposition to the second reading of the Bill was withdrawn, on account of the passing of the Standing Order proposed by his right hon. Friend the Member for North Hampshire (Mr. Sclater-Booth), which provided that any Bill containing provisions in regard to questions relating to new tolls or rates should not be reported by the Committee until a Report by the Board of Trade on the powers sought had been laid before the Committee, and the Committee should have reported, specially, to the House in what manner the recommendations or observations contained in the Report of the Board of Trade, and also in what manner the clauses of the Bill relating to the powers sought had been dealt with by the Committee. By that Standing Order, it was provided that all matters relating to new tolls or rates should be brought under the notice of the Committee, whether they formed the subject of opposition or not; and those who were looking after the agricultural interest in that House were induced to believe that the effect of that Standing Order would be to prevent Committees from imposing any increase of rates with regard to articles necessary for the fertilization of the soil, carried by new Railways. But now this Bill, among others, came down from a Committee upstairs; and it was found that the charges upon artificial manures were very largely in excess of the vast charge upon "dung, compost, and all other kinds of manures." It was contended in the Report of the Committee upon this Bill that the charges were not in excess of those authorized for like undertakings in previous years; but it appeared to him, although he did not know whether he was right in the supposition or not, that, upon the face of this Report, the Committee, who had the Bill under their consideration, had only looked at the charges which had been asked for in regard to the different classes, and had not turned their attention to the classification of the different articles in those separate classes. In all Railway Bills, except within the last year or two, when he believed that some eight or nine Bills were allowed to pass without these differential rates on manures having been brought to the attention of the House—in all Bills, except those Bills which had been allowed to pass by inadvertence, he was safe in asserting, artificial manures were intended by Parliament to be classed with manures of the lowest class, under the term of "dung, compost, and all other kinds of manures." But, in this Bill, although the attention of the Committee was called to the matter by Standing Order 145A, it appeared that artificial manures were charged at the rate of 3*d.* per ton. The original charge the Railway Company proposed to levy upon artificial manures was 3½*d.* per ton; but the Committee had reduced that charge to 3*d.* a ton. But they had not reduced the class in which artificial manures were here placed to the level of the lowest class given in the Schedule; and he found, also, in the Bill, that "dung, compost, and all other kinds of manures" were charged for at a higher rate than was formerly or generally permitted by the House of Commons. Instead of the charges being, as he believed it used to be, a general rate of 1½*d.* per ton, it was proposed now to impose, as the lowest charge, a rate of 2½*d.* a ton. It might be said, perhaps, that the Standing Order having been passed by the House, and the attention of the Committee having been called to the fact, and the Committee having reported upon it, it was not desirable or proper that he should challenge the decision of the Committee; but he should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that all the Committees to which this matter had been referred had not come to the same decision. In fact, the House had that day passed the third reading of a new Railway Bill—the Pewsey, Salisbury, and Southampton Railway Bill, which measure made the charge for artificial manures the same as that for the lowest class of manures. He found in Class 4, which included "coal, culm, cinders, &c.," "all sorts of manures and undressed materials, &c.," a charge of 1¼*d.* per ton. Therefore, it would be seen that, in the Pewsey, Salisbury, and Southampton Railway Bill, the charge upon the lowest class of manures was more than 1*d.* less than that proposed to be charged in the Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Bill, which the House was now asked to read a third time. He found that in the class in which he fancied the Committee had permitted, in the Bill now under discussion, artificial manures to be included — namely, sugar, corn, grain, flour, &c., in the Pewsey, Salisbury, and Southampton Railway Bill just read a third time, the charge was 2½*d.* per ton per mile, which was the same price the Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway Bill proposed to charge for their very lowest classes. It seemed to him that the object of the Standing Order, on account of which his opposition and the opposition of other hon. Members to this Bill was withdrawn on the second reading, had been overlooked, and that the Committee had had their attention called to the rating of different classes proposed to be taxed by the Bill, but had not had their attention called to certain subordinate articles which had been placed in other classes. The Railway Company had been enabled, by some means or other, to take artificial manures out of the lowest classes, which, he contended, were the classes in which they ought to be included, and had placed them, by some inadvertence on their part, in a higher class, thereby enabling the Railway Company to charge a higher price for the carriage of manures than had generally been permitted to be done by the legislation of former years. He thought it behoved those who represented the agricultural interest to keep a watchful eye on these attempts on the part of the Railway Companies to charge higher rates than were absolutely necessary for the carriage of agricultural commodities. It was necessary that they should keep a watchful eye upon every endeavour to impose higher charges on these articles; because the House would be aware of the fact that the Railway Companies were not altogether particularly careful of the agricultural interest, while they claimed, on the other hand, to have every care bestowed upon their interest. They had it in evidence, laid on the Table of the House, that the Railway Companies were in the habit of charging much lower rates for the conveyance of foreign produce from the port of debarkation than they charged to those members of the agricultural community who sent to London on the produce grown in this country itself. This difference in charge might not be a heavy loss in money to the agricultural interest. It might not be, in the case of this line, that so large a quantity of artificial manures would be carried as to occasion a very serious loss to the agricultural interest upon it; but hon. Members should remember that this was a precedent, and that it would be made a precedent in future for new Railway Companies to come to Parliament and ask for similar privileges in increasing their rates and charges. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary, for the well-being of the agricultural community, that all attempts of this kind should be carefully watched and guarded against. He might also say this—that the carriage of artificial manures was a matter of vital importance to the Railway Companies themselves; because it would be evident to the House that, the more agricultural manures were carried by the Railway Companies down to the country districts, and the more fertilizing materials were generally used in those districts, the larger would be the amount of produce that would be raised by the agricultural community in such part of the world and placed upon the Railway Company's line, and sent up to the different markets that might be located within reach of the Railway. It might be that the Railway Company, if they placed their artificial manures in the lowest class, should set themselves right by levying a charge for insurance on artificial manures. They contended that they ought to charge a higher rate, an account of artificial manures being liable to sustain damage in transit. Now, he wished to point out that it would be much better for the agricultural community that artificial manures should be placed in the lower class, and that the Railway Company should charge a certain rate for insurance. He found that the extra cost covered by insurance, supposing artificial manures were to be charged at the same rate as "dung, compost, and other kinds of manures," would be 1*s*. per £100 in value, or 1*s*. per cent. If the whole distance of the Railway was 24 miles, it would be a very easy sum to find out what the extra cost for carrying the artificial manures would be—namely, the fourth of 1*d*. per ton for the whole distance; whereas this Railway Company had come to Parliament to ask it to sanction a charge at an extra rate of 1*d*. per ton, not for the whole distance which the insurance of 1*s*. per £100 value would cover, but 1*s*. per ton for every mile. He thought he was not asking too much of the House, when he asked them to re-commit the Bill for the further consideration of the Committee; because it appeared to him that the Bill, and another Bill which came after it, and which he should oppose for the same reason, had been permitted to be passed by the Committee upstairs, under a misapprehension of the reasons for which the Standing Order was passed by the House, and for which his opposition and that of other hon. Members on both sides of the House was withdrawn. He begged to move that the Bill be re-committed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the noble Viscount propose to follow the usual course of re-committing the Bill to the same Committee?

Viscount FOLKESTONE: Yes.

Mr. JAMES HOWARD said, he had great pleasure in seconding the proposition of the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Folkestone), for there was no reason whatever why the Railway Company should charge more for guano than they did for farmyard or stable manure. In the first place, guano was only manure in a more highly comminuted and concentrated form; and it was far more easily handled, loaded, and unloaded, than stable manure. Another point was that a great deal more could be put on a truck than in the case of ordinary manure—perhaps two or three times the weight; and, upon these grounds, he should most strongly support the Amendment of the noble Viscount.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now considered," in order to add the words "re-committed to the former Committee."—(*Viscount Folkestone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered,' stand part of the Question."

SIR ARTHUR OTWAY said, that various questions of an extraneous character had been introduced by the noble Viscount who moved the re-committal of the Bill (Viscount Folkestone). The House would remember that, a short time ago, there was a long discussion upon the question of the charges to be imposed upon the carriage of manures, and the result of that discussion was the passing of a Standing Order, at the instance of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Hampshire (Mr. Sclater-Booth), whom he now saw opposite. Now, what did that Standing Order say? It said—

> "In the case of any Bill relating to a Railway, Tramway, Canal, Dock, Harbour, Navigation, Pier, or Port, seeking powers to levy tolls, rates, or duties in excess of those already authorized for that undertaking, or usually authorized in previous years for like undertakings, the Bill shall not be reported by the Committee until a Report from the Board of Trade on the powers so sought has been laid before the Committee, and the Committee shall report specially to the House in what manner the recommendations or observations in the Report of the Board of Trade, and also in what manner the Clauses of the Bill relating to the powers so sought have been dealt with by the Committee."

Now, the House would remember that that Standing Order met with considerable favour on the part of the House. It was regarded by hon. Members as a means of avoiding difficulties which might arise, and the waste of time which would be occasioned, if the rates inserted in every Railway Bill were to be considered and discussed over and over again by the House. The Committee upstairs had carried out strictly that which was required by the Standing Order, and its Report was in conformity with all the requirements of the Standing Order and of the Report of the Board of Trade, which was placed before the Committee. The Report of the Board of Trade upon the subject was very short indeed, and he would read one paragraph of it, which said—

> "In the Railway Acts of former years, when guano and artificial manures were less important than they have since become, no distinction was made between those manures and ordinary manures, and both were placed in the lowest class of about 1*d.* per ton per mile. In subsequent years, it has been the practice to grant more favourable terms. A table of some of the rates so authorized is appended to this Report. One of these Acts, it will be observed, dates as far back as the year 1857; other instances are to be found in Acts passed in 1863, 1865, and 1866; but more frequently in those of later years. Most, if not all, of the larger Companies appear to have made special charges for guano and artificial manures, as for manufactured articles. In this Bill, it is proposed to class guano and artificial manures with manufactured goods at a maximum rate of 3½*d.* per ton."

The question for the House to consider was, whether the Committee had dealt with that Report from the Board of Trade. The House would allow him, for one moment, to assure the noble Viscount opposite that he was not without sympathy with some of the statements which the noble Viscount had made. But he presumed that it was the duty of the Committee, in all matters, to conform to the requirements of the House. He would, therefore, state how far the Committee had conformed to the requirements of the House, and how far they had acted on the recommendations of the Board of Trade. This was the Report of the Committee—

> "That, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 145a, a Report from the Board of Trade was laid before the Committee stating that, subject to the observations in the Report respecting the maximum rate of charge for passengers, the tolls, and the maximum rates of charge for passengers, animals, and goods upon the Railway are not in excess of those authorized for like undertakings in previous years. In the Bill, as submitted to and passed by the Committee, the maximum rate for artificial manure, and other articles classed therewith, has been reduced from 3½*d.* to 3*d.* per ton per mile; the charge for parcels exceeding 56 lbs., and not exceeding 1 cwt., has been reduced from 3*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.*, and the charge for short distances has been reduced from four miles to three miles. After hearing evidence—and it has been proved to the Committee that the rates for passengers proposed by the Bill are the same as those authorized by the Teign Valley Railway Act, 1863, for the use of the Teign Valley Railway, of which the proposed Railway will form an extension—the Committee are of opinion that the rates proposed by the Bill, as amended, should be sanctioned."

He submitted to the House that there would be very considerable inconvenience if, in the case of every Railway Bill which came down from a Committee upstairs, they were to go into all these questions of rates again. He was afraid they might find themselves engaged in interminable discussions without producing any good result. Wherever a Bill allowed a Railway Company to make a higher charge than another Company was allowed to make, they would have this story repeated over and over again. He understood that it was in order to save the valuable time of the House that his right hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had proposed the Standing Order as a mode of terminating the difficulties to which he had alluded. Personally, he (Sir Arthur Otway) had only one wish, and that was to carry out what he considered to be the requirements of the House in dealing justly with the matter. He found, when the Bill came before him upstairs, that the rates of the new Railway were exactly those already in existence in the case of other Companies. He and his Colleagues had, however, taken off altogether a not inconsiderable sum from the charge originally proposed for the carriage of manures; and, on the whole, he submitted that the rates as now authorized by the Bill were no higher than they ought to be under the circumstances. The noble Viscount asked that the Committee should reconsider the Bill; but he frankly confessed that he was afraid they would be unable to come to any other conclusion than that which they had already arrived at. They had heard all the evidence with great care, and not without reference to the Birmingham case; and he had given his decision in conjunction with others who acted with him. He would appeal to the House whether they were prepared to sanction a course which would undoubtedly lead to great inconvenience, after having so recently determined how to avoid that inconvenience? If the Amendment of the noble Viscount were assented to, they would certainly have the re-committal of Railway Bills moved wherever the rates and charges appeared to those who represented the agricultural interest to be in excess of those which they would like to see imposed. If the House entered upon such a course, he was afraid they would be altogether departing from the most excellent arrangement for the settlement of the question they had adopted only a short time ago.

Mr. CHAPLIN said, he could not agree with the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway) that the observations of the noble Viscount the Member for South Wilts (Viscount Folkestone) were in the least degree extraneous. He (Mr. Chaplin) thought, on the contrary, that they were very much to the point, and he was of opinion that those who represented the agricultural interest in that House were much indebted to the noble Viscount for raising the question again upon the present Bill. He was quite aware of the Standing Order, which had recently been passed by the House; but he demurred to the proposition that that Standing Order, even at the time it was proposed, was universally considered to be satisfactory, or that it was received with universal favour. Whatever might have been the feeling at the time, undoubtedly, if the result of the Standing Order was to be that Bills were to come down to the House from Committees upstairs, containing clauses which were considered most detrimental to the agricultural interest, he, for one, objected to be bound in any way whatever by the decision of the Committee upstairs. The facts of the case were extremely simple, and nothing that had been said by the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means altered, in the least degree, the decision those hon. Members who opposed the second reading of the Bill had arrived at. The House had before them the plain fact that, in the Bill, there was a certain class of commodities necessary for the development of the agriculture of the country upon the carriage of which such a price was charged as must be most adverse to that agricultural development. That being the case, they really had no alternative but to oppose the further progress of the measure. The hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means had been lavish in his protestations of regard for the agricultural interest. Now, he (Mr. Chaplin) desired to see some practical effect given to those protestations, and he hoped the noble Viscount would press his Amendment to a division. He (Mr. Chaplin) felt convinced that if the noble Viscount did so, he would receive a very large amount of support, and he trusted that his noble Friend would be successful in carrying his proposition that the Bill be sent back again to the Committee upstairs. He believed it was highly probable that, in such a case, it would meet with a much more favourable consideration than it had received at present. Certainly, if it did not, the question would have to be raised over and over again.

MR. DUCKHAM said, they had been told by the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway) that, in the early days of Railway legislation, 1*d.* per ton was considered a fair charge for the carriage of manures. They were now called upon by this Bill to pay 3*d.* per ton per mile, and they had not heard any statement yet which would justify a three-fold charge being imposed upon the agricultural interest. The hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. James Howard) had stated, quite correctly, that artificial manures were more easily packed together in railway trucks, and that they did not occupy one-half the space of ordinary farmyard manures of the same weight. Then, why should the agriculturists be required to pay a greatly increased charge for carriage? He thought it behoved the House to look with a great amount of jealousy on any increased charge being placed by Railway Companies upon the carriage of agricultural produce, or upon commodities necessary for agricultural development. They had before them the Report of a Select Committee, which had taken great pains in investigating Railway rates and charges, and that Committee found that there was a great diversity in the amount of charge made for the carriage of the agricultural produce of the farmers of this country and the agricultural produce sent in from foreign countries. They were told that that was in consequence of the competition with water carriage. Nevertheless, the fact remained that the great Railway Companies were reducing the charges upon foreign produce which were formerly imposed; and, after buying up and closing our internal water carriage, thus creating a powerful monopoly, they were now seeking to place a three-fold charge upon the carriage of our own agricultural produce. Despite the opinion which had been expressed by the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway), he thought it behoved the House to look carefully into the matter, and to see that excessive charges were not sanctioned by any Act of Parliament.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he wished to assure his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway) that no blame was attached to him in respect of the complaints that were made in regard to the Bill. He quite agreed with his hon. Friend that it might be better if a Government Department had been empowered to settle these questions of rates without requiring them to be discussed by the House. At the same time, he submitted, that no private Bill should be allowed to pass through the House without being brought under the notice of those who were concerned in watching over the public interests, if it contained a proposal to increase the rates, or to establish a difference of classification. There was no desire to cast any reflection upon his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means. The question had been discussed fully in the House, upon the second reading of this and other Bills, and a desire was then expressed that the Board of Trade should deal with the subject. Nevertheless, the Board of Trade simply presented a Report to the Committee; and the Chairman of Ways and Means, on the strength of that Report, said there was nothing unusual in the Bill. No doubt, the Report of the Board of Trade, that there were precedents for the charges made in the Bill, was correct; but he (Mr. J. W. Barclay) thought it might fairly be said that they were very few. There were two complaints against the present Bill; first, in respect of common manures being charged the excessive rate of 2½*d.* per ton per mile, whereas the maximum charge in a large majority of cases was 1*d.* or 1½*d.* per ton per mile; and, in the second place, it was complained that the Railway Company, in this instance, sought power to charge a much higher rate for artificial manures than for ordinary kinds of manure. No doubt there were precedents for that; but the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade told them, when the question was under discussion on the second reading, that the eight Bills in which these differential charges were sanctioned had been passed in consequence of inadvertence, and that it was owing to the passing of those eight Bills that the necessity had arisen for the further consideration of the matter, with a view to the prevention of increased and differential rates on manures in future without the sanction of the House. If there was anything to be said in favour of uniformity of practice, he would call the attention of his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means to the fact that there were other Railway Bills now before the House in respect of which the rate asked was only one-half of what was asked by the Railway Company promoting the present Bill. He might instance the Plymouth, Devonport, and South-Western Railway, a line of 30 miles, which cost £43,000 a-mile. This Railway was a line of 18 miles, and would only cost £18,000 a-mile, and the charges proposed to be levied in this case were almost double those which the other Railway proposed to levy. Now, he contended, and he understood the House desired, from the discussion which took place the other day, that there should be some uniformity of charge—that some principle should be laid down on which rates and charges should be fixed, and that they should not depend on the will of the agents promoting these Bills, which was very much the case at present. If one Railway Company, in every respect similar to another Railway Company, wished to charge twice as much as the other for the same amount of work, he thought a strong *primâ facie* case was made out that the one Company was asking too much. Several Railway Companies, whose Bills had been called in question, had deferred to the views expressed by the House, and he contended that it would be wise on the part of the House to adopt a uniform practice of charging all manures alike. This Company had inserted very high rates indeed in their Bill; and, as it was the first time the question had come before the House in this manner, he thought if the House were to express a decided opinion on the subject, it would form a good precedent for the guidance of the Chairman of Ways and Means, and for Members of the House who might be called upon to serve on these Committees in future. At the same time, it ought to be made clear to the Board of Trade that the House of Commons would look to them to some extent to protect the public interests, and not to show themselves, as he was afraid they did, in too many cases, to be more anxious to protect the Railway Companies from the public than to protect the public from the Railway Companies.

Mr. B. SAMUELSON said, the question which had been raised was one which affected not only the agricultural interest, but the whole community. It was not simply whether the Railway Companies were to impose exorbitant charges upon persons who were chiefly concerned in agricultural pursuits, but whether Railway Companies were to be allowed, at their pleasure, to charge rates which were considerably above those which had hitherto been considered to be sufficient. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), that there was no intention to convey a reflection upon the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means, because it was clear that the Report of the Board of Trade did not afford sufficient materials to guide the hon. Baronet in regard to the rates which he ought to sanction. But if a Standing Order had been passed, and which, he hoped, would soon be passed, in conformity with the Resolution of the House on Railway charges—namely, one empowering the public to be represented before Railway Committees—then such a difficulty as had arisen in the present case would not have arisen at all. What had happened in this case was that the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means had not had his attention called sufficiently to the fact that the charges proposed to be made by this Railway Company were very considerably in excess of the charges usually levied on the articles to which they were intended to apply; and, although it was not desirable that they should, on ordinary occasions, review the decision of Committees of that House, still it must be considered, having regard to the new Standing Order moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Hampshire (Mr. Sclater-Booth), that this was a case for referring the decision of the Committee back again. It was desirable, if possible, to have nothing authorized beyond the maximum Railway charges now sanctioned; and if they now wished to insist in this Bill that no increase of the rates should be allowed, the attempt would, probably, never be made in any future Bill. If they did allow it, they would establish a precedent which, he was afraid, would be a bad augury for any attempt they might make hereafter to have the charges reviewed generally, and to lower the maximum rates in the interests of the public. He saw no reason whatever why they should not, in the present case, make an exception to the wholesome rule of abstaining from reviewing the decision of a Select Committee; and he thought it would be better to set aside the decision of the Committee in this case, in consequence of the extraordinary circumstances which had arisen. If they allowed the present rate fixed in the Bill to pass, they would be told hereafter that these rates had been sanctioned, and other Railway Companies would ask for similar high rates. He thought the value of the article did not justify them in accepting the rate, nor was there any reason for a high rate on account of the space taken up. In point of fact, no reason whatever was given by the Railway Company to justify any exceptional favour being conferred upon them. If this precedent were now allowed, any general review of Railway rates in the public interest would be rendered very difficult, if not impossible.

MR. ROBERTSON said, he disputed the wisdom of reviewing a decision which had already been arrived at by a Select Committee of the House. As a matter of common sense, he thought that when the question of what the charge should be was referred to a Committee, they should support the decision of the Committee. It was most unwise, in his opinion, for the House to re-open the special questions referred to a Committee, and again to discuss the principle upon which charges were to be levied upon articles of different bulk and different value. It was stated that these charges would be detrimental to the interests of agriculture. Now, he was sure that if any one interest in the country had been more benefited by the construction of railways than another, that interest was agriculture; and, in view of the depression which had come upon agriculture of late years, he was perfectly satisfied that if there had been no railways the agricultural community would have been far less able to bear it. They were in a position now to have their produce carried much more cheaply than formerly, and they were able also to get better prices for everything they produced. He could speak from personal experience. He had now to pay 12*s*. per ton for coal where he was living in Wales, which would have cost formerly 22*s*. per ton; and, in regard to agricultural produce, there was not only a reduction in the price of carriage, but the farmers got double the price they were able to obtain formerly. But, in point of fact, there were two sides to everything; and it was, indeed, too much the fashion for any interest which felt it had a grievance to come to that House to ventilate it. He asked the House, in the interests of public legislation as applied to Public Bills, not to agree to the Amendment proposed by the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Folkestone). They had every year to deal with millions of money expended in public measures, and he thought they ought to secure the pockets of the investing community from being improperly attacked. He hoped the House would not consent to send back the Bill to the Committee.

MR. HICKS said, he wished to draw the attention of the House to the only question before it, which was simply this—whether a certain class of articles which, from the very introduction of railways, had been placed in the cheapest class, should now, in these days, when agriculture was so depressed, and at a time when the House had, over and over again, professed its desire to improve agriculture and increase the production of the country, should be now placed in a higher class—were they likely to effect that object by allowing the Railway Companies to charge 50 or 100 per cent more for the carriage of agricultural commodities than they had been allowed to charge in times past? The hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway) told them there had been some few instances in which this alteration of charges had been allowed; but he (Mr. Hicks) was sure there was no hon. Member of that House who would not admit that such alterations had been made without the knowledge of the House. It was only this year that the attention of the House was openly drawn to the fact that, within the last year or two, several Railway Companies had succeeded in getting artificial manures removed from Class 8 to Class 9, and that was the real question now before the House. Were they going to allow one Railway after another, until it included the whole Railway system of the country, to depart from the original bargain made with Parliament? He thought it his duty cordially to support the Amendment.

Mr. HENEAGE said, he wished to ask the House, if it was going to stultify itself, by allowing the Bill in its present shape to be read a third time, after the discussion which took place the other day, and after a Standing Order had been passed as the result of that discussion. Either that Standing Order was intended to protect the public, or it was not; if it did not, then they ought to come to the conclusion at once that it was utterly futile. His own opinion, however, was that it would be extremely dangerous and inconvenient if, after having passed that Standing Order, they now allowed a Bill to receive the sanction of the House which increased a certain class of rates by 200 per cent, and thus form a precedent which would be quoted hereafter as done under the sanction of the new Standing Order.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he could not agree with what had just been stated by his hon. Friend the Member for Grimsby (Mr. Heneage), nor yet with the language of the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway). The hon. Member for Grimsby said the Standing Order was futile; but, if so, how was it that they were then discussing that Bill, seeing that all the Standing Order provided was that these matters should be brought to the attention of the House? Again, his hon. Friend opposite the Chairman of Ways and Means looked upon the Standing Order as a compromise. It was no compromise at all. It was merely a means of curing the grievance that a Private Bill Committee, whether dealing with an opposed or an unopposed Bill, should be allowed *per incuriam* to sanction the introduction of changes relating to tolls and rates without the knowledge of Parliament. The Standing Order provided a remedy for that particular complaint; and he was satisfied himself that in this and in other cases the Reports which had been sent down from the Committees upstairs effectually secured the object which the House had in view in passing the Standing Order. If Parliament desired to go further, and to alter the rates upon these commodities, or to give a *locus standi* to persons to be heard before Railway Committees on behalf of the public interests, it would require fresh legislation, or some other means beyond the Standing Order. His hon. Friend opposite (Mr. J. W. Barclay) stated that if anybody was to be complained of in the matter, it was the Board of Trade, who were instructed to report to the Committee, and recommend what should be done. In this case, that Bill came before the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means as an unopposed Bill, and the hon. Gentleman stated that he had acted in accordance with the Standing Order sanctioned by the House, and that he had given effect to the recommendations of the Board of Trade. The Bill, no doubt, contained provisions which increased certain charges, and as the hon. Baronet said, there were precedents for that; but the question was, whether the statements made by hon. Members were correct, that the effect of this Bill, as passed by the Committee, was practically to double or treble the charges upon the carriage of certain articles compared with those originally allowed to be charged by other Railway Companies in the same position. The point was, whether that should be allowed to pass without question. He certainly felt that the House was placed in a position of considerable difficulty; and if the Standing Order had answered the very limited purpose that these things should not be done without the knowledge of the House, he thought it was still free for the House to express its opinion upon the issue now raised before it.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 69; Noes 177: Majority 108.—(Div. List, No. 98.)

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*.

Bill *re-committed* to the former Committee.

WINDSOR, ASCOT, AND ALDERSHOT RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now considered."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, that, notwithstanding the very large majority by which the Amendment in regard to the last Bill was carried, he would venture to say a word, in order to show the extreme inconvenience of the course now being pursued, if it were to be considered that every Bill dealing with Railway charges, after it came down from a Select Committee, was to be discussed again in that House. He thought the House ought to do one of two things—either to give a *locus standi* to some authority representing the public to be heard before Railway Committees, or to abide by the decision of the Committee when that decision was reported. He thought the last case could not be regarded as a fair illustration of the present one. In this instance, all the landowners and persons interested in the carriage of agricultural commodities were in favour of the Bill, which would effect a considerable saving in the charges they now had to pay in sending their goods to market. He hoped the noble Viscount who proposed to move the re-committal of the Bill (Viscount Folkestone) would bear in mind that it was not always the agricultural interest that was benefited in these matters. They all knew very well that when the cost of carriage was diminished, the price of the article itself would immediately rise; and, even in this particular case, the profits would not go into the pockets of the agriculturists, but into those of the manufacturers, who were at the bottom of this agitation. At all events, he trusted that whatever the House did that day, they would consider carefully the gravity of the course they proposed to enter upon, and would, at any rate, in the first instance, alter the Standing Order passed a short time ago. Perhaps the best course would be to repeal the Standing Order, and to give certain authorities a *locus standi* to be heard in the different Committees, so that the question might be fought out with the Railway Companies in Committee, and the House might not be converted into an arena for settling disputes between one party and another.

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE, in moving that the Bill be re-committed in the same way as the last one, said, it would not be necessary for him to detain the House by repeating the observations he had made on the Exeter Bill, the grounds of his present opposition being almost identical with those which applied to the last case. He should like, however, to make one remark in regard to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Shrewsbury (Mr. Robertson). The hon. Member appeared to think that it was invidious for the House to take cognizance of anything that had been decided by a Committee upstairs. Now, he (Viscount Folkestone) begged to remind the House that one of the objects of passing the Standing Order this year was that by that means the House should be allowed to decide whether it agreed with any Committee in allowing the charges and tolls of a Railway Company to be increased. He understood his hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Sir Gabriel Goldney) to say that this was a question which affected the manufacturers of artificial manures more than the agricultural community. He begged to deny that assertion *in toto;* because, if the rates were raised on artificial manures, they would not be borne by the manufacturer at all, but by the agricultural community. If the price of manures was now £5 per ton, and the rates for carriage were raised by 1*s.* per ton, the manufacturer would not allow that additional sum to come out of his own pocket, but would throw the extra 1*s.* upon the unfortunate man who was compelled to purchase the article. His hon. Friend who reported the present Bill (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) said that this Bill had not been passed as it was submitted to the Select Committee, but the maximum had been reduced to 3*d.* per ton. Now, that was the rate which was charged for the carriage of sugar, grain, corn, flour, &c.; and, by imposing that rate on the carriage of guano and artificial manures, it was plain that the Committee had placed those articles in a higher class than that in which they were formerly placed. Guano and artificial manures were formerly in the lowest class, whilst sugar, grain, and other articles were in the highest class. It was, therefore, evident that in this Bill the attention of the Committee had been called to the rates charged in the different classes, and not to the classification of the articles themselves. He begged to move the re-committal of the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now considered," in order to add the words "re-committed to the former Committee."—(*Viscount Folkestone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question."

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that, after the discussion which had taken place, and the decision which had been come to on the previous Bill, he did not propose to detain the House for more that a few minutes. At the same time, he thought that, as Chairman of the Committee which made the Report in this particular instance, it would be hardly proper or courteous to the House if he allowed the matter to pass without making one or two remarks. He did not think that his noble Friend who moved the re-committal of the Bill (Viscount Folkestone) would, for one moment, suppose that the interests of agriculturists had not been considered, at all events, by himself, the Member for West Essex. But what the Committee had to deal with was a Report from the Board of Trade, submitted to them in consequence of Standing Order 145a; and, as he imagined, the object of that Standing Order was to call the attention of Committees to the classification, as well as to the rates charged upon different articles, so that, in their Report to the House, they should call the attention of the House to certain particular facts, in order that the House, as it was doing that day, might, if it thought fit, reverse the decision of the Committee. So far as the Committee were themselves concerned, it was certainly shown, to their satisfaction, that, on a short line of this kind, the carriage of this particular article of artificial manures would not be remunerative except at a given price; and it was shown, also, that there was an amount of care required in the carriage of this particular class of manures, and in the storage of it in trucks, which took it out of the class of ordinary manures, and justified, in their opinion, the higher charge which the Railway Company stated was necessary in order to enable them to carry at a profit this particular article of commerce. That matter came before the Committee, and they also took into consideration the fact that the Board of Trade, in their Report, pointed out to them that, in other instances, a similar charge had already been authorized in Railway Bills. Under those circumstances, the Committee felt justified in allowing a rate which seemed to be necessary for the proper carriage of these particular articles, and which did not seem unreasonable, when they considered the evidence brought before them as to the necessity of exercising greater care in the carriage of artificial manures as compared with the carriage of common manures. Those were the reasons which, he thought, justified the Committee in coming to the conclusion they had arrived at; and he could not help feeling that, if the House was of opinion that another course should be adopted, and that artificial manures should be placed in the lower class as common manures, they ought to go further, and instruct the Board of Trade to make representations to that effect before the Committee, instead of simply calling the attention of the Committee, as they had done in the present instance, to the Standing Order, and allowing the Committee to judge from the evidence whether the charge submitted by the Railway Company was a proper one or not. In this instance, the Committee had, upon the grounds he had mentioned, come to the conclusion set forth in their Report. They thought they had sufficient evidence before them to justify that Report. At the same time, the Committee would be perfectly prepared to reconsider the question if the House desired them to do so; but, on the evidence before them, they were of opinion that they were justified in the decision they came to. He could only repeat that, if the House had made up its mind that these particular manures were not to be classed with the higher description of goods which required special care and attention, it would do well to make a special Order to that effect, and thus prevent the constant recurrence of discussions in the House upon the decisions of Railway Committees.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *re-committed* to the former Committee.

EAST AND WEST INDIA DOCK BILL [*Lords*] (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he did not propose to proceed with his opposition to the Bill. He believed that the promoters of it had come to an understanding with their opponents; and, as he accepted the agreement which had been come to, he would not persist in his opposition.

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

MEXICO—RENEWAL OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.

MR. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will inform the House what steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government towards the renewal of diplomatic relations with Mexico?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, communications have recently passed which give hope of an early renewal of diplomatic relations between this country and Mexico, and I hope shortly to be able to make a fuller statement to the House as to their nature.

CIVIL SERVANTS OF THE CROWN IN CONNECTION WITH FINANCIAL UNDERTAKINGS.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the issue of general rules for regulating the connection of public servants, both executive and judicial, with Joint Stock Companies and other enterprises, and their receipt of emoluments as directors and managers, has yet been considered; and, if any decision has been arrived at?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The matter to which my hon. Friend's Question refers has not come before me since I became Chancellor of the Exchequer; but now that my attention has been called to it by my hon. Friend's Question I will take care to look into it. It is one, however, which does not concern the Treasury only, but which may, perhaps, require the collective action of Her Majesty's Government.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that as the Prime Minister, while he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, had promised to look into the matter, he would repeat the Question on a future occasion.

IRELAND—LOANS TO IRISH RAILWAYS.

MR. T. A. DICKSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If, in reply to the deputation which waited upon him on the 26th of April, he is now prepared to state the decision of the Government with reference to the application for a reduction of the rate of interest on loans to Irish Railways?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Sir, in reply to my hon. Friend, I have to state that although some details have not yet been settled, we have virtually decided to reduce the rate of interest on loans to Irish Railway Companies made by the Irish Board of Works from 5 to 4 per cent as from the 1st of July next. Special arrangements will have to be made with reference to certain cases where payments have fallen into arrear, and these may take some little time to complete. When the whole are completed the Treasury Minute will be laid before Parliament.

SOUTH AFRICA—ZULULAND.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What steps, if any, Her Majesty's Government propose to take to put an end to the hostilities now being carried on between Cetewayo and another Chief in Zululand?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, Her Majesty's Government do not propose to intervene in the quarrel now going on within the borders of Zululand proper any more than they did before the Zulu War.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: May I ask the hon. Gentleman a Question arising from that answer? Did not Cetewayo undertake, at the instigation of Lord Kimberley, not to make war on the neighbouring Chiefs or people without the previous sanction of Her Majesty's Government, and, in the event of any dispute with any neighbouring Chief, to refer it to the arbitration of Her Majesty's Government? Does Her Majesty's Government intend to insist upon the execution of those terms on which he was restored to Zululand, or is the Convention with Cetewayo to be a dead letter, like the Transvaal Convention?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: In a matter of such importance and intricacy, I must ask the right hon. Baronet to give Notice of his Question.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I will ask the Question to-morrow.

LUNACY ACTS—MR. JOSEPH BERRY.

Mr. BROGDEN asked the Secretary of the State for the Home Department, Whether he has seen a statement in the "Echo" newspaper of the 19th instant in reference to a patient named Mr. Jos. Berry, detained in the Kent County Lunatic Asylum; and, whether he will be good enough to make inquiries into the case?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that he had ordered inquiries to be made into the truth of the statements referred to in *The Echo* to a patient named Mr. Joseph Berry, detained in the Kent County Lunatic Asylum.

THE MAGISTRACY (ENGLAND AND WALES)—PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH MAGISTRACY.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Lord Chancellor has refused to consider the unanimous recommendation of the Town Council of Portsmouth for the appointment of an ex-mayor, being one of the senior aldermen, to the commission of the peace for the borough; and, whether it is his intention to appoint instead a gentleman not resident in Portsmouth, and who has never taken any part in the general business of the borough?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that he had received a letter from the Lord Chancellor's Secretary stating that his Lordship had never refused to consider the recommendations made to him by the Town Council of Portsmouth. On the contrary, he had followed the recommendations of the Town Council, who submitted the names of two of their Aldermen to him. No objection had been raised by them to the intended appointment.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF gave Notice that he would repeat the Question, and would also ask whether the gentleman to be appointed had not taken a prominent part in organizing a great Liberal demonstration?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he knew nothing about the matter; but it appeared, from the postcript of the letter, that the gentleman appointed was a Conservative.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he did not know whether the Alderman or the other gentleman had been refused; but he would repeat the Question on Monday.

NAVY—WARRANT OFFICERS.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether it is the intention of the Government to improve the position of the warrant officers of the Navy in respect of uniform, compensation allowances, pay while serving on board ships in harbour, and Greenwich pensions?

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir, no final decision has been come to on this subject; but, as I informed the hon. Member in answer to a Question on the 16th of last month, the case is under consideration.

THE NATIONAL GALLERY AND BRITISH MUSEUM—ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

Mr. COOPE asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he is aware that the Electric Light has been used in the South Kensington and Jermyn Street Museums for upwards of two years, without any accident occurring; whether he is aware that a code of regulations has been adopted jointly by the Electric Lighting Companies and the Fire Insurance Offices, and approved of by his Department, whereby the risk of fire is reduced to a minimum, and no extra charge for insurance is made for electrically lighted buildings where these regulations are in force; whether there is absolute danger of fire to the National Gallery, arising from the proximity of the old workhouse in St. Martin's in the Fields, now used by the Admiralty as a receptacle for disused stores; and, whether he is prepared to take measures whereby the National Gallery and the British Museum may be lighted by electricity, and thus be made available for at least three evenings in the week for the improvement and enjoyment of the working classes and others who are prevented by their avocations from visiting our grand national collections during the day?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Sir, I am quite ready to admit all the premises of the hon. Member's Question, except the danger to the National Gallery from the workhouse at its rear, which has no foundation whatever. I still remain of opinion, however, that we have not had sufficient experience of the electric light to justify me in advising the Trustees to use it in the National Gallery, even if they did not entertain other grave objections to opening those Galleries at night.

CRIMINAL LAW—WIFE-BEATING.

MR. COOPE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in the case of men brutally assaulting their wives, when, as at present, the effect of being sent to gaol is frequently more severely felt by the wife and children than by the guilty party, he is prepared to take steps whereby magistrates may be empowered, at their discretion, to inflict the punishment of flogging in lieu of fine or imprisonment, the punishment to be doubled in the case of a second offence?

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, that, before the right hon. and learned Gentleman answered the Question, he wished to asked whether, considering that almost all brutal assaults on wives referred to in the Question of the hon. Member were committed by drunken men, the right hon. and learned Gentleman would consider the desirability of providing more adequate punishment for those who supplied them with the drink?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that the question of adding or substituting the punishment of flogging in cases of assaults of this character had been very carefully considered in a Bill proposed by his Predecessor in Office, and the conclusion arrived at by the late Government and the House was that it was not desirable to make any change in the law. He saw no reason for dissenting from that view.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE V.—RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN BULGARIA.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the American Missionaries and the Greek Schools in the principality of Bulgaria have been exposed to any ill-treatment on the part of the Bulgarian authorities; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government are taking any steps to prevent such infractions of Treaty stipulations?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I regret to say, Sir, that there have been complaints of conduct on the part of the Bulgarian local authorities in the matter alluded to by my hon. Friend. Her Majesty's Agent and Consul General has, on several occasions, made representations on the subject to the Bulgarian Government, and has called their attention to Article V. of the Treaty of Berlin, which guarantees religious liberty in the Principality. He has also received instructions that whenever specific acts, such as those complained of, come to his knowledge, he should join with the Representatives of the other Treaty Powers in remonstrating. The Secretary of State is in communication with the United States Government on the subject of the closing by the Bulgarian authorities of the American schools.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—MR. HEALY, M.P., MR. DAVITT, AND MR. QUINN, PRISONERS IN RICHMOND GAOL.

MR. LALOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that Mr. Healy, M.P., Mr. Davitt, and Mr. Quinn, who are at present confined in Richmond Gaol, have been deprived of the usual privilege of receiving visitors, in consequence of the appearance in the newspapers of the 18th instant of letters from Messrs. Healy and Davitt in reference to the Pope's Circular; and, if it is true, whether the authorities in Ireland will regard it as a punishable offence to question the justice of the Pope's interference in the temporal affairs of that Country?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the letters of Messrs. Davitt and Healy, which were addressed to the Lord Mayor of Dublin, were submitted on Thursday last by the General Prisons Board to the Government for instructions as to whether they might be sent on. The Government offered no objection to their being sent on, and accordingly they were posted to their destination on the same day. On the following day—Friday—they appeared in the Dublin newspapers, and on Saturday a report was received from the Prisons Board that Messrs. Healy and Davitt had sent copies of these letters for publication before authority for their despatch had been given, and that for this breach of the prison rules the privilege granted to them of seeing visitors had been suspended. Messrs. Davitt and Healy ought not to have sent copies of these letters for publication without permission, and the Prisons Board took the usual course in suspending their privileges for an infraction of the rules; but his Excellency, having regard to the fact that the issue of the letters had been allowed, ordered the suspension of their privileges to be removed. Mr. Quinn was not concerned in the matter at all, although reference is made to him in this Question.

Mr. HARRINGTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has any proof that the letters were brought out from the prison by visitors?

Mr. TREVELYAN: There is enough proof to satisfy the Prisons Board.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the state of affairs in Ireland will permit of the release from prison of Mr. Healy, M.P., Mr. Davitt, and Mr. Quinn?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, this is not an ordinary case of remission of sentence, as Messrs. Healy, Davitt, and Quinn can at any moment obtain their release by undertaking to comply with the law. This, however, is not altogether a sufficient answer, because, undoubtedly, on previous occasions the Irish Government has communicated with the judicial authorities which required certain persons to keep the peace, and who, on refusing to be bound over, were committed to prison; and after negotiations with those judicial authorities, the Irish Government had brought the term of imprisonment to a close without the persons in question having consented to give bail. The Lord Lieutenant will, therefore, in this case communicate with the Judges of the Queen's Bench who passed the sentence, with a view of satisfying himself whether any action is desirable.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS — PREMATURE DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS—THE ARMY MEDICAL INQUIRY.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Secretary of State for War, By whose authority a full Report of the Army Medical Inquiry was sent to the newspapers before that Report had been communicated to the House; and, if sent without authority, if steps have been taken to find out the person who furnished to the papers a copy of the Report? He wished to add the further Question whether the noble Marquess was aware that the Report was not even yet in the hands of Members, although it was published in the newspapers on Saturday last?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, I extremely regret what has occurred in this matter, and I will state to the House exactly what has taken place. For some time past *The Times* newspaper has devoted considerably more space and attention to the discussion of military matters than any other morning paper has done. Having regard to this circumstance, and also to the fact that from time to time unauthorized and incorrect statements have, somehow or other, got out from the War Office, and considering also that it was desirable that questions of this kind, if discussed elaborately in newspapers, should be discussed in a deliberate and careful manner, and not in a hurried manner, it has been for some time past the practice to allow gentlemen connected with *The Times* newspaper to have an early proof of the Papers which it is intended to present to Parliament and to publish. I ought to add that the Department, which had, or was supposed to have, with regard to the gentlemen to whom the documents were committed, satisfactory proof of their good faith and discretion as to the manner in which the documents should be used, obtained a distinct understanding from those gentlemen that nothing should be published on the subject until the Papers were in the hands of Members. Acting on that practice, my noble Friend the Earl of Morley, the Chairman of the Committee on the subject, gave to two gentlemen connected with *The Times* immediately before the Whitsuntide Holidays his own proofs of the Report and of the Evidence taken before the Committee, in the expectation that the Papers themselves would be in the hands of Members by the time Parliament re-assembled, and that they would not be published until they were distributed. My noble Friend was extremely surprised to find that the Report and extracts from the Evidence were published at great length in *The Times* of Saturday and subsequent days, and he has communicated with the editor of *The Times*, who has expressed his regret at the premature publication of the articles; but I must say that, looking to the want of care, to say the least of it, that has been exhibited in this case, it appears to me the practice had better be altogether abandoned. No blame whatever rests on any person in the Department. In reply to the additional part of the Question of the hon. and gallant Member, I am sorry to say that I have been informed by the Stationery Department the Evidence is so voluminous that it will not be in the hands of Members until Tuesday next. Under these circumstances, I propose to postpone Vote 4 of the Medical Vote until the House has had time to read and carefully consider the Report. I may also add that on the Army Estimates I will postpone Vote 9, which contains the Vote for the constabulary employed under the Contagious Diseases Acts, because the House will probably like to have the Bill, which is to be introduced on the subject, in their hands before they discuss the Vote which raises the question.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he believed that the Prime Minister gave the House an assurance, through the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that no publication should take place until Papers were in the hands of Members; but, notwithstanding this, they found a full and authentic Report of a Committee that sat at the War Office appearing in the newspapers before it had been distributed to Members.

Mr. GLADSTONE: As this, Sir, is a matter in which I am concerned, I am bound to say that, without at all going into the merits of the matter, the promise to which my hon. Friend refers was a Departmental promise, and had no relation to this particular matter.

Mr. PULESTON asked when the Bill referred to by the noble Marquess would be laid on the Table?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I cannot say, Sir.

Dr. CAMERON said, that, as there was a great deal of dissatisfaction felt throughout the Medical Profession at the very unfair nature of the extracts published, he should to-morrow ask the noble Marquess sundry Questions as to the correctness and accuracy of various statements, and whether they had not been contradicted by other evidence which had been suppressed?

Mr. CALLAN gave Notice that to-morrow he would ask the Secretary of State for War whether the action of the Earl of Morley had not been in consequence of the bad example of the late Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who communicated the Report of the Land Commission to *The Times* several days in advance?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: With reference to what has fallen from the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), I may say that one of the reasons why I regret the publication is that the Papers have been published, not only without any authority, but, in my opinion, in a manner altogether calculated to mislead the public.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, that there was no pledge that such a thing would not occur again. Perhaps the Prime Minister would now give the House some promise which should not be Departmental.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The answer which I gave did not afford ground for a taunt.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, he did not intend a taunt.

Mr. GLADSTONE: If the hon. Member did not intend a taunt, he has an unfortunate mode of expressing himself, or I have become more obtuse. It was merely that the House might not be misled on matters of fact that I referred to what happened on a former occasion when a promise was given on behalf of the War Department. I am not aware that this objectionable practice prevails in other Departments, but I entirely concur with the noble Marquess in the letter and spirit of his reply.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR wished to repeat that he had intended no taunt to the Prime Minister.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War, If he would inquire whether the understanding on which early copies of documents were furnished to *The Times* was an understanding that the review of them should, on the whole, be favourable to the Government of the day? If so, he would ask the noble Lord, with regard to the understanding that the publication of a review in *The Times* should not precede the distribution of the Papers to Members; whether its object was to conceal from the public the fact that *The Times* was in possession of those documents some days before they were in the possession of the House? If the Question was not answered now, he would repeat it to-morrow.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: As far as I am aware, Sir, the practice arose as stated by me in answer to the Question of the hon. and gallant Member (Sir Walter B. Barttelot). I know no other object intended or thought to be gained by it. As to the question whether the reviews were to be of a favourable character to the Government, any hon. Member could see that if such an object had been sought in the present instance, it certainly had not been attained.

RUSSIA—TRANS-CAUCASUS TRANSIT DUTIES.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, consequent upon the recent opening of the Poti-Tiflis-Baku Railway, any new arrangement has been made as to Russian Customs Duties upon British cotton manufactures and other goods in transit for Persia and Central Asia?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, according to the last Reports from St. Petersburg, it would appear that there is an intention on the part of the Russian Government—although no Ordinance on the subject has been as yet published—to impose a duty of from 30 to 50 per cent on the import duties now in force in Russia upon merchandize arriving at Batoum or Poti in transit for Persia, that this merchandize should not be allowed to be transported by railway further from Tiflis, and should be deprived of the use of the railway now ready from Tiflis to Baku, being obliged to go by road to the Persian Frontier, and thence to Tabreez. Reports on the subject will be found in Parliamentary Paper No. 15, 1883, Part III., and other Papers will be laid on the Table.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

Mr. DUCKHAM asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether the Privy Council will enforce (with the least possible delay) the provisions of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1878, and prohibit the importation of live animals into the United Kingdom from countries in which the foot and mouth disease prevails?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, I cannot admit the assumption involved in the Question that the Act of 1878 has not been carried out by the Privy Council. That Act laid down as the general law that all foreign animals were to be slaughtered at the port of landing, subject to a positive direction to the Privy Council to admit freely animals from countries free from disease, and with a power enabling the Privy Council to prohibit importation in exceptional and special cases. The question of the hon. Member is too vague to admit of a definite answer in the affirmative or the negative. I may, however, say that the Privy Council have exercised their prohibitory powers in the case of all countries likely to send us rinderpest, that they have also, from time to time, exercised their discretion in prohibiting animals from specified ports and specified countries in which foot-and-mouth disease has been exceptionally prevalent, and that they will continue to use the discretion vested in them, subject to a deep sense of the responsibility imposed upon them.

Mr. HENEAGE subsequently gave Notice, in consequence of the very unsatisfactory answer given by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, that on Monday next he would ask whether he would lay on the Table a copy of the case on which a legal opinion was taken in reference to the powers of the Government under the Act to prohibit the importation of cattle from foreign countries where there was reason to believe disease existed, as was lately mentioned by Lord Carlingford?

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS—MR. ERRINGTON.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Mr. Errington has again been the channel of communication between the Foreign Office and the Vatican; and, if so, whether papers on the subject will be printed; and, whether Lord Granville has written to Mr. Errington congratulating him on his success in securing the censure of the Archbishop of Cashel by the Pope, and if it is intended to remunerate Mr. Errington for his services?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, I stated on March 19, in reply to the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Macartney) that the British Government never entertained a scheme for establishing a Resident at the Vatican. Mr. Errington has not been the channel of communication between the Foreign Office and the Vatican, and I would refer my hon. Friend to the answers given in this House on the 7th and 10th of February of last year by my right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and on the 14th of the same month by the First Lord of the Treasury. Mr. Errington, having received no appointment, will receive no remuneration. There are no Papers to present to Parliament on this subject. Her Majesty's Government highly appreciate any measures which tend to strengthen the respect for law and order in Ireland; but the document to which my right hon. Friend refers was not issued at the request of Her Majesty's Government, and no congratulations have consequently been sent to Rome with regard to it.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN: I should like to ask the noble Lord for an elucidation of this point. Mr. Errington went to Rome last year; he carried with him a letter of recommendation from the Foreign Minister; and, in consequence of that letter a Circular was issued to the Irish Bishops. Mr. Errington has since been to Rome. ["Order!"] I am perfectly in Order, Sir. Another Circular has been issued, and I wish to know if the letter of recommendation which Mr. Errington formerly carried has been withdrawn, or is still in operation?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I make no complaint of the Question of my hon. Friend; but I think he will see that it is to a great extent of an argumentative nature and dealing with a delicate matter, and I must ask him to give Notice.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I wish to put a Question to the First Lord of the Treasury. It is manifest from what has appeared in this House that certain communications have had the authority of Her Majesty's Government. ["Oh!" *and* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now entering on matters of controversy. He can put any Question he thinks proper arising out of the answer to the last Question.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I humbly apologize, Sir. I thought it necessary to make a statement. I will put the Question in this shape. I wish to know whether Mr. Errington—whose success I need not refer to—[*Cries of* "Order!"] I wish to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether Mr. Errington has had any authority from any Department of Her Majesty's Government in approaching His Holiness the Pope; and, if so, under what Act of Parliament the Department which has authorized Mr. Errington has acted?

MR. GLADSTONE: I rather think, Sir, although I will not trust my memory at this distance of time absolutely, that this Question was put and answered last year, and that it was explained last year in one or more of the answers to which my noble Friend has referred, that Lord Granville had written and addressed a letter to Mr. Errington, of which the nature was then distinctly explained. If I am wrong, and the hon. Member does not find that information in former answers, there will be no difficulty in repeating the nature of the letter. There has been no other authority whatever to my knowledge, and I do not think it could have been given without my knowledge.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I will put the Question, in a more regular form, on Monday.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: May I ask the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State, in reference to his answer, whether the letter to which the Prime Minister has just alluded, given by Lord Granville to Mr. Errington, still remains in force, or whether the recommendation contained in it has not expired; and, if it has not expired, whether the recommendation will be contemporaneous with the life of the present Government; and I also wish to ask whether the noble Lord is prepared to state positively that Mr. Errington has not had any part of his expenses paid out of public funds?

Mr. GLADSTONE: If I am right in my impression of that letter, the noble Lord will see that it must undoubtedly remain in force until Mr. Errington ceases to be a Gentleman of honour, intelligence, and good information. The letter simply conveys an assurance of that kind.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Are we to understand from the answers which have just been given that if Mr. Errington represents himself to His Holiness the Pope or the Government of the Church in Rome as in any way authorized by Her Majesty's Government, he is acting under false pretences? Either "Yes" or "No" can be given to that Question.

Mr. GORST: Can the noble Lord give the House any assurance that no part of Mr. Errington's expenses has been paid out of the public funds?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I think Notice ought to be given of that Question.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: The noble Lord, in his reply to the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen), said that Lord Granville had not written any congratulation to Rome. The Question that the hon. Member for Newcastle asked was whether Lord Granville had written to Mr. Errington a letter congratulating him on his success; and, therefore, I would like the noble Lord to be good enough to answer that Question.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I naturally gave the answer to the Question in the sense in which it was asked.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I think the House is entitled to more definite information on this point. The noble Lord says that Lord Granville has not written to Rome; but the question is whether he has written to Mr. Errington. That is a very simple question, and one to which we ought to have an answer, "Yes" or "No."

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I gave a perfectly fair and straightforward answer. [*Cries of* "No!" *and a cry of* "Evasion!"] I made no verbal distinctions whatever, and I believe the House is satisfied with the answer. ["Hear, hear!" *and* "No, no!"] If the hon. Member is not satisfied, he is, no doubt, at liberty to ask a further Question on giving Notice.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I ask the Question distinctly; and I have a perfect right to have an answer.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has any objection that it should be distinctly known in Rome that any representations made by Mr. Errington have only as much weight as is given by Mr. Errington's position as Member for Longford, and that he is in no sense a Representative of the Government?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Perhaps the hon. Member will be kind enough to put that Question on the Notice Paper. It is also most reasonable that the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) should give Notice of his Question.

An hon. Member: It is on the Paper already.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: We have adopted lately, Sir, in this House a practice which has been convenient, no doubt—namely, instead of reading the Questions out aloud, they are merely referred to by their number; and, therefore, there may be some mistake as to the Question which was really put. The Question put by the hon. Member for Newcastle was put very distinctly in these words—

> "Whether Lord Granville has written to Mr. Errington congratulating him on his success in securing the censure of the Archbishop of Cashel by the Pope?"

The Answer which was given by the noble Lord did not appear to be a direct Answer to that part of the Question. I think the noble Lord will see that the Question having been put upon the Paper in these terms, it should be answered directly.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman; but I have said already that I gave my answer in the sense of the words on the Paper. When I said that Lord Granville had not written to Rome, I was answering the Question whether Lord Granville had written to Mr. Errington, who is, I believe, at Rome. I must add I drew no verbal distinction whatever.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: In consequence of the answer of the noble Lord, I beg to give Notice that I shall again bring this subject forward on a Motion for the Adjournment of the House.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN: The Question which I put to the noble Lord was clear and distinct — namely, whether Earl Granville has written to Mr. Errington expressly with reference to certain transactions, or has he not? Yes or no?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I should very much regret if, through any want of clearness on my part, any misunderstanding should have arisen in reference to this subject. I have already answered the Question twice. [*Cries of* "Yes or No?"] When my hon. Friend asks whether Earl Granville has written to Mr. Errington congratulating him on his success in securing the censure of the Archbishop of Cashel by the Pope, I distinctly say that Earl Granville has not done so.

MR. HARRINGTON: I beg to give Notice that on Monday I shall ask the Prime Minister, Whether any instructions were given to Mr. Errington by Earl Granville; and, if so, what the nature of those instructions was?

MR. JOSEPH COWEN: I beg to give Notice that on Monday I shall ask the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Earl Granville has written to Mr. Errington a letter thanking him generally for his success at Rome, without thanking him specially for having procured the censure of the Archbishop of Cashel?

MR. O'DONNELL: I beg to give Notice that on the same day I shall ask the noble Lord, Whether he has any objection to lay the letter of Earl Granville to Mr. Errington upon the Table of the House?

INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—TREATMENT OF NATIVES AND EUROPEANS.

MR. O'DONNELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If his attention has been called to the fact that, in a recent prosecution against the European proprietor and a Native captain of a Bombay line of coasting steamers for alleged breach of the Passenger Acts, both the European proprietor and the Native captain were sentenced to fines by the magistrate; whether the European proprietor made use of his right of appeal as a European to procure a rehearing of the case in a higher court, with the result that it was decided that no breach of the Passenger Acts had been committed, and that his fine must be remitted; whether the Native captain, because he was not a European, had no right of appeal, and cannot have his fine remitted; and, whether Government intends to maintain the privilege of appeal for some of Her Majesty's subjects, and to refuse it to others, solely on the ground of difference of race?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Sir, since answering the hon. Member's Question on Monday last, I have seen, in *The Hindoo Patriot* of the 30th of April, a mention of the case referred to; but the facts are so insufficiently stated, that it is not possible to say whether the Native would, or would not, have had the right of appeal.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—CASE OF JOHN RAFFERTY.

MR. WILLS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When it is intended to proceed by writ of "capias" in the Queen's Bench Division of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice against John Rafferty of Monaghan, who was charged in February last before the Liverpool Stipendiary with being concerned in smuggling 2,405 pounds of leaf tobacco concealed in fifty casks, entered as containing flax seed, and also with being implicated in three other smuggling transactions of great magnitude, the said John Rafferty having been then discharged by the Stipendiary Magistrate from the custody of the police on the application of the Commissioners of Customs, who intimated their intention to prosecute in the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Yes, Sir; proceedings are being taken in Rafferty's case, and it is set down for hearing this term. It is not, however, possible, as yet, to give the exact date of hearing.

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE.

MR. ROUND asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, If he will have the Report from Her Majesty's Commissioners on Agriculture re-printed?

MR. DODSON, in reply, said, that he was now in communication with the Stationery Office on the subject.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—COUNTY LONGFORD.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the fact that, after the recent contest for the election of Poor Law Guardians in the neighbourhood of Clough Keenagh, county Longford, twelve electors who voted against the nominees of a resident landlord were refused the right of turbary which they had enjoyed for years; and, whether he will take steps, at future elections, to protect voters from being punished for voting according to their conscientious convictions?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have received a telegram from which it appears that the facts are substantially as stated, except that there was no right of turbary in question, but a yearly rental, which the landlord refused to renew. The Government cannot, of course, take any steps to compel a landlord to let a turbary to particular individuals. With regard to future elections, I have, on more than one occasion, already referred to a measure by which the Government hopes to be able to secure protection for voters from interference from any quarter in the exercise of the Poor Law franchise.

CONVICT PRISONS—PAY AND POSITION OF WARDERS—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can lay upon the Table the Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the claims of the Warders of Convict Prisons; and, whether it is intended to make any improvement in the pay and position of those officers?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: This Report is, I believe, completed; but I have not yet seen it.

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACTS—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If there is any evidence to show that dynamite has been purchased from dealers in that article for illegal purposes; and, whether the new Orders in Council are unequally applied; if they have led to a large reduction in the consumption of dynamite for legitimate purposes; and if his attention has been called to a trade circular issued by a firm of gunpowder manufacturers showing how the stringent regulations applied to the sale of dynamite do not apply to the sale of other explosives? He also wished to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman, Whether he intended to bring in a Bill this Session dealing with the general question of the sale of explosives as he had promised to do; and, whether he was aware that in certain mining districts the sale of explosives had decreased by one-half?

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the great inconvenience caused to those engaged in mining operations by the late Orders in Council in regard to explosives; also as to the dubiousness of certain words used in the Orders, such as "keeping" and "private use," as applied to miners, storekeepers, agents, instructors, and others respectively; also as to the jurisdiction apparently given under these Orders to the rural police; and, whether he will consider the propriety of some modifications or some explanatory directions to the local authorities?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: No doubt, Sir, this is a very important question; and when I brought before the House the Bill relating to explosives I referred to the unsatisfactory state of the law upon the subject. Under the law, as it then stood, any person might have had in his possession 15 lbs. of dynamite; while a person having a registered store or magazine might have a much greater quantity in his possession, and the local authorities had no power to restrict such persons from possessing any quantity of explosives of that character. It was the general opinion of the House, at the time I brought forward the Bill, that such a state of things was not satisfactory. Under the existing law, power has been to impose, by Order in Council, such conditions upon the sale and possession of explosives of a nitro-glycerine character as may be thought necessary. The possession of gunpowder is not regulated by Orders in Council, because it is provided for by express Statute. What has been done by recent legislation is this—Persons are not to have in store, or for private use, dynamite, or other nitro-glycerine compounds, without obtaining a certificate from the police or the Justices that they are proper persons to have it. That seems to me to be a very necessary and reasonable condition. The hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) asks me whether, under the present law, persons have not improperly obtained dynamite. Well, it is just the fault of the present law that we do not know how persons become possessed of that explosive; and that is why we have thought it necessary to obtain, as far as we can, a register of the persons who have it in their possession. There is no difficulty whatever for a decent and respectable person to obtain the necessary certificate, which is granted without any charge being made for it, and which, we hope, will prevent explosives of this character from getting into improper hands. Under the old law, it was possible for 10 persons conspiring together to get into their hands 150 lbs. of dynamite. It is quite true, as has been stated in the Question, that a circular has been issued by the manufacturers, who naturally are not satisfied with any restriction upon their trade, which, however, is a very dangerous one, and which, in the opinion of Parliament, requires regulation. The Inspector of Explosives states that the complaints with regard to the restrictions come almost entirely from the manufacturers, and not from those who use these explosives. As far as I am aware, these restrictions have acted beneficially, and in no case injuriously. The words "private use" are well understood, because they are in the Act of 1875; and as to fuller terms and explanations, the Inspector of Explosives has published a handbook, of which a new edition is in course of publication, which contains all the regulations on the subject.

Mr. DONALDSON - HUDSON: I should like to ask the Home Secretary whether it will be necessary, under these regulations, for every miner who uses nitro-glycerine compounds in mines to take out a certificate?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I think that it is only right that miners should be required to obtain certificates. What I hope is, that we shall see done universally what is done generally—namely, that dynamite is kept in store by the mine owner, and is served out to the miner for his daily use. It is extremely dangerous for miners to keep dynamite in store in their own houses.

Sir BALDWYN LEIGHTON inquired whether there was any authority to make a charge for the certificate?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: No, Sir.

INLAND REVENUE—EXCISE PERMITS.

Mr. BIGGAR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he is aware that Excise Officers issuing permits for removal of "Duty paid" unblended spirits in cask, frequently omit to enter on the permits the date on which the spirits were bonded, and whether he will arrange to have this information supplied in future; what mode of supervision exists to ensure the delivery of spirits to consignee within the period specified on the permit, and whether such time is in many cases greatly in excess of that required for consignment; whether the Revenue authorities have any objection to order that the date on which spirits are placed in bond be branded on the casks; and, whether, in the case of spirits blended in bond, they will have the casks containing same legibly endorsed with the word "Blended," and so described on the removal permits?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): In reply to the first Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that it is not necessary for the date on which the spirits were bonded to be entered on the permits. In reply to the second Question, the rule is that when the time limited in the permit is exceeded, the spirits are detained until an explanation of the delay is furnished. It is, however, necessary to leave the matter in some cases to the discretion of the local officer, who knows the mode of conveyance intended to be used. I see no reason for adopting the suggestion made in the third Question. The suggestion in the fourth Question is already the rule, so far as the casks are concerned; but there seems no reason to alter the form of the permits, as suggested.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST POST OFFICE.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is a fact that the Government have bought or rented ground in Belfast to build a new post office; and, whether it is not possible to have sufficient accommodation in the present building; and, if it is not sufficient, if he would explain why the Government does not push forward the new building?

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, in reply to the hon. Member, I beg to say that the Government has bought ground in Belfast for the erection of a new Post Office, in consequence of the insufficiency of the present accommodation, and that no time is being lost in making arrangements for its erection.

IRELAND—THE COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION—THE VOTE FOR MODEL SCHOOLS.

Mr. LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any communications, in the nature of advice or instructions, has passed between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, as to the future application of that portion of the Vote in Supply for National Education hitherto used in support of model schools, and suggesting less expenditure thereon in future, in order to have funds to carry out certain intended arrangements for separate denominational training of teachers; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table a Copy of any such communications?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the hon. Member refers to a Correspondence between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of National Education, which has not, as yet, been officially before the Irish Government. I am not, therefore, at present in a position to express any opinion as to whether it ought to be laid on the Table.

THE SCOTTISH LEGAL FRIENDLY SOCIETY—DISHONESTY OF OFFICIALS.

Dr. CAMERON asked the Lord Advocate, If the Crown authorities have yet decided whether they will institute proceedings against any of the office-bearers of the Scottish Legal Friendly Society for their dishonest practices, which official reports show to have been resorted to in connection with the management of that Society?

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. Balfour): Sir, some time ago a criminal charge of falsehood, fraud, and wilful imposition was preferred against certain of the office-bearers of the Scottish Legal Life Assurance Society in Glasgow. I caused a very careful investigation to be made. It appears that at a general meeting held in June, 1881, the salaries of the Secretary and of the Treasurer were raised from £250 to £500 each, that of the President was raised from £100 to £250, and that of each member of committee from £25 to £125. The charge against the accused office-bearers was that this very large and sudden augmentation of their salaries had been corruptly obtained by means of fictitious votes. Admission to the general meetings is obtained by presentation of the contribution books of the members; and it was alleged, and I believe there is ample evidence to prove, that fabricated contribution books were used for gaining admission by persons who were not members of the Society at all. Unfortunately, it is not possible to ascertain how many fictitious votes were so admitted, nor how far the resolutions to increase the salaries were carried by their votes. This circumstance, as lawyers know, raises a great difficulty in the way of preferring a relevant criminal charge. In the second place, whatever ground of suspicion there may be, it does not appear, from the evidence at our command, that the fabrication or the use of the fictitious books can be brought home to the office-bearers accused. It is only too apparent that there has been gross and culpable mismanagement in this Society, to the great injury of its members, who belong to the working classes; and I do not hesitate to say that I should be glad if I saw my way to the discovery and punishment of the guilty parties by the Criminal Law. But, after consultation with my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Scotland, I have come to the conclusion that there is not sufficient evidence, at least for the present, to sustain a criminal prosecution.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—ROMAN CATHOLIC MILITIAMEN.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. Sexton) asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is true that, on Friday, the 27th ult. the Catholic men of the Militia under training at Monaghan (being about 100 out of a total of 110) were left without dinner because, as Catholics, they refused to eat meat on a Friday; and, if so, how the matter can be explained?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, of the Militia training at Monaghan, on the 27th of April, 104 out of 156 present were Roman Catholics. The usual meat ration was issued to them, and if they refused to eat it I am afraid it is probable that they went without their dinner. I am informed that, by universal custom among Roman Catholics, soldiers and sailors are dispensed from all obligation to fast or to abstain from flesh meat, and that this applies even in Catholic countries. Therefore, as no soldier need have any scruple on the subject, I see no objection to the issue of meat rations on the occasion referred to. Further, it was brought to notice that some of the sergeants were making a traffic of the meat rations, supplying eggs, &c., to the recruits in exchange. As it appeared that the sergeants were the only gainers by this transaction, the strict rule of each man having his own ration was enforced.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—SCOTCH BUSINESS.

Mr. A. ELLIOT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he can state when it is intended to introduce the Bill for the improvement of the administration of Scotch Business?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I am not able at present to answer the Question.

SOUTHPORT FORESHORE.

Mr. GRANTHAM asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether the seal of the Duchy has now been affixed to any document for giving effect to the contemplated sale of the foreshore to the riparian owners; whether, by the exercise of his good offices, he has now succeeded in securing for the town of Southport that part of the foreshore which they consider it is essential to the interest of the town they should possess; whether Lord Belper (a former Chancellor of the Duchy) did not state in his evidence before the Select Committee in "Bertolacci's" case, that by an almost invariable usage, and one which he thought it was very desirable to maintain, it had been customary in all cases of important grants and donations out of the Queen's revenues of the Duchy, or of granting important leases, or of any great question for the improvement of the landed property of the Duchy, for the Chancellor to reserve such questions for a meeting of the Council; to hold such meetings from time to time, and then to bring all those questions before the Council; and that it had also been his custom to be guided by the opinion of the Council; and, whether, inasmuch as the proposed sale embraces over 9,000 acres of land, for a sum of £15,000, to private persons, and thereby excludes the rights of the public, it is not of sufficient importance to induce him to seek the advice of the Council?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, my answer to the first Question is—not yet. My answer to the second Question is also—not yet. But I hope what I am now doing will ultimately lead to an amicable settlement, especially if, as both parties have now accepted my good offices, the matter is allowed to be quietly worked out. With regard to the third Question, the usage referred to still prevails; but this Question does not fall within any of the categories mentioned by Lord Belper, the conclusion of whose statement, as to the entire authority resting with the Chancellor, the hon. and learned Member has not quoted. With regard to the last Question, all that is sold of the foreshore is the Duchy's interest, whatever that may be; and the rights of the public, so far from being excluded by the sale, are increased by it, inasmuch as, by the transfer from the Crown, they become subject to the compulsory powers given to local authorities by the Public Health Act.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1881—JUDICIAL RENTS—"CHAINE *v.* NELSON."

Mr. T. A. DICKSON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If his attention has been called to the case of Chaine *v.* Nelson, decided in the Common Pleas in Dublin on the 17th, as to the date of judicial rents, and whether that decision affects 35,000 tenants; and if, having regard to the fact that these tenants entered the Land Court in October and November 1881, on the assurance of the Chief Commissioners that their rents would accrue from the gale day next after the passing of the Land Act, pursuant to the 60th section, the Government have any remedy to propose?

Mr. GIVAN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the recent decision of the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland, in the case of Chaine *v.* Nelson, that the sixtieth section of "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," does not apply to decisions fixing fair rents, was in direct conflict with the opinion of the Chief Commissioners; whether over 30,000 cases were entered and recorded at the first sitting of the Land Commission, owing to the announcement of the Commissioners that the fair rents, when fixed, would commence on the 1st November 1881; whether, acting on the opinion of the Commissioners, landlords have accepted, and tenants paid, the judicial rents as from the 1st November 1881, in the majority of cases already decided; and, whether, in view of the litigation which the decision of the Court of Common Pleas will cause between landlords and tenants whose rents have been so paid, the Government will introduce a measure during the present Session to settle the question, or otherwise support in whole or in part a Bill now before the House, and set down for the 6th June, which provides that where an application has been made, or shall be made, to the Court, under "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," to fix a fair rent, the judicial rent fixed by the Court shall relate back to, and shall commence to run from, the gale day next after the service of the originating notice to fix a fair rent, this provision to apply to rents fixed either before or after the commencement of the Act?

Mr. PARNELL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas Division of the High Court of Justice in Ireland, in the case of Chaine *v.* Nelson, by which the declaration of the Court of the Land Commission, made in November 1881, that, in the case of tenants who filed their applications for the fixing of a judicial rent on the first occasion on which the Court sat, the judicial rent should date from the gale day next succeeding the passing of the Land Law Act, has been annulled; and, whether the Government will consider the desirability of introducing a short Amendment Bill to clear up this doubt which has arisen as to the construction of the Act, and to ratify to the forty thousand Irish tenants who filed their applications on the first occasion on which the Court of the Land Commission sat, the undertaking and advantages extended and promised to them by the Court?

Mr. BRODRICK said, that, before the right hon. Gentleman answered, he wished to ask him whether any inconvenience which might result would not arise from the unprecedented action of the Land Commissioners in issuing an erroneous interpretation of a portion of the Land Act, before the matter was judicially brought before them?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I think, Sir, it would be irregular on my part to answer the Question which has been put to me by the hon. Member, involving, as it does, a censure upon the Land Commissioners in putting their judicial interpretation upon the Act.

Mr. GIBSON: Not judicial.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I will not enter into controversy with so high an authority as the right hon. and learned Gentleman on that point; I will assume, even, that I am entirely wrong; but still my answer will remain the same, because, in the present position of the question, it is not for me to give an opinion upon it. And that is really my answer to the three Questions which have been put to me. In the first place, I believe the facts, as set forth in the Questions, are stated with substantial accuracy. In the second place, the importance of the subject is very great indeed, and Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to it, and it will be their duty carefully to watch and consider the proceedings. But the judgment is one that has been delivered by the Court of Common Pleas, and it is possible that it may be made the subject of appeal. That being so, it is quite obvious that it would not only be contrary to general rule, but highly impolitic in the circumstances, for the Government to signify any intention whatever, until the law is finally settled, either by judgment upon appeal, or by its being made known that the present judgment is acquiesced in.

Mr. LEWIS, in consequence of the answer just given by the Prime Minister, gave Notice that on Monday he would ask, Whether the view taken by the Land Commissioners in this case was not stated in a Circular issued by them to the tenants, not in the exercise of their judicial office, but voluntarily on their part?

Mr. T. A. DICKSON: I do not think there is the slightest prospect of an appeal in this case. The tenant was utterly unable to enter upon an appeal. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not putting a Question.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON: I wish to ask, in case the tenant decide not to appeal, whether the Government will be prepared to enter upon the matter, and relieve the tenants from the effect of the decision of the Court of Common Pleas?

Mr. GLADSTONE: With great respect to my hon. Friend, I own I have serious doubts as to the expediency of entering, at the present moment, into the consideration of these contingencies; and I do not think the matter can be advanced by further discussion in existing circumstances.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL.

Mr. HENEAGE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can fix an early day for the Second Reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill, in order that there may be a convenient time between the Second Reading and the Committee stages of the Bill without unnecessarily delaying its progress?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he thought the week after next would be a very convenient period for many Members for taking the second reading of this Bill. Monday next was already engaged for the Estimates; and he was not able to say anything about Thursday until he saw that progress would be made in Supply to-night. He referred to the Notice Paper for Tuesday, and, without any disrespect to the subjects which appeared on the Paper, he was inclined to think it very probable that that evening might be practically free; and, if it could be arranged, his right hon. Friend (Mr. Dodson) would be glad to propose the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill on that day.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: At the Evening Sitting?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL subsequently asked whether the Prime Minister's proposal referred to Tuesday next only, or would apply to all Tuesdays?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he was making no declaration one way or the other; he was speaking only in reference to the state of the Notice Paper.

PARLIAMENT—RULES OF DEBATE—QUESTIONS.

Mr. STEWART MACLIVER asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he will take into consideration whether the time has not arrived for revising the present system of putting Questions in the House, so as to limit the number of Questions at each sitting; and, whether, with a view to facilitate Public Business at the opening of the House, a new arrangement could be made for answering Questions?

Mr. O'DONNELL, at the same time, asked whether it was the intention of the Government also to consider whether the time had not arrived for revising the present system of giving answers to Questions.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I do not think it would be expedient that I should re-open, at the present moment, this important part of the question of Procedure.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL.

Mr. GORST asked, Whether it was still the intention of the Government to proceed with the Corrupt Practices Bill?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am not aware that there ever was any doubt as to the intention of the Government to proceed with that Bill.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—NATIONAL DEBT BILL.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked, When the Government intended to proceed with the second reading of the National Debt Bill; and why the Bill had not been delivered to Members?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) replied, in terms of his answer just before the Recess, that full Notice would be given before this Bill was proceeded with. He hoped the Bill would be circulated almost immediately.

MADAGASCAR—BOMBARDMENT OF MAYUNGA.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: There is a Question I should be glad to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. There is a rumour, which I have heard with regret, to the effect that a port in Madagascar has been bombarded by the French Fleet. I would like to know if the Government have any information about it?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: In reply to my right hon. Friend, I cannot do better than read a telegram handed to me a few minutes ago, just as I was leaving the Foreign Office. It is from Colonel Miles, our Agent at Zanzibar, and is as follows:—

> "Bombardment of Mayunga took place on the 16th, and lasted six hours; force then landed under cover of guns and took possession. Hovas suffered great loss; French none. Admiral returned Mayotte, leaving garrison."

I may add that Mayunga is a port and town on the North-West Coast of Madagascar; and Mayotte is an Island already in French possession.

TURKEY—THE NEW TARIFF.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he could give the House any information in reference to the important telegram which had appeared in *The Times* and other newspapers concerning the Commercial Treaty with Turkey?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, the statement in *The Times* to which my hon. Friend refers is practically correct. Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople received, on the 31st of March, an assurance from the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs that the Tariff of 1861 would remain in force till the end of September next, pending further commercial negotiations between this country and Turkey. On the 18th instant, however, Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires received a Note from the Porte, stating that it was their intention to levy forthwith an *ad valorem* duty of 8 per cent on all imports. Her Majesty's Government have since been informed that this duty is now being imposed. Mr. Wyndham has addressed a formal protest to the Porte on the subject.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—USE BY THE VOLUNTEERS OF THE BUTTS AT WORMWOOD SCRUBS.

ADMIRAL EGERTON asked the Secretary of State for War a Question of which he had given him private Notice—Whether the butts at Wormwood Scrubs were to be permanently closed, so as to deprive the Volunteers of their use?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the private Notice to which the hon. and gallant Member had referred was given him as he entered the House. He could hardly be expected to know what was going on at Wormwood Scrubs; but he would endeavour to obtain information on the point before the Volunteer Vote came on.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEIZURE OF THE "KERRY SENTINEL."

MR. PARNELL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he could give the House any information with regard to the reported seizure of the printing presses, the type, and the premises of *The Kerry Sentinel*, the seizure of the issue that was in course of being printed, the arrest of the printer and manager of the paper, and the occupation of the premises for several days by an armed police force, an occupation which, as regarded a portion of the premises, was, he believed, still in operation, and by which three issues of the newspaper were prevented from being printed?

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he would wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman, at the same time, if he would be prepared to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the article which appeared in *The Kerry Sentinel*, and which was reported to have formed the basis of the action by the Government?

MR. HARRINGTON asked, also, whether any such article as the hon. and gallant Member alluded to had appeared in *The Kerry Sentinel*; and whether it was in consequence of such an article that the course referred to was taken against the paper?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the reports which have appeared in the newspapers regarding the seizure of *The Kerry Sentinel* were obviously so important that I came down to the House provided with extremely full information with regard to the whole affair. Since, however, I came to the House I have received a telegram from Dublin, which, while not asking me to refrain from answering the Question, is of such a nature as to lead me to think that it would be in the interests of public order, and possibly in the interests of private individuals who may have charges brought against them, that I should not answer it, and that I should be wrong to enter into any details on the matter. I regret extremely, however, that I am not able to give the full answer to the Question which I came to the House prepared to give.

Mr. PARNELL wished to say, with reference to the refusal—which, he trusted, was only a temporary one—of the right hon. Gentleman to reply to the Question, that he should put a Question on the Notice Paper for next Monday.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he was quite prepared to give full information; but he should not be justified in doing so after receiving the telegram he had alluded to.

Mr. HARRINGTON said, he was interested in the question; and as it would appear from the answer of the right hon. Gentleman that he had some peculiar feelings of delicacy with regard to giving information, he wished to assure the right hon. Gentleman that he was perfectly prepared to meet any charge either in that House or out of it.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he did not wish to press the right hon. Gentleman to give any information which he had good reason for withholding; but the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the County of Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) had asked a Question which was calculated to excite misapprehension, and to leave his hon. Friend near him (Mr. Harrington) under an unjust stigma. He would, therefore, ask the Chief Secretary, whether he was able to inform the House that the proceedings against *The Kerry Sentinel* were not based on any article which appeared in that newspaper; and whether the notice which appeared in it addressed to the "Invincibles" was not also published in, and copied from, *The Times* and other newspapers?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am sorry to say that I feel bound to confine myself to the answer that I have already given; and in confining myself to that answer I wish it to be understood that it is not intended to imply any charge against any individual whatever, either in the House or out of it. Still, I am quite certain that I ought not to answer this Question without more minute information from Dublin.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £56,000, Divine Service.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, that upon this question of the Vote for Divine Service, which made provision for Roman Catholic and other chaplains for Her Majesty's Forces, he wished to suggest that not only with advantage, but with justice, there ought to be an addition to the staff of Catholic chaplains, and that they ought to be permanently attached to the Service, so that, in case of necessity, they might follow the regiments abroad. The reason why he offered that suggestion to the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) was that, under the present system, when Catholic soldiers were ordered abroad, and especially to India, they found themselves, in a large number of cases, practically deprived of the ministrations of clergymen who were able to converse with them on the most necessary topics in connection with their religion. He believed that the Vote now before the Committee made no provision for Catholic chaplains, in such cases, accompanying Catholic regiments from home for service in India; and he would strongly suggest to Her Majesty's Government—it was not in his power to propose an increase in the Estimate—but he would strongly suggest to Her Majesty's Government that they ought to take some steps to provide Catholic soldiers with adequate divine service, and with proper assistance, in the form of chaplains, for the performance of their religious duties when they left England, as well as when they were at home in England. He was aware that when Catholic soldiers left England and went to such a place as India, they found there, in numerous instances, a species of local chaplain or priest, who was appointed by the local government to supply the religious necessities of the Catholic troops. But he wished to point out to Her Majesty's Government that in 9 cases out of 10 that provision was utterly inadequate, and, in many instances, was merely nominal, for this reason—that owing to the want of Catholic chaplains accompanying the regiments who were able to speak the English language, the soldiers had to put up with the ministrations of Italian, Portuguese, and French priests, who, possessing a very scanty acquaintance with the English language, were unable to hear the confessions of the soldiers, or of their wives and children, and were unable to preach a sermon on Christian duty in intelligible English. On that account the difficulties of the Service were greatly increased among Catholic soldiers serving upon garrison duty in India, yet there was an unusually large proportion of Catholic soldiers with their wives and children on foreign service. This was exceedingly hard upon the Irish soldiers. As the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War would be able to inform himself, it was the practice, in accordance with old traditions, which had not yet been given up in the Army, to enforce an altogether excessive measure of foreign service upon Irish recruits. By the existing system in the Army, Irish recruits were passed in excessive numbers from the home battalions to the battalions ordered for foreign service; and, in that way, in proportion to the whole number of Catholics in the Army, there was always an excessive number of Catholics on service in India and at other foreign stations, the idea being, he supposed, that Irish soldiers would do better when they were as far as possible away from Ireland, having in view the state of government which Her Majesty's Advisers maintained, as a rule, in that country. This point must also be taken into consideration—that, even if there was no more than a proper proportion of Irish Catholic soldiers serving abroad, there should still be precautions taken that chaplains able to converse with, and preach to, and hear the confessions of, Catholic soldiers and their wives and families, should be provided in adequate numbers. But when there was a disproportion in the number of Catholic soldiers sent abroad, the grievance was undoubtedly increased, and the injustice dealt out to such Catholic soldiers became much more apparent. He wished to point out to Her Majesty's Government that the difficulty of finding recruits in Ireland and in Irish Catholic centres for the Army was a difficulty that was recognized; because, as the noble Lord who now sat on the Front Opposition Bench, and who was, he believed, one of the Secretaries connected with the Army (Lord Eustace Cecil) under the late Government, had more than once pointed out that there was a distinct difficulty in obtaining recruits for the Army. Could there be a stronger reason, he would ask, why young Irish Catholics, brought up in religious principles, ought to object to enter the Army, than the knowledge that they were generally sent on foreign service in disproportionate numbers; and when they arrived abroad they found, in the vast majority of cases, no priest with whom they could enter into conversation, or from whom they could receive advice with regard to their spiritual condition? Of course, there was provision for the service of Mass; and the service of Mass being in Latin in all parts of the Catholic Church, except in Asia Minor and Poland, Catholic soldiers, accustomed to attend the service of Mass in their own country, could follow that service wherever it was performed. But, outside the service of Mass, there were a large number of other duties intimately connected with the performance of Catholic worship and the fulfilment of the obligations of the Catholic Church, which required that the priest should be able to converse well with Catholic soldiers. Nothing could be more grotesque than the efforts of these foreign priests; no doubt, most worthy, zealous, and devout French, Italian, and Portuguese priests, appointed to fulfil the duty of Catholic chaplains in India and other places—nothing could be more grotesque than efforts to explain the simplest principles of the Catholic religion to the unfortunate military congregations committed to their charge. Of course, Her Majesty's Government took these chaplains from the ranks of the Roman Catholic missionaries; and, to a large extent, the Roman Catholic missionaries in these parts were supplied from the Propagandist Mission in Rome and elsewhere; and, from that reason, they could not rely upon the persons so selected and so appointed conveying that which was necessary to be conveyed to Irish Catholic soldiers, and it was absolutely necessary to provide the means of furnishing Roman Catholic soldiers with priests who were able to preach to them, and to speak to them in their own tongue. He could assure Her Majesty's Government that complaints upon this head were being made privately everywhere throughout Ireland by Irish Catholic soldiers who had returned from India; and unless something was done to remove the grievance these complaints would take a public form. No attention had hitherto been paid to the complaints of the men; and it was only natural that if this inattention was continued their grievances would become public eventually. There were many reasons why Her Majesty's Government, if they were desirous of bringing Irish recruits into the British Army, should exercise some care in regard to this point. He did not wish to do more now than to refer to the unfair portion of service abroad imposed upon the Irish recruits, apparently, simply because they were Irish; and, in the present case, he only referred to the matter in order to show the necessity of supplying Catholic soldiers ordered for foreign service with English chaplains. He did not intend to propose any reduction of the Vote, because his suggestion would really involve, if adopted, an increase; but he had raised the question upon this Vote, because, unless he did so, he did not well see how he could bring under the notice of the Government the absolute necessity of dealing with an actual and growing evil.

Colonel O'BEIRNE said, that he had served for some years in India, and he had visited almost every garrison and every station; but he had certainly found no difficulty in obtaining the services of a Roman Catholic chaplain who could speak English. There were only two occasions which he recollected in which there was any difficulty; and in one of those two instances the priest was an Italian. He thought the real grievance the Roman Catholic chaplains were under was, that they were not placed upon a footing of equality with the Protestant chaplains with regard to pensions and furlough. They received no pension whatever; and they were treated very unjustly in the matter of furlough, being allowed no leave of absence. He certainly saw no reason why they should not be placed upon perfect equality with the Protestant chaplains, both as regarded pension and furlough; but he did not think there was very much force in the grievance suggested by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), that they could not speak the English language. His own impression was that that was an entire misapprehension; but if it was really a fact, there could be no doubt that it was a very improper arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE said, he was personally able to corroborate fully the statement of his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) as to the hardships which English-speaking soldiers in India suffered in consequence of the inadequacy of the supply of English-speaking chaplains. The hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim (Colonel O'Beirne) stated that, according to his experience, all the Catholic chaplains in India spoke English. Now, he (Mr. Blake) ventured to think that his own experience of India was even more extensive than that of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. He had visited almost every cantonment from Lahore to Mysore; he had been in 25 or 30 cantonments at least; and he had taken great interest in the Roman Catholic soldiers, and in the manner in which provision was made for the performance of their religious duties. He had heard some of the sermons preached by the Roman Catholic chaplains; and he ventured to say that at least six out of seven of them were utterly unintelligible. They were preached by Italians, Frenchmen, Poles, and priests of other nationalities; and, although they were undoubtedly delivered in what was called English, if the chaplains had spoken in their own language, there would have been a far better chance of understanding them than there was from the attempt to speak in English. The soldiers complained very much of the great deprivation they were subjected to in not being supplied with priests whose ministrations they could understand; and the soldiers' wives complained of the same thing, and especially of the absence of religious instruction for their children by the chaplains, such instruction as was given being absolutely useless. It was also a matter of complaint that when the services of the priest was required at the last moment by an English-speaking soldier, the comfort which he would have received from a chaplain who was able to speak his own language was altogether denied him. The Catholic Metropolitan in India was a Swiss, and all the Bishops were foreigners. He believed that, throughout the whole of India, there was not a single English or Irish Bishop; and the foreign Bishops naturally brought their own countrymen over. He entertained no doubt that, from what he had heard, there was a real and substantial grievance in not having English-speaking chaplains sent out with the Catholic soldiers serving abroad; and he trusted that the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War would consider the grievance, and listen to the representations which were made to him. If English-speaking chaplains were supplied, he believed it would afford great comfort to these men, and their wives and children, and that it would tend to increase the morality of the Army, and produce other good results.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the immediate question they had before them was the provision to be made for the administration of Divine Service to the troops on the Establishment of the Army. The respective proportions of members of the English Church and of Roman Catholics in the Army were 62 chaplains in the English Church, 17 Roman Catholics, and 7 Presbyterians. The hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) had raised the question of the provision made for Roman Catholic chaplains in India. As the Committee were aware, they had nothing to do in those Estimates with any of the Indian military establishments. All the provisions of every kind for the Army in India were made and paid for by the Indian Treasury; and he almost doubted whether they were in Order, on that occasion, in discussing the question of the ministrations of Roman Catholic chaplains in India. Perhaps the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), and other hon. Members from Ireland, would recollect that when he (the Marquess of Hartington) was Secretary of State for India, he had, in answer to a Question, entered fully into the provision made for Roman Catholic chaplains; and he thought he was able to show that their condition had been considerably improved within recent years, and that the authorities there were not indisposed to make a further improvement, if it were called for. The hon. Member had referred to the condition of Roman Catholic chaplains on board ship on the passage from this country to India. A correspondence had taken place between the India Office, the War Office, and the Admiralty upon this subject; and he found that the provision of Roman Catholic chaplains on board ship devolved upon the Admiralty; and he was not in a position to say whether it was done or not, or what was done. But when he was previously in Office it was certainly his own view that provision should be made. The hon. Gentleman also complained that there was a system also prevailing in the Army of imposing an undue proportion of foreign service upon Roman Catholic soldiers. That was the first time he (the Marquess of Hartington) had heard that allegation made; and he had no reason whatever to suppose that any disproportion whatever took place. He thought that if the hon. Member would look at *The Army List* he would see that it was not so. He quite agreed that, wherever it was practicable, the arrangements in connection with religious ministrations should be so made that the clergymen appointed would be able to converse with the soldiers in a language they could understand; and if the hon. Member would refer to the answer he had given upon that subject when he was at the India Office he would find that the matter had not been neglected.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, he would like to say a word upon the statement of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War in reference to the present position of the matter. He recognized the disposition of the noble Marquess to deal with the question in the fairest possible way; but he wished to point out that, although the position of the Roman Catholic chaplains might be better now in India than it was some years ago, yet that, nevertheless, it was very inferior to that of the Protestant chaplains. In the case of the Protestant chaplains, provision was made for granting a furlough of two months. Now, a furlough of some kind was absolutely necessary; and although for two months the Protestant chaplain could go on furlough, and the Department paid for his substitute, there was no such provision made in the case of the Roman Catholic chaplain. He thought the question of furlough ought to be looked into again by the Indian Government, with the view of placing the Roman Catholic chaplain upon nearly, if not entirely, a footing of equality with his Protestant brethren. He was sorry to hear the depreciation of the Roman Catholic chaplains serving in India which had been indulged in by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) from the Irish Benches. He believed that nothing of the kind was felt by the soldiers, who had benefited by the ministrations of these reverend gentlemen, nor was it the feeling of the authorities in India. There might be instances in which Italian, French, or Polish priests were unable to speak the English language well; but, as a rule, he believed the services of the Roman Catholic chaplains had been very valuable, and were fully appreciated by the soldiers. As far as he could learn, the chief matters of complaint were that the Roman Catholic chaplains were not sufficiently paid, and that they were not allowed a substitute when proceeding on furlough.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he had never known a single military station in India where the services of Roman Catholic chaplains had not been available for the European troops there located. A more devoted set of men than these priests, he was bound to state, he had never known; and as regarded the implied assertion that the priests were on the same footing as chaplains of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches, he was surprised to find that the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), who was generally so well informed upon Indian subjects, was not better informed upon this matter when he put forward such an idea. If there were any difficulties in India, they arose, he was afraid, out of difference of opinion in the Roman Catholic Church itself. The priests were still declared to be wholly subject to the orders of the Bishop, and not disposable at the orders of the Government. They were not, then, servants of the State, being removed and posted at the will of the Bishop. That was a source of more trouble and discontent than the difficulty of understanding or appreciating the services rendered by the Roman Catholic chaplains. Then, also, there were the rival pretensions of the French and Portuguese Sees in India, in opposition to the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops. The latter were supposed to be viewed with far less favour by the Pope than the other Sees were.

Mr. O'SHEA inquired whether any appointments of Roman Catholic chaplains were made after consultation with the Irish Bishops?

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he had raised the question for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to a very important subject; and it was a question upon which he certainly expected to have obtained some amount of sympathy from so good a Catholic as the hon. and gallant Member who represented the County of Cork (Colonel Colthurst). He had brought forward the question for the sole purpose of securing that the Catholic soldiers in India should be provided with chaplains who would fully attend to their religious duties; and he had not said a single word against the worthy and admirable Catholic priests who at present performed these functions in India, except that, in many cases, they were Italians and Portuguese, and were imperfectly acquainted with the English language. He therefore failed to see the applicability of the words the hon. and gallant Member had, no doubt, inadvertently used, when he spoke of him (Mr. O'Donnell), and of the denunciation of the priests coming from the Irish Benches. Perhaps, however, the hon. and gallant Member had made that speech in order that his words might be reported by the faithful Errington, as part of the ambassadorial mission confided to that hon. Member by Her Majesty's Government. It would, at least, be equally trustworthy with many other things the faithful Errington had been instructed to pour into the ears of the Roman Propaganda. He admitted the readiness which the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) had displayed in dealing with some of the grievances of the Catholic chaplains in India; but that was not the question he had brought forward that night. He was glad to hear an admission from the other side of the House that there was still much in the condition of the Catholic chaplains in India that required improvement. The question he had raised related solely to the inadequate number of Roman Catholic chaplains supplied in India who could speak the English language fluently and distinctly, and in a manner suited to the understanding of their Roman Catholic congregations.

The noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War pointed out that the present system of supplying Roman Catholic chaplains was entirely a matter for the Government of India and the Catholic Church in India; but that was one of the strongest arguments that could be brought forward in support of his (Mr. O'Donnell's) contention. He had suggested that, under the existing system, there was much that was capable of improvement; and, in those respects, he had suggested an improvement. Insomuch as they had no means of dealing with the Government of India, he proposed that a permanent staff of Catholic chaplains should be sent out, and also that there should be a sufficient increase to allow of additional chaplains being kept to minister to the wants of Catholic soldiers in those cases—unfortunately too numerous—in which English-speaking chaplains were not at the disposal of the Government of India, or the ecclesiastical authorities in India. Unquestionably, unless they could increase the strength of the Government chaplains from this end, there was very little chance of increasing the number at the other end; and that was why he had brought forward the question on the present Vote, which dealt with the provision for Divine Service. If there was an increase in the number of Catholic chaplains sent out to India, they would be available wherever they were wanted; and he believed that there would not be any hesitation on the part of most worthy men in Ireland and in this country to go out to India, in case of necessity, for that purpose. In regard to the differences between different sections of the Catholic Church, to which the hon. and gallant Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour) referred, he believed they were much less important than the hon. and gallant Member appeared to think; and if any differences of that kind required to be smoothed over, why not transport the faithful Errington to India? This was a very important question; and although it was in the power of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War to say that, strictly speaking, they could not go into details upon the matter on the present Vote, still the fact was widely known to hon. Members representing Ireland that the difficulty in providing Catholic chaplains to minister to the spiritual wants of Catholic soldiers serving abroad greatly increased the difficulty of recruiting the Army in Ireland. In the case of the Protestant chaplains, the Government was able to find English-speaking clergymen in abundance; and there could be no difficulty as to their power of speaking to Protestant soldiers in a language that was intelligible to them. If the Government found any difficulty in providing English-speaking chaplains from England, he could assure them they would get plenty of volunteers from the ranks of the Irish Catholic priesthood. He trusted, therefore, that more attention would be paid to the matter than appeared to have been done hitherto, if he might judge from the speech of the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War. He had been glad to hear the noble Marquess express indignation at the idea of sending out an undue proportion of Irish Catholic soldiers abroad; but, although the noble Marquess doubted the fact, he (Mr. O'Donnell) was satisfied that it was correct. That, however, was not the time to enter into details; but he would be prepared to give details, either privately to the noble Marquess, or in any debate which might be raised in the House. The evil had been growing for some time, and attention required to be paid to it. Although there could be no doubt of the admiration felt for the fighting qualities of Irish soldiers, he, for one, thought that a fair chance ought to be given to their valorous fellow-citizens from England and Scotland for doing their duty also.

Sir **ARTHUR HAYTER** said, he wished to state, in answer to the question of the hon. Member for Clare (Mr. O'Shea), that the Roman Catholic chaplains were named by the Roman Catholic Bishops, and not by the Government. He was afraid that in discussing the Vote the Committee had rather strayed away from the subject before them, because the question of chaplains in India formed no part of it. He might observe, however, that there was no foundation in fact for the statement that there was any disproportion between the number of Roman Catholic chaplains, in comparison with the number of Roman Catholic soldiers, and those of other religious denominations. The total number of Protestant soldiers, according to the last annual Return, was 60,000, and the number of chaplains was 62; the number of

Catholic soldiers was 18,000, and the number of Roman Catholic chaplains 17; the number of Presbyterian soldiers was 7,500, and the number of Presbyterian chaplains 7. One-fifth of the soldiers were Roman Catholic, and one-fifth of the entire number of chaplains were also Roman Catholics. As a matter of fact, the proportion was about one chaplain to every 1,000 soldiers in each case. He might add that an additional Roman Catholic chaplain had recently been appointed at Gibraltar. He could assure the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) that the matter should be further looked into by the War Office and the Secretary of State for India; and if there was anything to complain of a remedy should be found. He hoped the hon. Member would be satisfied with that assurance, and would now allow the Vote to be taken.

Mr. BLAKE said, he wished to say a word in regard to the observations which the hon. and gallant Member for the County of Cork (Colonel Colthurst) had addressed against himself (Mr. Blake) and his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). The hon. and gallant Member spoke of their denunciation of the Catholic priests in India. That observation was most unwarrantable and unjust. There had been no denunciation of any kind. His hon. Friend and himself had spoken in becoming terms of these excellent, zealous, and holy men; and the only thing they had said in relation to them, as a matter of objection, was that they were indifferent English scholars. He believed it was a fact that a considerable number of the chaplains who attended to the religious wants of the troops spoke indifferent English, and some of them hardly any English at all. He remembered, on one occasion, being in company with a Polish priest on the Indus, who was fulfilling the duties of chaplain to the Roman Catholic soldiers, though he did not speak a word of English. He was, nevertheless, a most excellent man; and he (Mr. Blake) only instanced the case as an illustration of a good many ones of a similar character. A great number of Poles and Frenchmen had gone out to India from the most laudable motives, in consequence of the persecution against the Roman Catholic priesthood in Poland and France. That persecution had been the cause of a very large number of foreign priests going out to India; and many of them, to his own knowledge, hardly spoke one word of English. Their sermons, owing to this cause—although he had no wish to speak of them with the slightest disrespect—were sometimes positively ridiculous. The soldiers and their wives frequently complained to him that some of the chaplains could not give consolation to the dying, or instruction to the children, in consequence of not knowing their language sufficiently. The only question raised by his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) had reference to the inadequacy of the number of English-speaking chaplains. There was, however, another question which had also been raised, which ought to receive the attention of Her Majesty's Government; and that was the insufficiency of the pay received by the Roman Catholic chaplains.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the present Vote had no reference to that question.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR thought that this was a question which would be much more properly discussed upon the Indian Estimates; and he trusted that the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) would bring it up when those Estimates were before the House. The hon. Baronet (Sir Arthur Hayter) had stated that there was this year an addition to the list of Roman Catholic chaplains, and that a new chaplain had been appointed at Gibraltar. He would suggest to the hon. Gentleman the desirability and propriety of also establishing an English-speaking Catholic chaplain at Aden. He had more than once heard from officers coming back from India and China with sick Catholic soldiers—either going down the Red Sea to Aden, or coming from the Persian Gulf—who could obtain no religious consolation, because there was no English-speaking priest at that station. On many occasions officers had clubbed together, and, at their own expense, sent out mules and donkey boys in search of a priest who lived in the country some miles from Aden, in order to bring him to minister to the spiritual wants of some dying English or Irish soldier. The Portuguese chaplain was not sufficiently conversant with the English language, and, therefore, the services of a Roman Catholic chaplain were practically *nil*. He believed he had brought this matter before the Government on previous occasions; but he had not heard that anything had been done in regard to it, and it was, unquestionably, a very great hardship. The men were expected to fight like heroes in maintaining our Empire in India; and in return they were allowed to die like dogs, without the religious ministrations which were allowed to their Protestant countrymen.

Colonel COLTHURST said, he wished to say a word in reply to the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake). He was sorry if he had wounded the hon. Gentleman's susceptibilities; and he would substitute the word "depreciation" for "denunciation." His hon. Friend said that he (Colonel Colthurst) knew nothing of the subject; but he had been many years in the Army, and had spoken a great deal upon this matter to officers and men who had been in India, and who knew quite as much about the matter as the hon. Member did. He had found very few complaints of want of knowledge of the English language on the part of the Roman Catholic chaplains; and the best remedy for that would be to make more liberal arrangements. As regarded the question of chaplains on board the troopships, the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War said it was a matter for the Admiralty. It had been brought under the notice of the Admiralty; and it had been passed on from the Admiralty to the War Office, from the War Office to the India Office, then from the India Office to the Admiralty back again, and so on, backwards and forwards. He thought there would be no real difficulty if these Departments would lay their heads together, and come to a conclusion as to the provision that was necessary. Ships were constantly coming home with invalids, and they ought to be accompanied by a Roman Catholic priest speaking the English language. He hoped his hon. Friend the Financial Secretary for War would give an assurance that this important subject would be taken into consideration, and brought under the notice of the Secretaries of State for the different Departments.

Mr. HARRINGTON said, that, although the hon. and gallant Member for Cork (Colonel Colthurst) had made an explanation of his previous remark, he was a little unfortunate in the word he had substituted for "denunciation." He had used the word "depreciation," which was quite as little called for. There had been no attempt whatever, on the part of his hon. Friends on those Benches, to depreciate the character of the Roman Catholic priesthood who ministered to the wants of Roman Catholic soldiers in India. There could be no depreciation in saying that a man who was not born in England, and had had no opportunity of learning the English language, did not speak that language thoroughly. The hon. and gallant Member had had no personal experience of his own; but, nevertheless, he gave his opinion in opposition to the experience gathered by his hon. Friend the Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake) on the spot, which was, that the want of English-speaking Catholic chaplains was largely complained of by the Roman Catholic soldiers as a very great grievance. As to the differences of opinion among the Roman Catholic Bishops in India which the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Sir George Balfour) had hinted at, he could assure him that he had mistaken for jealousy and difference of opinion that which was a principle of discipline in the Catholic Church. There was no doubt the subject was somewhat involved, and that difficulties laid in the way of a satisfactory arrangement; but these were matters which might easily be taken in hand and got over. The proposal of the hon. and gallant Member for Cork (Colonel Colthurst) was, that the only way to meet the difficulty was to send out to India chaplains from this country; but the question was one of Church discipline, and the Bishops were very jealous of their rights, and he doubted whether they would feel disposed, to give facilities to chaplains who were sent out, not by the Ecclesiastical Body, but by Her Majesty's Government. It would be better, he thought, to communicate with the Bishops in India, and see whether they would not find it worth their while to keep, at the principal stations where soldiers were placed, a certain number of English-speaking chaplains. He had no doubt that the Bishops would be glad to co-operate with the Indian Government, and would gladly bring English-speaking chaplains, when the necessity arose, into communication with English-speaking soldiers serving in any part of their Bishoprics.

MR. BRAND said, the hon. Member for the Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) had raised a question as to the appointment of a Roman Catholic chaplain at Aden, so that soldiers coming home from India should have the ministrations of a Roman Catholic chaplain at that place, if it were found necessary. The appointment of a Roman Catholic chaplain would rest with the Indian Government, and he would take care that the attention of the Secretary of State for India was drawn to the statement which had been made. There was one point in the remarks of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) which he ought to refer to. The hon. Member contended that a distinction was drawn between English and Irish soldiers with regard to service abroad. Now, it was quite impossible that such a distinction could be drawn in selecting soldiers for foreign service, because they were sent by roster, and it was quite a chance whether they were English, Irish or Scotch. He could assure the hon. Member that if any case of the kind could be pointed out to his noble Friend the Secretary of State for War, it would be visited with the most severe censure. He trusted that, after this explanation, the House would be allowed to proceed with the Vote.

MR. BIGGAR said, he believed it to be a fact that the number of Irish Catholic soldiers in the Army sent out for service abroad was much larger, in proportion to their total number, than either English or Scotch soldiers. If chaplains were attached to a particular regiment, then they would go from place to place with the regiment. That would be a great advantage, because the chaplain would become acquainted with the different members of the regiment to which he was attached, and the result would be that he would have complete control over the men, and a knowledge of their different peculiarities of character. It appeared to him that the present system was so arranged as to provide the Army with chaplains in the worst manner that could be fixed upon. The Government sent out troops to India without chaplains at all, and then they provided no proper remuneration for the services of the clergymen they employed in India. If the English or Irish Bishops were asked to recommend chaplains, there would be no difficulty in obtaining the services of English-speaking chaplains, notwithstanding that the persons sent out would necessarily be deprived of preferment, and of all chance of becoming public men. It certainly seemed to him that the present system of supplying chaplains who could not speak a word of English to English-speaking soldiers was most absurd. He agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) as to the importance of giving instruction to the children of soldiers in the Army; but it was perfectly impossible that the children could receive any instruction from chaplains who could not speak a word of English. It was very well known that the men who enlisted in the Army were, as a rule, men possessed of a small amount of education, and especially of a small amount of religious education. It was, therefore, most desirable that the influence which proper chaplains could exercise over such men should be brought to bear, so that the men themselves might be benefited in their moral life. Even from a selfish point of view, that was a most desirable object for the Government to attain, seeing that it would make the men less likely to get into difficulties and misconduct themselves. The more highly trained a man's moral and religious principles were, the less probable it was that he would be led away by bad companions, and be guilty of breaches of discipline and other misconduct. This was not the first time the question had been raised, both in regard to the Army and the Navy, and, on the last occasion, many promises had been made by the Government of future improvement. Those promises, nevertheless, had been constantly broken, and no substantial improvement had taken place. He thought the best course would be for his hon. Friend to move the rejection of the whole of the Vote, in order to see if the Government were not able to make some substantial *bonâ fide* promise, of which some account might be taken. Until that was done, he entertained no sanguine anticipation of being able to see any real reform effected, and no satisfactory settlement could be arrived at until a substantial promise could be extorted from the Government.

MR. O'DONNELL said, that in regard to the establishment of a sufficient number of chaplains, he would remind the Government that by the scheme now in force in the Army there was an opportunity of entirely recasting the method of appointing chaplains, because, under the scheme for the localization of the Army into practically three Armies, an English, a Scotch, and an Irish Army, the Irish Army would be almost entirely composed of Catholics, and it would be only natural for the Irish regiments to take Catholic chaplains with them whenever they were ordered for service abroad. He thought it would not be very difficult to come to a permanent arrangement with the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities, by means of which special faculties would be granted to the Roman Catholic chaplains appointed to the Irish Catholic regiments. He did not know whether the formation of the Army into three Divisions was actually contemplated under the original scheme—"Childers' scheme," as it was called—but, if so, they would soon have a substantial Irish Army, and it would then be economical, as well as expedient, to supply the Army directly with chaplains. It might be a little too soon to carry out a scheme of that kind in the present year; but, in the course of a very few years, the progress of localization would make it incumbent upon the Government to consider the existence of a separate and distinct Irish Army, and to legislate for it.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £36,900, Administration of Military Law.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, he desired to call the attention of the Committee and of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General (Mr. Osborne Morgan) to the very large number of sentences by general courts martial of penal servitude which had been carried out last year in the Army stationed in the United Kingdom. He trusted that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would be able to give some explanation of the cause of this increase of the number of sentences of penal servitude inflicted last year over the year 1881. Whereas, in the year 1881, only 11 sentences of penal servitude were carried out in the Army at home, in the year 1882, no fewer than 86 sentences of penal servitude were inflicted, or eight times as many as in 1881. In point of fact, nearly as many sentences were carried out in the Army at home as were carried out both in the Army at home and abroad together in the year 1881. He must remind the Committee that at home only one description of court martial—namely, a general court martial—could pass a sentence of penal servitude, and, in former times, it was seldom ever necessary to have recourse to so high a Court. He, therefore, thought it did not speak much for the conduct of the Army at home last year, that it had been found necessary so frequently to hold a general court martial with a view of obtaining sentences of penal servitude. They had heard a great deal lately about the better class of recruits they were now obtaining in the Army. The fact he had just mentioned seemed rather to belie that statement. He did not speak of minor courts martial, such as district and regimental courts martial, of which there were a considerable number, seeing that the test of the discipline of a regiment was not exactly the number of courts martial in the Court Martial Returns, because he knew that very many commanding officers abstained from trying a man when they ought try him by court martial, merely in order that he might be able to point to a clean court martial sheet; but a general court martial was quite another thing. When sentences of penal servitude were passed, and carried out, the soldier in fact became lost to the Army, and was virtually expelled from Her Majesty's Service. He, therefore, hoped his right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General would be able to give some explanation of the very large number of 86 sentences of penal servitude which had been carried out in the Army stationed in the United Kingdom.

The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said, he was glad that his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Alexander) had asked the question, because it gave him an opportunity of contradicting a statement which had been made in the public papers in regard to the Return to which his hon. and gallant Friend referred. It was quite true that the number of sentences of penal servitude had been very much increased during the last year, but that was because penal servitude had this year been awarded for offences for which only imprisonment was awarded formerly—namely, offences under the 32nd section of the Army Regulation Act with reference to enlistment in the Force after having been discharged with disgrace. Formerly, that offence was punished by imprisonment only, and the offenders were tried by district court martial; but, in consequence of the frequency of the offence, it had been thought proper—he said nothing as to the justice or policy of the change—to try the men by general court martial, for the purpose of giving them penal servitude. The offence itself had decreased, but the severity of the punishment had increased. With one single exception, the Return, so far from showing an increase of crime, showed a remarkable decrease of crime. He had taken some pains to get the figures accurately, and he had compared them with those of previous years. The figures were these. Number of courts martial at home of all kinds in 1881, 9,451; in 1882, 8,319; number of offences for which men were tried at home in 1881, 13,324; in 1882, 11,927; showing a reduction of about 11 per cent. But that did not represent the whole of the decrease during that time, because the total average strength of the Army at home was larger than it was in the previous year. The total average strength of the Army at home, in the year 1881, was only 87,982; whereas in 1882, it was 90,075, showing a 2 per cent increase in the number of men in the Army, which must be added to the percentage of decrease in the number of punishments, thus showing a reduction of rather more than 13 per cent. What was even more satisfactory was, that there had been a reduction almost everywhere, with only a single exception, in every kind of crime. For instance, the number of desertions had fallen from 1,393 in 1881 to 1,383 in 1882. That was not a very large reduction, but still it was a reduction. The offences against enlistment regulations were in 1881, 1,133; in 1882, 854, showing a large diminution of cases of drunkenness on duty; there were in 1881, 1,004; and in 1882, 969; of simple cases of drunkenness, in 1881, 932; in 1882, 800; of cases of making away with necessaries, which was a very common offence, there were, in 1881, 2,212; in 1882, 1,873; of cases of absence without leave, in 1881, 1,871; and in 1882, 1,634. He gave these figures, because he thought they were important, as showing that there had been a substantial decrease in almost every kind of crime in the Army. He was very glad to have had an opportunity of giving this explanation, because a certain class of writers had attempted to make out that the conduct of the Army was going from bad to worse, and he thought the figures he had given afforded a strong proof that the charge was not only unpatriotic but untrue.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he had fully intended to reserve the remarks he was about to make until a subsequent Vote was reached; but, as the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General (Mr. Osborne Morgan) had gone very closely into the question of punishments, he was bound to take the present opportunity of saying that as he could not agree with the figures the right hon. and learned Gentleman had put forward, he must, therefore, demur to the statement he had just made. With the permission of the Committee, he would give the numbers of courts martial, and the various punishments inflicted in the Army, taken from the annual Returns, the only source of information on the subject. He had taken great trouble to compare accurately the Returns of 1872, and those of 1877, the medium year, with the Returns for the year 1881, and with the Return in respect of the Army at home for 1882. They had not received any Return from abroad for the year 1882, and why that Return had not been produced by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, who knew all that was taking place with regard to this matter, he was quite unable to conceive. He was certainly of opinion that the Return in question should have been laid upon the Table of the House, because upon the thorough understanding of this subject depended the efficiency and well-being of the British Army. It was professed that we had a better class of men, that crime had diminished, in short, that in our Army we had everything that could be required. He had no wish to depreciate anything that had been done. This was no Party question, and whatever he might have to say upon it now, and in the future, would be in the interest of the Service and the country alone. The result of his comparison was very different from that arrived at by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General, for what did he find? In 1872, the number of courts martial at home was 9,408; in 1877,11,145; increase 18 per cent; in 1881, 10,706, increase 14 per cent; in 1882, 9,243, decrease 2 per cent over the number in 1872. In 1872, the number of courts martial abroad was 5.924; in 1877, 5,792; in 1881, 7,621. He was bound to admit that, under this head—court martials at home—there had been a decrease last year; but it was a very small one indeed. In 1872, the number of desertions and offences relating to enlistment at home was 2,271; in 1877, 3,211, increase 41 per cent; in 1881, 2.871, increase 26 per cent; in 1882, 2,402, increase 6 per cent over 1872. In 1872, the number of desertions and offences relating to enlistment abroad was 206; in 1877, 285, increase 38 per cent; in 1881, 280, increase 36 per cent over 1872. The number of cases of violence to superiors, insubordination, and neglect of orders at home in the year 1872 was 1,153; in 1877, 3,777; in 1881, 1,862, increase 61 per cent; in 1882, 1810, increase 57 per cent over 1872. The number of cases under this head abroad was for 1872, 898; 1877, 900; and in 1881, 1,502, or an increase of 67 per cent over 1872. The number of offences under the head of quitting or sleeping on post at home for the year 1872 was 202; for 1877, 255, increase 26 per cent; 1881, 380, increase 88 per cent; in 1882, 322, increase 59 per cent over 1872. Cases of drunkenness on duty at home were 470 in 1872; 747 in 1877, increase 59 per cent; 1,232 in 1881, increase 162 per cent, and 1,077 in 1882, or an increase of 129 per cent over the number in 1872. ["No, no!"] The right hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to signify some doubt as to the accuracy of these Returns; but if they were inaccurate, he would ask what was the use of publishing these delusive volumes every year. He came now to cases of ordinary drunkenness at home, of which there were 1,000 in 1872; 1,419 in 1877, increase 42 per cent; 1,059 in 1881, increase 6 per cent; 889 in 1882, decrease 11 per cent as compared with 1872. He was very glad to have reached a point at which he could corroborate the statement of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. The number of cases of disgraceful conduct at home in 1872 was 403; 659 in 1877, increase 65 per cent; 339 in 1881, decrease 16 per cent; and 324 in 1882, or a decrease from the number in 1872 of 36 per cent. In the case of the offence of absence without leave, the result was very much the same, there having been a decrease of 33 per cent for the year 1882 as compared with 1872. Under the head of making away with necessaries there were at home 2,038 offences in 1872; 4,255 in 1877, increase 109 per cent; 2,627 in 1881; and 2,081 in 1882, increase of 2 per cent. The Committee should understand that he had made these calculations upon an average of 100,000 not upon the exact number of men in the Army, so as to avoid unnecessary difficulty, as the Army in 1872 was 99,306. He now came to the punishments inflicted of penal servitude. There were at home in 1872 12 cases; 16 in 1877; 12 in 1881, and 86 in 1882. Of penal servitude inflicted abroad there were 59 cases in 1872; 35 in 1877; in 1881, no fewer than 87, or an increase over the number in 1872 of 47 per cent. In 1872, the number of cases of reduction to the ranks was at home 1,001; 1,171 in 1877; 1,830 in 1881, increase 83 per cent; and in 1882, there were 1,337 cases; or an increase of 34 per cent over the number in 1872. The number of cases of this kind abroad were 1,131 in 1872; 915 in 1877; and 1,582 in 1881, or an increase of 40 per cent as compared with the number in 1872. In 1872, the number of cases of reduction to the ranks with imprisonment was 81; 169 in 1877, increase 102 per cent; 293 in 1881, increase 260 per cent; and in 1882, there were 219 cases, or an increase of 170 per cent as compared with the number in 1872. It might be said that corporal punishment had nothing to do with the matter. But it was in force in 1872, and certainly existed abroad in 1877, although the Returns for those years were absolutely *nil.* In 1872, the number of solitary confinements and imprisonments at home were 5,018; 9,381 in 1877; 8,161 in 1881; and in 1882 they were 7,272, which represented an increase of 45 per cent over the number in 1872. Under this head, abroad, there were 4,161 in 1872, 4,315 in 1877, and 5,206 in 1881. Having gone through the Returns of punishments for serious offences, he would not trouble the Committee with a comparison of the numbers in the case of minor punishments. He could not, however, help thinking that if anyone would take the trouble to read an article which appeared in *The Times* with regard to punishments in the Army, he would come to the conclusion, notwithstanding the anxiety of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General to show there had been a decrease of crime, that the small decrease which had taken place in some instances did not tell favourably for the soldiers, when we took into account the great advantages that had been bestowed upon the Service, and from which great results had been expected.

The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said, that having again compared the Returns for 1882 with those for the year 1881, he was in a position to state to the Committee that the account he had given of the state of crime in the Army, before the hon. and gallant Baronet opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) rose, was absolutely accurate. He pointed out that the Return for 1882 was necessarily incomplete, because it only referred to soldiers serving at home. The Returns showed a diminution of every description of crime. The total number of offences committed by soldiers at home in 1881 was 13,324; whereas in 1882, it was 11,927. The total number of home courts martial in 1881 was 9,421, as against 8,393 in 1882, showing a decrease of 11 per cent, or, taking into account the increased number of men then on home service, a diminution of 13 per cent. If the hon. and gallant Baronet would look at page 49 of the Report for 1881, he would find the number of courts martial held since 1868 had been decreasing, and it would appear that, so far as it went, the Return for 1882 was smaller than for any other year, except one, since that date. In 1868, there were held at home 12,701 courts martial, and though they subsequently fell, they rose again in 1877 to 10,870; in 1878, to 11,751; in 1879, they fell to 9,729; in 1880, to 9,108; in 1881, they were 9,421; and in 1882, they stood at 8,319. He thought these figures would bear out the statement he had made, that, with the single exception of one year, the number of courts martial held in the United Kingdom last year was the smallest on record.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL said, he thought his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had done good service in drawing attention to the Returns furnished to the House on the subject of Army offences and punishments. He (Lord Eustace Cecil) would not, however, go into the question between his hon. and gallant Friend and the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Osborne Morgan), and would merely remark that it was unfortunate that the matter had been discussed without full Returns, and especially in the absence of the Returns from abroad for the year 1882. The Committee must bear in mind that a great many crimes committed by the 20,000 men who composed the Army in Egypt before starting, were adjudicated on board ship. There must also have been a large number of offences committed by the Army in Egypt of which the Committee had no account whatever. In saying that, he was casting no slur on the gallant Army which served there; but it must be recollected that corporal punishment had been abolished two years ago, and that sundry other punishments had been devised in lieu of it, although he had not been able to make out exactly what they were. Unless they had a Return of the number of courts martial held abroad last year, together with the crimes, and the punishments inflicted for them, more especially the extraordinary punishments —such as penal servitude—the Committee could come to no conclusion as to whether the abolition of corporal punishment had had a good effect or otherwise in the case of the Army when on active service. His hon. and gallant Friend had called attention to the fact, and he himself had also observed, that there had been a great increase in the number of punishments under the head of penal servitude. The right hon. and learned Gentleman, as he understood him, implied that penal servitude was a substitute for imprisonment; but, surely, the former was the more severe punishment of the two. The right hon. and learned Gentleman, being a lawyer, must know that two years' imprisonment was the punishment for misdemeanour, and that penal servitude was inflicted in the case of felony. He believed that the same rule held good in the Army. Having, in his time, sat at a good many courts martial, he knew that penal servitude was very properly looked upon as a fearful punishment, and that it was never inflicted except for very grave and serious crimes. The increase of punishment under this head showed that, at all events, the officers had had some difficulty in maintaining discipline amongst the men, and keeping that good order in the regiments which everyone desired to see in the British Army. Of course, it was not for him to say that the figures of the right hon. and learned Gentleman were in any way wrong. He had not been into the question so closely as his hon. and gallant Friend; but, having listened to his statement, he was bound to say that there were still some points which demanded explanation, and which could not be satisfactorily cleared up until the Return of the number of crimes committed abroad, and the punishments inflicted for them, was laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, that anyone who had listened to the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), in which this question of the effect of the abolition of corporal punishment was raised, and the answer made to it by the right hon. and learned Judge Advocate General, must have been almost amused at the diametrically opposite conclusions which they drew from precisely the same Returns. He thought that, perhaps, one cause of the difference between his hon. and gallant Friend and the right hon. and learned Judge Advocate General—two Gentlemen quite capable of accurately extracting information from a Government Return—was that his hon. and gallant Friend had adopted, for the sake of convenience, a fixed numerical basis on which to found his calculations of the percentage of increase or decrease in the amount of crime and punishment in the Army. Whatever the year, whatever the actual strength of the Army, his hon. and gallant Friend assumed that he was dealing with 100,000 men, so that the comparison of one year with another could always be made on the same principle; but, of course, the result of the plan adopted by his hon. and gallant Friend, which was convenient for many reasons, was to produce a discrepancy between his figures and those of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General. But, apart from that explainable difference, there remained a large amount of discrepancy between his hon. and gallant Friend and the right hon. Gentleman the Judge Advocate General which could not be thus accounted for. He attributed it, however, partly to the fact that, while the right hon. and learned Gentleman only made a comparison in respect of last year, his hon. and gallant Friend had dealt with the state of the Army during the last 10 years, and had pressed upon the consideration of the Committee the conclusion he had drawn from the comparison of the Returns during that period. He (Mr. A. J. Balfour) was obliged to confess that no answer had yet been made to his hon. and gallant Friend's contention, that though within the last 10 years a new Army system had been adopted, that privileges and advantages had been conferred upon recruits, and that, in consequence, the country had a right to expect men of a better class to enter the Army, nevertheless, this result had not been attained. His hon. and gallant Friend had pointed out that if you take the years 1872, 1877, 1881, and 1882, you will find an increase in the number of crimes under almost every head, and that, corresponding with this, there was an increase, as admitted by the Judge Advocate General, both in the quantity and the severity of the punishment inflicted. The conclusion drawn from that was that, notwithstanding all their endeavours to render the Military Service attractive, the men who joined it were either of a worse class, or were dealt with in a less successful manner than our soldiers were treated before. From one of those positions it was impossible to escape. If hon. Members looked back they would find that, during the last 10 years, there had been in respect of the Army, both at home and abroad, a large increase of crime and punishment. He hoped the right hon. and learned Gentleman having charge of that part of the subject would furnish the Committee with the conclusion he had framed, not upon the comparison of the Returns of the years 1881 and 1882, but upon the comparison of all the Returns of crime and punishment in the Army for the last 10 years.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, it was only fair to assume, in comparisons of this kind, that the Army numbered 100,000 men—they would find that, in 1872, the Army was, as nearly as possible, 100,000 strong—and, therefore, it was utterly impossible to make a fair comparison unless they considered its present strength 100,000 men. He ventured to say that no record could be produced that was more condemnatory of the system which at present existed than the record of crime he had produced to-night, which, though it might be inaccurate in certain minor points, was generally accurate. He challenged the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War to get up and say that the crime of the Army had not steadily increased since 1872, when the old system prevailed. What with the new appliances and methods of making the Army a perfect machine, they had not yet been successful in doing so.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he quite agreed with the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) that this ought not to be, in the slightest degree, a subject of Party discussion. He believed that the actual facts, as presented in the annual Return, bore out the conclusion the War Office had come to; and he contended that, without knowing what were the exact circumstances of particular years, what were the changes, what were the circumstances under which the Army was serving in one particular year or another, it was almost impossible to arrive at an accurate conclusion. He had endeavoured to follow the hon. and gallant Gentleman, but he was unable to call to mind the exceptionable circumstances of the first year to which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had referred. He, however, found that the number of courts martial in the first year recorded — 1865 — were 109 per 1,000 men at home and abroad; in the next year, 125 per 1,000 men; in the next year, 124 per 1,000 men; and in 1868, without any apparent cause, the number had risen to 144 per 1,000 men. The number then considerably fell, and again apparently without cause; while it had increased in the last two years. Until one had had the opportunity of going into the matter thoroughly, it would be impossible to arrive at a just conclusion. He, however, entirely agreed with the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the subject was one of the greatest possible importance, and fully deserving the attention of the Committee and those who were in charge of the Army.

Colonel STANLEY said, he thought that every word the noble Marquess had said had only strengthened the case of his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) in pressing upon the Government the necessity of giving—which he (Colonel Stanley) did not think the noble Marquess opposed—some Return which would really show how the figures stood in regard to crime in the Army. As the noble Marquess had stated, no doubt there was great force in the assertion that the circumstances of the various years differed, and that some explanation could be given to show obvious causes why figures differed; but there was an insuperable difficulty in the way of giving the figures. The figures were given for the use of those who were, generally speaking, conversant with the general position of affairs; and, therefore, a marginal note to show what proportion of the Army was not in actual service, and to show what change had taken place in Military Law, would be all that would be required by his hon. and gallant Friend. It was a great advantage that the Committee should have a speech on a subject of this kind from a person who was not connected with the Army, such as his hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. A. J. Balfour); and he (Colonel Stanley) hoped that they might understand from his noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) that if his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) pressed for the Return, and they were able to agree upon its commom form, the Government would assent to give a Return, showing the state of crime in various years, with such explanations that might be necessary to bring out the accurate facts of the case, it being borne in mind it was a matter of vital importance to the Army. He assumed, apart from Party considerations on this matter, it was of vital importance to show whether the reforms that had taken place in the past 10 or 12 years had been attended by the result that Parliament was led to believe would attend them, or whether they had been pursuing throughout a mistaken policy.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, that before the Vote was put, perhaps he could explain one point that was mooted by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) —namely, the word "nil" under the head of "corporal punishment." Upon the Chairman's (Sir Arthur Otway's) own Motion, in 1867, the power of inflicting corporal punishment was struck out of the Mutiny Act, except when the Army was actually serving in the field. He thought it right to call attention to the numerous cases of penal servitude which occurred last year. There never had been a year, for the last 200 years, in which penal servitude had been inflicted so largely at home—86 cases of penal servitude, inflicted at home in one year, was entirely unprecedented. It should be borne in mind that when a man had undergone an ordinary term of imprisonment he could return to his regiment; but if he was sentenced to penal servitude, he passed from the Army, and virtually became a convict.

The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said, he had stated before that almost every one of these sentences of penal servitude were awarded for crimes for which, formerly, imprisonment was awarded. Formerly, men re-enlisting without declaring the circumstance were sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and then discharged with ignominy; but now they were sentenced to penal servitude, and then discharged with ignominy.

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER pointed out that he made out his Return quite separately from his right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General, in regard to the years 1881-2. He had in his hand a Return, or an analysis, of the crime in the Army during those two years; and he was able to follow, item by item, and crime by crime, his right hon. and learned Friend's statement, though he had not seen it previously; and he found that his Return exactly corresponded with his right hon. and learned Friend's. In 1881, the number of courts martial held at home was 9,421; and in 1882, 8,319. In the two years there was a decrease of total offences for which men were tried at home; for the number in 1881 was 13,324, and in 1882, 11,927, a decrease of 1,397. The number of sentences passed in 1881 was 9,251, and in 1882, 8,156. For drunkenness, the court martials were, in 1881, 932; and in 1882, 800; a decrease of 132. In 1881, there were 1,889 cases of absence without leave, and 1,639 cases in 1882. There were, in 1881, 1,393 courts martial for desertion, and 1,308 in 1882. For offences in relation to enlistment, the courts martial were 1,133 in 1881, and 854 in 1882. For violence to superiors, 875 courts martial were held in 1881, and 753 in 1882. In 1881, the number of offences for being drunk on duty were 1,084, and in 1882, 969. Of making away with uniform the number of offences in 1881 was 2,312, and in 1882, 1,873. He might add that, in 1881, the total strength of the Army at home, exclusive of officers and warrant officers, was 87,992, while in 1882 it amounted to 90,075. He assured the Committee that these figures were absolutely accurate. The only reason why he was not able to produce the figures with regard to the men abroad was that they had not received the particulars; as soon as the Returns were received, they would be included in the annual Statement, and would be at once presented to the House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked what had been done with regard to the Office of the Deputy Judge Advocate in Dublin? He would like to know also how the work, formerly done by the Legal Secretary to the War Office, was now performed.

The JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. Osborne Morgan) said, that last year his right hon. Friend the late Secretary of State for War (Mr. Childers) and himself thought they could reduce the staff by doing away with the deputy Judge Advocate in Dublin; but Sir Thomas Steel was so opposed to the abolition of the Office that, as a matter of fact, that Office had never been discontinued. In answer to the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. A. J. Balfour), he would take the opportunity of stating a fact, which was not generally known, that for the last three years the sum of £1,600 had been saved to the country annually, in consequence of the work formerly done by the Legal Secretary to the War Office, Mr. Clode, being taken over by the Judge Advocate General and his staff.

Dr. LYONS said, it was not easy for the public to ascertain to what extent the strength of the Army varied year by year; and, therefore, it would be as well that in the Return there should be a statement of the percentage of the increasing of the various crimes. There was, undoubtedly, a very warm feeling in the country upon the subject; the public believed that the Army was improving in the general moral character of the men, and that all that had taken place recently had had the effect of improving the tone of the men of the Army. He trusted that nothing would transpire to shake that belief which the people had.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £520,000, for Militia Pay and Allowances.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL said, there were one or two matters arising out of this Vote which he wished to bring before the Committee and the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington). He thought it was plain, from the Report of the Committee on Recruiting, that the Militia this year was in a much less satisfactory state than it had been in any previous time since its organization; there were, in point of fact, 12,200 less effectives in the Militia than there were two years ago, and he should like to hear an expression of opinion as to the reasons for that alarming decrease. For his own part, he was inclined to attribute it to the new system of training the recruits. That point was referred to in the Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting. The great evil of the present system seemed to be that there were two systems at work—two competing systems. Under the old system, the recruits were drilled with their comrades at head-quarters; but now, a change had been made, whereby they were drilled by themselves. He was aware there was an apparent saving. The recruit who enlisted formerly received 10*s*. bounty; and it was very true that, occasionally, he pocketed his bounty and never came up for training at all. Under the present system, he received nothing at all, unless he remained for the full period of training of 63 days. What resulted? The desertions under the new system seemed to be almost the same as under the old—namely, about 5 per cent; and, as a mere question of economy, what was the result? Under the old system, a recruit received 10*s*. on enlistment; and, therefore, when he disappeared, he cost the country 10*s*., and no more; now he cost the country, not only his bounty, £1, but his daily pay and the cost of his kit; in fact, it might be safely taken, that whereas 9 per cent of the desertions under the old system cost the country a sum of £1,250 a-year, the same ratio of desertions under the new system cost the country no less than £25,000; therefore, the apparent saving gained by insuring the re-appearance of recruits after enlistment, was totally lost by the increased cost of recruits under the new system. And the country was not a bit better for the change; it was no advantage to the country that a man should be trained for 63 days and then disappear. The main evil of the existing state of things seemed to lie in this—the competition between the two systems, and he could give an instance of his own experience. His own regiment was the 4th Battalion of the Royal Scotch Fusiliers, the territorial district of which regiment comprised the counties of Ayrshire and Wigton. The Renfrewshire Militia, now called the 3rd Battalion of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, whose head-quarters were at Stirling, was trained and recruited in Ayrshire; therefore they had comprised in that one episode of Militia training almost the length and breadth of Scotland, because the Renfrewshire Militia, belonging to the head-quarters of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders at Stirling, was sent to train in Ayrshire, where it competed unfairly with the district regiment. It competed unfairly with the district regiment, for the very reason that the regiment was sent from its own head-quarters, its own recruits were sent to be drilled under the old system, and the recruits in the county regiment were drilled under the new system. A recruit, so long as he got his bounty and pay, did not care twopence whether he belonged to the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, or to the Royal Scotch Fusiliers; and the result in this case was, that whereas the 3rd Battalion of the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders was formerly never up to its strength, it was now considerably over it, and the battalion with which it completed, and which up to the last two years had always been above its strength, was now considerably below it. What he desired the noble Marquess to do was to hold out a hope of some equalization of the conditions of recruiting; for the present system seemed to be altogether unfair and undesirable. There was another point to which he wished to draw the attention of the Committee, a point to which he had, in former years, called attention —namely, that of the musketry training in the Militia. He was most unwilling to repeat what he had said in former years; but since last year they had the Report before them of the Committee on Musketry Instruction. In that Report it was stated that the musketry instruction of the Militia was in a most unsatisfactory state, and the causes were not far to seek, for those causes were set down as want of time, want of instruction, and want of range accommodation. In fact, musketry instruction in the Militia was nothing more nor less than a farce, and a very expensive farce. What was done at present was to give a man 20 rounds of ammunition, which he had simply to fire away in his annual course, imposing on him at the same time most difficult and unreasonable conditions. He had to fire his rounds in a very great hurry. A strong battalion—say, of 800 or 1,000 men—would, under ordinary conditions, take a long time to fire 20 rounds, with due care and attention to principles; but what did they find? He had seen repeatedly men marched down to the range, often a very bad and inadequate range, and the pressure of time had been so great that they had had no opportunity of studying the proper positions; the great thing seemed to be to fire away the ammmunition, and get the Returns made out. The Committee on Musketry Instruction considered that recruits would be trained more perfectly the first year they were out if they were put through a competition similar to that which took place in the Line, and they recommended that an extra three weeks be given for that purpose. When recruits had once been properly trained, which he admitted to be of immense advantage, he should be very glad to hear that some provision had been made for improving their firing. The Committee hoped that the shooting might be kept up at an annual course of 60 rounds per man. That would be a great improvement; but if, under the existing system, a difficulty was felt in completing a course of 20 rounds, how would it be possible to get through a course of 60 rounds. He thought that rather than impose an additional 40 rounds, it would be better to discontinue for a time musketry instruction altogether. The present instruction was perfectly useless and expensive, and by its discontinuance they would, at all events, save the trouble—which was considerable—and the expense. Another course, which he had ventured to suggest on a former occasion, was that alternate annual training might be devoted to drill and musketry instruction, and a third course, to which he himself considered greater objections might be raised, was that the companies should come up singly to head-quarters, and be instructed during the non-training portion of the year. That would involve, of course, the men leaving their homes twice a-year instead of once; and he thought that, on the whole, there was no alternative between extending the period of the Militia training and the discontinuance of musketry instruction.

Colonel RUGGLES-BRISE said, he could say, with some authority, that the Militia in the Eastern Counties was never at so low an ebb as it was at the present moment. There was no doubt that the agricultural depression and the great sparcity of labourers and working men in agricultural districts had had a considerable effect upon recruiting; but the deterioration of the Militia at the present time not only prevailed in regard to the non-commissioned officers and rank and file, but even on the officers. Perhaps he would be allowed to show what was the state of things in his own regiment in the year 1877-8. Under the old system, and before they had the system of brigade depôts, his regiment was 840 strong; under the operation of the brigade depôt system it had been reduced to 600. Now, he would give the House, as shortly as he could, what he thought were some of the reasons for the deterioration of the rank and file in the Militia. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman below him (Colonel Stanley) had stated, very clearly, the views he himself held on this matter. He (Colonel Ruggles-Brise) believed that the taking away of the 10*s.* gratuity upon enlistment was the main reason of the deterioration, and a greater piece of false economy than that, to his mind, had never been committed in connection with the Force. If 10 per cent, or 15 per cent only, of those who received the 10*s.* gratuity, never appeared at the training —say, about 500 men in all—it would not cost the country more than about

2*s.* 6*d.* per head upon those who remained. Boys now came up without gratuity, and deserted after having obtained the bounty and other necessaries, and that was a far greater expense to the country than would be a increase of 10 per cent, or 15 per cent, on the bounties paid to 400 or 500. Another reason for the deterioration of the Militia was the necessity for their coming up for preliminary drill at the time of the enlistment. The result of that had been most unfortunate, particularly upon recruiting in the Eastern Counties. The Government had given the commanding officer no option. He, however, would insist upon the men coming up for their 56 days' preliminary drill, previous to their entering the regiment; but he would not continue the system at present in force. Another thing, which was highly objectionable to the people who would be most likely to join the Force, was that the men were kept at drill during the hay harvest. That was a great grievance, particularly in the Eastern Counties; and he would recommend, for the future, that the men should be called up at a convenient season of the year. By keeping the men up after the hay season had commenced, they were retaining them at one of the most inconvenient seasons —so far as employers of labour were concerned — which could possibly be found. There were other causes for the deterioration of the Militia; and the result of all these things had been a diminution in the number of enlistments. In one district with which he was acquainted the number had fallen from 411 men in 1877-8 to 140 men in 1882-3. Another complaint he had to make with regard to the Militia was with reference to the control the commanding officers now had over the men. The officers were, as a matter of fact, treated as nonentities, and were hardly ever consulted upon any matter affecting the regiment. The officers could not enlist their own recruits; they could not select their own adjutants; they were not consulted on any points whatever. Up to a few years ago, he thought up to the year 1880, every man who made an application for his discharge, made it to his commanding officer all the year round—that was to say, not only during the training season, but all through the year. If the commanding officer thought fit, as he naturally would, in the case of a man who held a lucrative situation which it would be a great disadvantage to him to lose, and it was necessary for the man to leave the Militia, that commanding officer did not hesitate to give a discharge. Now, however, under the Order of July, 1880, the discretionary power was taken away from the commanding officer, and every man who applied for a discharge had to have it. He (Colonel Ruggles-Brise) had found, when he went up to train his regiment in 1882, that 63 men had been discharged without the fact having been brought to his knowledge. Under those circumstances, he had asked for the orders granting the discharges. These were furnished to him, and he found that he had nothing whatever to do with the discharges, and that if the men applied for them, they were to have them. It seemed to him a most monstrous thing to enlist men into the Militia who, after a short service, if they changed their mind, could leave the Force again without difficulty. As he had said, it had always been the custom of commanding officers to give men their discharge. rather than to allow them to lose an advantageous situation; but now, the men who applied for their discharge through any freak of temper or caprice, were to have it. No doubt, a greater number of men had been discharged as medically unfit during the last few years than had been discharged previously. So far as the Army went, no doubt, it was most desirable that they should be careful in selecting the men; but he thought that in the Militia it was not necessary for them to be so particular. There were many slight defects in the temperament and constitution of the men; and it was surely not necessary to lay down the same hard inflexible rules as to men in the Militia as it was in the Army. The authorities, however, seemed to be of a different opinion; and the result of the course they had taken had been to deprive the Force of a great many men. Then, again, the Militia had been weakened through the brigade depôt system; because, whilst formerly if a man who was out of work and wanted a few shillings would enlist for the bounty, he had not that inducement at the present time. What he (Colonel Ruggles-Brise) disliked more than anything else was the recruiting for the Militia being mixed up with the Army recruiting. The Militia commanders had no power whatever to enlist Militiamen, and their own staff were not under their control, except during the training period of the year. As he understood it, the recruiting sergeant sent out for recruits in the Militia and in the Regular Army, got 2*s*. 6*d*. for a recruit for the latter, and only 1*s*. 6*d*. for one for the Militia. Owing to that, what inducement had a sergeant to make any effort to secure recruits for the Militia? He had none; and the result was, that he cared little about enlisting Militiamen, and went in to get as many of the 2*s*. 6*d*. men as he could. Moreover, the Militia sergeants and non-commissioned officers were in a very unsatisfactory position at the present time. Formerly, commanding officers used to get in the Service excellent men from the Line regiments—men who had seen service, and who had good characters, and who had been wont to look to the Militia as a resting-place after a hard service in foreign countries. Now, however, they had no rest at all. Under the brigade depôt system, they were employed all the year round; and the work they had to do now, they told him, was far harder than that which they ever had to do in their old regiments. He could assure the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War that the dissatisfaction of these non-commissioned officers was complete. As to the Militia bands, he knew of one case where the brigade colonel at the depôt had insisted on taking control of it. The officer commanding the Militia refused to give the brigade commander that control, on the ground that the instruments belonged to the officers, and not to the Government. That excuse was a valid one, and the bandsmen were not interfered with so far as the instruments were concerned; but they were ordered on parades which, of course, very much interfered with their practice. In this matter, he was not finding fault with the officers commanding the depôts; but he very strongly complained of the system. Then it had been said in the debate, that they ought to have some voice in the selection of their adjutants, and so they ought; but, instead of that, the state of the case was this. He himself had, within the last 12 months, had a vacant adjutantcy. He knew a young officer, in one of the depôt brigade regiments, who was formerly in his (Colonel Ruggles-Brise's) own regiment, and he had been satisfied that he would make a very useful adjutant, and had intended, when a vacancy came about, to recommend him for it. To his surprise, however, one morning a letter came down from the brigade depôt, saying that Captain So-and-so had been nominated, and that if he had any objection to make to him he was to say so. That, certainly, astonished him. Of course, he knew of no objection to the officer named, and it would have been a very invidious thing for him to have stated an objection. The captain recommended might be a very good officer; but he (Colonel Ruggles-Brise) did object, on the ground that he knew an officer in the brigade who would be useful to him. On making application at the War Office, he found, however, that that officer was in India, and that he would not be allowed to return home unless he paid his own expenses; therefore, he (Colonel Ruggles-Brise) was compelled, *nolens volens*, to accept the officer nominated by the War Office. He could not say that he had not got an attentive, and zealous, and able adjutant; but this he did say, that the system was as bad and as rotten as it possibly could be. Out of four regiments, there were two from which they could select their adjutants; but those regiments might happen to be in India, or on foreign service. They had only a few officers at home, and, out of that few, probably some of them might be suffering from ill-health, or, for other causes, might be unfit to act as adjutants, which would reduce the number from which they could select very considerably. Probably very few of those officers at home cared to have the adjutantcy; probably, none of them were apt teachers, or fitted to take the position; but, whether that were so or not, the commanders were bound to choose from the limited number of officers who might happen to be at home. It was not fair to these commanding officers that they should be bound down to so limited a selection. He had said, when be commenced the few observations with which he had troubled the Committee, that he never knew the Militia in a less satisfactory condition, both as to men, non-commissioned officers, and officers, than it was at the present time. Before long, he had no doubt they would be in the same position with regard to junior officers in the Militia as they were 20 years ago, or previous to 1868. There would be a great dearth of them. They had been filling the ranks of junior officers from young men, who were anxious and willing to enter the Line; but, now, the difficulties of getting into the Army through the Militia were so great, the competition being so considerable, that it was really harder work for an officer to obtain admission into the Line through the Militia, than for him to obtain it in the ordinary way. No one had done more since 1868 for the officers of the Militia than Lord Cardwell; no one had done more for them, in his (Colonel Ruggles-Brise's) experience, since the noble Lord's Army Bill came into operation. He was afraid now, however, that, before many years had elapsed, they would have no junior officers at all in the Militia. The captains and officers of high rank they might have; but they would not get the boys. He would not occupy the time of the House any more than to say that he did hope the Government would treat the Militia as a more local Force than they were doing at the present moment. They were now being blotted out most certainly and most surely. As far as the men were concerned, what he should like to see would be a re-introduction of the system of paying the 10*s.* bounty on enlistment, and that the Government should revert to the old system of training and drill.

Lord ALGERNON PERCY said, he wished to draw attention to one or two questions which had not been touched upon by previous speakers. The first was the position of sergeant majors of Militia regiments serving on their Army engagements, as regarded promotion. They were induced to enter the Militia under the supposition that they would be in exactly the same position as the sergeant majors of their linked battalions. They were made warrant officers, and they imagined that they would be in the same position; but it appeared that they were not eligible for promotion to the position of quartermasters in any battalion except their own Militia battalion, and, only then, in the event of no quartermaster of the Line battalion wishing for the place, and the commanding officer of the Line battalion not putting forward any other candidate. The result was, that the sergeant major of a Militia regiment could not, by any possibility, be promoted, because the new quartermaster of the Line regiment would at once be in his place; and if the quartermaster of the Militia retired, he would, of course, apply for the vacant place, and the sergeant major of the Militia battalion could only remain in the position of sergeant major. That did not seem to him (Lord Algernon Percy) to be fulfilling the territorial system. He did not think that a good system; but if we were to have the territorial system carried out in its entirety, the three battalions should be treated like three battalions of one regiment, and the promotion should go in these three battalions. Now that pensions were done away with, every inducement should be held out to good non-commissioned officers to go on to the Militia Staff. A short time ago, the Militia Staff was filled by very young non-commissioned officers, and commanding officers felt great inconvenience from that. This would be the result again, because no non-commissioned officer of any standing would take all the hard work of a sergeant-majorship, if he could get no other promotion. This might be said to be only an individual case; but he had a letter from a non-commissioned officer, whom he had known in the Regular Service, and who said this had utterly shipwrecked his career, and was creating great discontent among the non-commissioned officers in the Service. With regard to the clothing of the Militia, it was monstrous that the moment new clothing was served out, it should come unsewn and require repairing. Militiamen could not be expected to repair their clothes neatly; and the result was, that the regiment did not look as smart as it should. Then, with regard to the boots, he hoped the Government would do something, for that was a most important point. When the men were in billets, it perhaps did not matter so much; but now that the majority of the Militia regiments were in camp—and it was very much better for the Service that they should be in camp—only one pair of boots for each man, whatever the weather might be, or the condition of the ground, was bad both for the Service and for the men. It caused discontent among the men, and the effects would be felt after, if not during, the training. Wet weather was known to have an effect on men after a time, and he had no doubt that was the case with the Militia. During the first week's training of his own regiment there was rain incessantly; the camp could not be easily drained, and the lines were extremely wet. Waterproof sheeting could not be obtained at the time, and the men had no change of boots. There might be some difficulty in dealing with more boots at the end of the drill, for men could not well be allowed to take away two pairs of boots; and the boots now supplied were so bad, that if they were stored till next training, the men would not be able to put them on. This difficulty, he thought, might be obviated by serving out better boots, which would last two or three years. There was no reason why the boots should not be kept in store with the rest of the clothes and properly looked after by the non-commissioned officers. Allusion had been made to the drilling of the recruits immediately on enlistment, instead of waiting till the regiment came up for training. One great objection to that was that the recruits could not be drilled by their own non-commissioned officers at all, and it very often happened that the Militia sergeant was away recruiting; men were enlisted and sent to be drilled by the depôt sergeant, who took no interest in them. The men then went away, and when the training began the sergeant knew nothing of the men, and the consequence was that the men were thoroughly neglected, and became dissatisfied. There was no doubt that the drill of the Militia had very much deteriorated since this new system was adopted. While he was at Aldershot he saw several Militia colonels, who agreed that the system of drilling recruits the moment they came in had spoiled the drill of the battalions; for it was impossible to give the men battalion drill, and so the men were only partially drilled. An Order was issued not very long ago that the permanent Staff should always appear in uniform. That might be all very well on paper, and, no doubt, the Order was issued because the system suited the Army very well; but it had had a bad effect on the Militia. It was hard upon the sergeants that, whenever they were not on duty, they should always have to appear in uniform; but it operated still more hardly upon the bandsmen, because in all the Militia regiments the bandsmen obtained a certain amount of income out of the training period by playing in twos and threes at theatres and other places, and by giving instruction in private houses. If they were always to appear in uniform, they would be very much prejudiced; and there were regiments in which, upon the issue of that Order, the band had given notice that they would purchase their discharge in a body. Another Order was issued not very long ago, which had operated very hardly on the men, under which no man was allowed to purchase his discharge unless he had given notice some time previous to the training—about three months' notice. The result was, that at the commencement of the training, men came up to purchase their discharge at the last moment. They had not heard of the Order, and they were told that they could not purchase their discharge. The result was that a great many men were absent. The system had created uncertainty, and men would not enlist. There could be no doubt as to the bad condition into which the Militia had fallen. Men were being recruited at the present moment standing only 5 feet 2 inches; and, judging from their appearance, they were very juvenile indeed; in fact, it had lately been brought to his personal notice that some of these men burst into tears on discharging their rifles. That did not look as if they were very fit to defend their country; and he was told that the chest measurement was not properly considered. The Militia was very much below its strength, and that, he believed, was due among other things, to the Orders he had mentioned, which were vexatious, and were issued without due regard to the nature of the Militia, and the circumstances by which it was surrounded. Orders which suited the Army would not suit the Militia, and Orders which looked well on paper had had a bad effect on the Militia.

SIR HENRY FLETCHER said, there was one matter which he should like to bring forward, and that was that there were two classess of sergeant majors in the Militia. One class were men who were what he might call old soldiers; and the other class were men who were appointed to the rank of sergeant major who had never been in the Regular Army, but had been, all through, pure and simple Militiamen. The difference of pay and allowance in these two classes was very considerable, and had, for some time past, caused great dissatisfaction. The sergeant majors who had been promoted without having been in the Regular Army received 3*s.* 6*d.* a-day, with a maximum pension of only 1*s.* a-day; whereas the sergeant majors who had been promoted from the Regular Army received 7*s.* 2¾*d.* a-day, and were entitled to a maximum pension of 4*s.* 6*d.* a-day. He brought this matter forward, because it affected very materially the regiments in Scotland. In many of those regiments the language used among the men was the Gaelic, and that was the reason, he supposed, why the sergeant majors were promotod from the ranks of the Militia regiments to sergeant majors; it was because they knew the language. And, beyond their not receiving the same amount of pay and a pension as the non-commissioned officers who were promoted from the Regular Army, the system materially affected the discipline of these Highland regiments, because now there was great difficulty in obtaining recruits, and the commanding officers of those regiments were in a great measure dependent on the sergeant majors to act as interpreters in the orderly room and on parade. He strongly urged the Government to put the sergeant majors from the Militia on the same footing as those who had risen from the Regular Service, in order that the discipline in the Scotch regiments should be as efficient as it formerly was. There were, he believed, only eight or ten of those officers; and he hoped the Government would see the propriety, while they existed, of putting them on the same footing as warrant officers. That would have a good effect on the discipline of the Scotch regiments, which had proved true and faithful to this country in the past.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, if the efficiency of the Militia could be fairly judged of by the numbers available at training, then the present Militia Force was nothing but a miserable paper Force. Out of 143,000 officers and men, only 85,000 had appeared at the training; and out of a nominal strength of 1,256 permanent Staff, there were only 881. Military efficiency could never be expected so long as there was that remarkable falling off in officers and men at the training. With regard to the Artillery, out of 18,000 men, there were only 8,577 present; and, in the Engineers, only 928, out of 1,319; and nearly half the Infantry were absent from the training. No doubt, the non-training of the Irish Militia might account for the absence of a portion of this Force; but, after making allowance for that fact, it would still be found that the absentees from training were far too numerous. Now, considering the short training given to the Militia, it was utterly impossible, with these great absences, to give them anything like a military appearance. All the men who were enrolled in the Militia ought to have been present at the training, and the Return should distinctly show not only the men and officers of the several arms, but also the numbers for the several parts of the United Kingdom.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL asked the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War to state all he could as to the Irish Militia. He understood they had been called out; and he should be glad to know whether the whole Force was to be called out, and whether the noble Marquess would turn his attention to the condition in which the Irish Militia were said to be, not only as to training, but, what was of more importance, as to musketry instruction? He was told that their condition in that respect was terrible. Colonel Walker, of the Fusiliers, who had paid attention to this matter, stated that the state of the Irish Militia was a great deal worse than that of the English, both as to instruction and the arms with which they were supplied. He did not quite understand whether they were all to have the Martini-Henry rifle, or only a portion of them. If those rifles were only to be supplied to the English and Scotch Militia, he supposed the Irish Militia would still be armed with the old Snider, and then there would be differences as to instruction and ammunition; and if it happened that the Militia were called out for active service those differences might be very serious. But there was something more serious still. He was told that a number of the ranges in Ireland were very deficient—more deficient than in England—and that was a matter of the first importance. All these things were still as they had been for some years past. He did not blame the noble Marquess, or the War Department; but this was still the fact, and he thought upon these questions as upon other Army questions, something should be done. He and his Friends would be most happy to give the Government their assistance and advice in these matters, and he was sure if the noble Marquess would give his attention to these questions, he might be even more successful than those who had preceded him in finding a solution. A solution of some sort was most necessary. Nobody could look about and see what was going on abroad, and at home, without feeling that the position of both our Army and our Militia was of the utmost importance. He did not go so far as to say that this was merely a question of money, because he did not think it was. There were a good many things to be thought of besides money; and he was anxious to hear what was the noble Marquess's solution of the difficulties which had been pointed out. These difficulties were undoubtedly very great, and he was sorry to see that there were increasing difficulties—namely, in getting recruits for the Militia, in instruction, and in training.

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER said, the proposal of the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Herbert Maxwell), that a certain number of the Militia should be detached, either by regiments or companies, and employed simply in learning musketry, had been tried and had failed. The authorities at the War Office believed that it would always do so, because so much in this country depended on the state of the weather, which often put great difficulties in the way of regiments getting any opportunity whatever of firing.

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL said, his proposal was not that companies should be struck off training, but that they should either be brought up for musketry instruction during the non-training period, or else be exclusively trained in musketry in alternate years.

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER said, that plan would entail additional expense, because the men could not be expected to come up without receiving the ordinary pay. Some of the remarks addressed to him by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for East Essex (Colonel Ruggles-Brise) with regard to the Militia appeared rather to be directed against the system as a whole. For instance, with regard to the adjutants, he (Sir Arthur Hayter) must point out that the union between the Militia and the Line was a cardinal principle of the existing military organization. He had been informed by very high authorities, that there was no difficulty in obtaining excellent adjutants for the Militia from the linked battalions, and that, therefore, there was no necessity to create a wider field of selection for adjutants than already existed. He could not say that any complaints on this subject had reached him other than those of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. With reference to the statement that there was a want of officers in the Militia, that, he was sorry to say, was the case, and the fact was a good deal caused by their being less inducement for them to qualify for commissions in the Line, where he believed the number of commissions open to them had been reduced by nearly one-half. But, as he found that the want of officers varied in different parts of the country, it was difficult to draw conclusions from particular instances; and their hope was, that the agricultural depression which, as he understood, had been so detrimental to the Militia, would not continue to injure it. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had also said that there had been a diminution of enlistments in the Militia on account of the bounty of 10*s*. having been abolished; but it was thought much better not to recur to the bounty system. There were two systems of drill going on in the country; and it was considered that the better way of dealing with recruits would be to give the men the option, either of drilling immediately on enrolment, or of drilling continuously with their regiments. The reason for giving this option was that, owing to the conditions existing in some counties, it was found impossible to make the two systems work together. In the agricultural districts, they found that the men preferred, as a rule, to work with their corps; on the other hand, they found that the men in the manufacturing districts, who felt perhaps the immediate pressure of want, preferred to proceed at once to the barracks, and go through their drill there, where they received the money due to them. Where the drill and training took place together, a man would only be disturbed in his calling once, and it was proposed, in that case, to give him 30*s.* at the close of the preliminary training; but were these were separate, it would be seen that a man would be twice disturbed, and, in that case, they proposed that he should receive £1 at the commencement of the drill, and £1 at the close of his training. It was thought that that arrangement was a fair solution of the difficulties of the question. The hon. and gallant Gentleman also alluded to the fact that the Militia sergeants complained of overwork, because they had to perform duties at the brigade depôts harder than they were before accustomed to. No doubt, they were hard worked; but it must be borne in mind that they had better men to compete with. He thought, however, this question was one rather for the consideration of the colonel of the regiment than the Department which he had the honour to represent. Remarks had also been made upon the payment of sergeants major in the Highland Militia regiments; and it had been pointed out that the difference between their pay and pensions, as compared with those of the Army sergeants major, was very considerable. He understood the hon. and gallant Baronet (Sir Henry Fletcher) to say that the sergeants major in the Highland Militia regiments received 3*s.* 6*d.* per day, and were entitled to a maximum pension of 1*s.* per day; while the Army sergeants major received 7*s.* 2¾*d.* a-day, and were entitled to a pension of 4*s.* 6*d.* a-day. The hon. and gallant Baronet asked that there should be a removal of this inequality, and had based his claim upon the fact that the services of these men were almost indispensable to their regiments, owing to their knowledge of Gaelic. He (Sir Arthur Hayter) would investigate the matter; but he was bound to point out that however valuable their services had been, and although they were undoubtedly useful on account of their speaking Gaelic, they had always been confined to the Militia, whereas the serjeants major of the Army had to undergo a long period of active service abroad. It seemed, therefore, hardly fair to put the two classes of men upon a footing of equality. However, as he had already said, the matter should be inquired into. He was glad to point out an encouraging feature in the present Returns—namely, that they showed an increase in the number of Militia recruits as compared with the preceding year. That was a circumstance that would be satisfactory to the noble Lord opposite (Lord Algernon Percy), who said that the test of the popularity of the Service was to be found in the number of enrolments. On the other hand, the Militia Reserve showed a slight decrease; the number of men being 26,629 for 1883, as compared with 27,274 for the year 1882. The noble Lord the Member for West Essex (Lord Eustace Cecil) had inquired as to the weapons supplied to the Irish Militia. The order had been given for the supply of 9,000 Martini-Henry rifles, and only one regiment of the Irish Militia would that year be armed with the Snider rifle.

Earl PERCY said, he had listened with interest to the speech of the hon. Baronet the Financial Secretary to the War Department (Sir Arthur Hayter); but he was bound to say that the hon. Baronet had left untouched a great many points to which his attention had been directed. He trusted the authorities at the War Office would take all those points into consideration; and he would remind the hon. Baronet that as this Vote presented the only occasion on which the Militia were able to express their hopes and fears, it was natural that they should desire to know as soon as possible what chance there was of their hopes being realized. The hon. Baronet had said nothing about the musketry training of the Militia, a subject on which, for some time past, so much had been said and written; but he could not help thinking that the Government would do well to state what they really proposed to do in this matter. It was all very well to tell the Committee that it was impossible to have the regiments up for drill and musketry instruction in alternate years, because the weather had affected some regiments detrimentally; but that statement equally applied to companies being struck off in alternate years for musketry training. The complaint was, that the training was very hurried, and that each unit, struck off for musketry instruction, was obliged to undergo it under circumstances of great disadvantage. When the weather was extremely bad, the disadvantages of the present arrangement were very great; and, he believed, that unless some remedy for this state of things could be devised, the Militia would never attain the desired efficiency. Next to this came the question as to the drilling of recruits on enrolment; and he must express his regret that the authorities did not propose to make any change in this respect. The hon. Baronet had told the Committee that, as far as the War Office view of the subject went, drill on enrolment was more popular in the manufacturing than in the agricultural districts. He (Earl Percy) doubted that very much. He knew that the Militia regiments in the agricultural districts were very much below their strength; and he knew, also, that in the Northern manufacturing districts, the percentage of recruits under the old system of preliminary drill was more than double what it was in the case of battalions who trained their recruits under the new system, and that the percentage of untrained men in those battalions was much more than double what it was in the battalions in which the old system was in force. When the hon. Baronet said that the great test of the popularity of the Militia was the recruiting, and that if we could get a great number of recruits we really assured the efficiency of the Militia, he (Earl Percy) was, with great respect, obliged to differ from him entirely. It was not the number of the men, but the training which they received, which constituted efficiency; and, even if it could be proved that the training of the men on enrolment was popular, and succeeded in bringing recruits, it would be found that the present system of training them was such as to give no chance of getting a thoroughly efficient Militia. Everyone knew that Parts 2 and 3 of the *Field Exercise* could hardly be taught to men when they were only brought together in small numbers; and that the *esprit de corps*, which existed in the case of a large number of men, ceased under those circumstances, when the men were drilled only in small squads by a sergeant or other non-commissioned officer. His own regiment, he was glad to say, had never been subject to that most pernicious system, and he hoped it never would be. With regard to the appointment of adjutants, he agreed with every word which had fallen from the hon. and gallant Member for East Essex (Colonel Ruggles-Brise). It was all very well for the hon. Baronet (Sir Arthur Hayter) to say that no complaint had reached him on the subject; but there was a good reason for that, because it was a very disagreeable thing for an officer, commanding a regiment, to complain of his adjutant. Of course, he would complain of a serious dereliction of duty; but there was no doubt that, otherwise, a commanding officer would do anything rather than report against his adjutant, because he knew that such report would ruin that officer's career. If the hon. Baronet inquired into the subject, he would find an almost universal dislike to the system of changing the adjutants of regiments every five years, not only because of the difficulty of getting an officer suited to the service, but because, if a good officer was obtained, two years were necessary for him to become thoroughly acquainted with his duties, and then, at the end of the fifth year, he went away, and another officer took his place. His own experience was, that this system was most detrimental to the efficiency of a regiment; and he contended that it was impossible, in so short a space of time, for men coming straight from the Regular Army to learn all the contradictory orders contained in that huge volume issued to the Militia under the name of an Army Circular. The consequence was, that the commanding officer was not able to trust to his adjutant; he had to look to everything himself. It might be said a colonel ought to know everything; but it must be remembered that a Militia colonel had his attention turned to other things for 11 months of the year, and, therefore it was very hard that he should be handicapped in this way. The whole system was bad. He was not there to speak of the bearing of the system on the Regular Army; but as to its bearing on the Militia he felt very strongly. He believed that the Militia, in its present condition, could not much longer exist. He did not know whether there was a definite purpose on the part of anyone at the War Office to disgust the present senior officers, or not; but he was firmly persuaded that such would be the result of the course which was now being pursued. There were two small points which had been mentioned in the discussion, and which had received no notice from the Treasury Bench. Both of them were points which he could assure the hon. Baronet affected the popularity of the Militia. One point was, that most absurd Order which was issued, to the effect that the Staff of the Militia was to wear their uniform all the year round. His noble Relative (Lord Algernon Percy) had said that that Order worked particularly hard upon the bandsmen. He (Earl Percy) disagreed with his noble Relative. He did not believe the Order bore more severely upon the bandsmen than upon the remainder of the Staff, because many of the regular Staff were employed in civilian occupations; and, if they were forced to wear their uniform on all occasions, he did not see how they were to carry on their work. He had heard of colonels of Militia regiments—in fact, he knew one—who employed his Staff from time to time in beating his covers. He (Earl Percy) had serious thoughts, when the Order was issued, of having all his Staff in uniform out to beat his covers, so that they might see what the real consequence would be of preventing the men pursuing their ordinary civilian occupations in plain clothes. The next point was that relating to a second pair of boots. He believed the supply of a second pair of boots would do more to increase the popularity of the Militia than almost anything else they could do. He was sure all Militia officers would bear him out in that opinion. One word about recruiting. The hon. Baronet had said that the failure in recruiting in agricultural districts might be attributed to the agricultural depression. Unfortunately, he (Earl Percy) could not get any recruits, and his regiment was recruited entirely from the manufacturing districts. In fact, he found, in regard to recruiting, exactly the same complaints in manufacturing districts as in agricultural districts, and, therefore, he could not accept the statement of the Government, that the agricultural depression was the cause of the want of recruits. He, however, could tell the Government what was one of the chief causes of the want of recruits. Last year, it was thought necessary, on account of the exigencies of the Public Service, to call the Militia up for two months. How was that done? It was well known that a Militiaman, when he came out for training, did not do so for the sake of his pay. He laid by a little, out of his previous earnings, to keep his wife and family during the training of the regiment, and made an arrangement with his employer to take him on again when the regiment was disbanded. In proof of the fact that the men's families were but poorly provided for, when the Militia were up for training, the men constantly applied for advances which they might send home. Such being the condition of the men, last year, on the very day his regiment would naturally have returned to their homes, the Government sent down an official Order, that the men were to be kept for another month. He (Earl Percy) applied for leave to send home those men who were in the greatest distress; but he got no answer until the third week of the second month, when, of course, it was of no good. The distress in the regiment was excessive; and he said then, and he was prepared to say now, that the action of the Government in that instance did more to make the regiment unpopular, and to prejudicially affect recruiting, than anything else that could be done. If such a thing was to be done again, some compensation should be given to the men. The men came out on warrants for only a month's training; and if the men had raised the question as to whether they could legally be kept up for a second month, he was not sure whether it would have been found that there was any legal power to prevent their return home at the end of the first month's training. Practically, the Government deluded the men into believing that they would be kept up for only a month; whereas it was intended that they should be kept up for two months, while no separation allowance or additional pay was to be allowed them. He had no wish to detain the Committee with a long story; but he could tell the Committee of individual cases of great hardship. A most respectable man—a Volunteer sergeant—came to him at the end of the first month's training with tears in his eyes and said he could not remain, because his wife and children were starving at home; and he added that, as soon as that training was over, he would rejoin the regiment, but that he would not re-enrol then. He (Earl

Percy) was persuaded the same intention entered the minds of many other men, and that, owing to this circumstance, he was more deficient of recruits than he had been for a long time. This playing fast-and-loose with a battalion did not only affect the particular regiment, but all the regiments in the district around. The regulations which now existed in the Militia rendered it almost impossible to get any Volunteer sergeants at all. Volunteer sergeants, at the best of times, were not the best part of the Militia Force; but, however inefficient they were, it was absolutely necessary to have them, but the action of the Government had tended to deprive regiments almost entirely of those men. He did not wish to make an accusation against either one Government or another, because he did not know under what Government what he was about to refer to occurred. At one time, when a Volunteer sergeant committed himself in any way, the practice was to reduce him. It was, however, said that it was necessary to make a Militia sergeant equal to a sergeant of the Regular rank, and that it was a great shame that a Militia sergeant should be reduced without being tried by court martial. It was now impossible to punish a sergeant without trying him by court martial. A man who might have committed some trivial offence, which could very justly be overlooked, had now to be brought up before a court martial; his trial had to be fixed in a formal manner, and, finally, his sentence had to be read out at the head of the regiment, and his stripes taken off. A Volunteer sergeant's office was a very invidious one, because he had very often to take into custody men who were his friends. It would, therefore, not be anything to wonder at if, when men were liable to be tried by court martial for the slightest offence, they refused to take the stripes. He must now apologize to the Committee for having detained them so long. The present, however, was the only occasion there was to express the grievances of the Militia; and he trusted that before the debate closed they would receive from the Treasury Bench some explicit answer to the questions raised. He trusted, likewise, that the Committee would be cheered by some hope being held out that the changes which had lately been made, and which he and others considered worked so prejudicially to the Militia, would be reviewed.

Colonel STANLEY said, that, before the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War rose to reply to the observations of the noble Earl (Earl Percy), he hoped he might be allowed to add his testimony to that of his noble Friend as to the hardship which, no doubt, was quite unintentionally imposed by the action of the War Office last year upon certain Militia regiments, in keeping them up for double the usual period of training. The War Office acted strictly within their right, and the power which they exercised was one which undoubtedly might, under certain circumstances, be a useful one, and one which it was well to retain in the Act. It was, however, a power which worked very hardly upon the men, unless concurrently with its operation the question of separation allowance could be dealt with. He knew of many hard cases resulting from what occurred last year. There were many men perfectly ready to train for one month, but in regard to whom it amounted to a great hardship to continue up for a second month. Many men were, in consequence of the prolonged training, subjected to the loss of employment; though he was happy to say that, in more than one case, employers who had found themselves obliged to give the men notice had, in pursuance of a generous public spirit, taken them back. Commanding officers were, by the proceedings of last year, placed in a position in which they ought not to be placed. As to the disrating of non-commissioned officers, he agreed there was some inconvenience found in the way in which it was now brought about. That House, itself, however, was responsible, because when the Act of 1879 was passing through the House, the change was fully discussed, and was forced upon the authorities by the distinctly expressed wish of the House. It was thought that non-commissioned officers ought not to be disrated without a power of appeal to a court martial; and the power which remained to the Militia, although it had been taken from the Line, was done away with, and done away with, he felt, at some practical inconvenience to the Service. As to musketry instructions, he owned he did not quite understand what was the argument of his hon. Friend the Financial

Secretary (Sir Arthur Hayter). It was admitted that the musketry instruction in the Militia was very imperfect, and the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Financial Secretary had said it was felt to be desirable to extend the musketry training; but the weather had interfered with it so much, that it was deemed wise not to sacrifice the time and trouble, but to hurry on the instruction in a few days. He (Colonel Stanley) thought it was a question well worth consideration, whether some arrangement could not be made, say, every second or third or fourth year, whereby the training would take place at a time when fine weather might reasonably be expected to prevail. His noble Friend the Member for Westminster (Lord Algernon Percy) had spoken of the hardship inflicted on sergeant majors of Militia, in consequence of their not being able to be promoted beyond that rank. He (Colonel Stanley) confessed that he might not have followed correctly all that had taken place; but he had something to do, in 1877, with the quartermasterships of the Line and of the brigade depôts, and it was then intended that the duty of the quartermastership should, as far as possible, be worked round, so as to give all the officers who had once been quartermaster an opportunity of remaining at the depôt. He did not know whether it stopped short at quartermasters; but he believed the intention was that sergeant majors and Staff sergeants should be dealt with in the same manner. It was well worthy the attention of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) as to whether something could not be done to improve the position of sergeant majors of the Militia. He hoped the noble Marquess would rise before the discussion was closed, and find himself able to give the Committee an assurance that all the points to which attention had been drawn would receive his careful consideration; and that, if possible, he would make some proposal in respect of them.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the Committee would not expect him to enter into the details, of a somewhat technical character, which had been touched upon in the course of the discussion. He could assure the Committee that he and his hon. Friends would, as far as they were able, cause inquiries to made, and do what they could to meet the wishes of hon. Gentlemen. There were one or two points, however, that had been touched upon, on which it might be desirable he should make a few observations. Perhaps, the most important point raised was that of the musketry instruction of the Militia. The Report of the Musketry Instruction Committee was in the hands of the military authorities early last year; but the operations in Egypt very naturally prevented its full consideration. There were two very great difficulties in the way of imparting to the Militia anything like thorough musketry instruction; one was that of time, and the other that of ranges. Considerable progress had been made, however, in doing something to remove one of the difficulties. Full information had been obtained as to the state of the ranges throughout the country, and of the possibility of improving the range accomodation. Arrangements had been made for improving the actual ranges on the Northern stations; and in the South there were ranges which, he hoped, would be available for complete musketry instruction of the Line, and also of certain Militia regiments, which would be banded together for the purpose of instruction. Very exhaustive inquiries were being made throughout the country as to the ranges; and when the Reports fell in, they would be tabulated, and everything would be done to improve the range accomodation, both for the Line, Militia, and Volunteers. The question of time was, perhaps, a still greater difficulty. He perfectly agreed with what had been said by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Herbert Maxwell). It was, however, almost impossible to increase the amount of ammunition and to extend the time of training. The change would not only entail a large expenditure, but it would also alter the character of the Militia Force, and it was very doubtful whether it would be possible, or, if possible, desirable, to greatly prolong the term of training. It might be possible to devote alternate trainings exclusively to musketry instruction, or to devote occasional trainings to such instruction. The military authorities at the War Office were endeavouring to do what could be done in the matter, although he did not see it was possible, in the very short time available for the purpose of training, that the musketry instruction could be brought to a very high pitch of perfection. It had been already shown what it was proposed to do in regard to the training of recruits. Any hon. Member who read the Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, would see that that subject had been very fully and very candidly discussed in that Report. It was pointed out that there were some advantages and some disadvantages in the present system, and the Government had endeavoured to modify matters in a way which they hoped would be satisfactory to Militia officers generally—namely, by enabling recruits to be trained in such a manner as would be most convenient to the men themselves. If was said it was impossible to train recruits at the depôts. The Report of the Inspector General dealt, to some extent, with that subject. The position of officers and non-commissioned officers in Militia regiments had also been referred to, and complaint had been made that Militia officers had not the same control over different matters which they had had hitherto, and which, on the whole, they had so satisfactorily exercised. The Committee would see that Parliament, having adopted the principle of amalgamating the Militia with the Regular Forces, it was not possible to leave to commanding officers and to adjutants of regiments the entire and complete discretion which might formerly have been possible, and which, in many cases, was exercised with very great advantage. Lord Cardwell endeavoured to blend the Auxiliary and Regular Forces into what he called "an harmonious whole." Progress had been made in that direction. There might, in the process, have been some friction; but what they had to look for was the efficiency of the whole Force. He could not help thinking that the Committee would be of opinion that a united Force, which was under the direct control of the military authorities, would be, in time of need, a much more valuable Force than one whose parts performed independent duties, no matter how well those duties might be performed. He thought that, at the outset, there must inevitably be some friction, when changes such as those were made. The authorities in the Regular Army had been used all their lives to strict discipline, and could not, therefore, be expected, at first, to have all that consideration for the more imperfect discipline, or, perhaps, the more imperfect methods, that prevailed in the Militia, that might be expected of them. He had no doubt that the Army authorities might have been, in some cases, too exacting in their demands, or too ready to find fault with the system they found in operation; but he trusted that, as the system was more developed, and as the actual connection between battalions of the Line and of the Militia became more direct, the effect would be to reduce the inequality, and to produce greater efficiency in the whole Force. In time, he believed, the system would be found to work with greater smoothness, and the friction that existed would not be found to have any permanent existence. Some reference had been made to the Orders issued to the permanent Staff, as to the wearing of uniforms, and as to the period of training. Those were specimens of what he referred to, when he spoke of the friction that existed. They would make inquiries into those matters; and he trusted that the Militia officers would not hesitate to communicate with the War Office authorities, who would be anxious to give full and reasonable consideration to all the complaints that were made.

Lord BURGHLEY said, he wished to know why the pay of the Infantry Staff of Militia was reduced this year by £1,200?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON asked, what page the items referred to appeared upon?

Lord BURGHLEY replied, that they would be found upon page 33. The noble Marquess would find that, last year, the pay for the Militia Staff was £219,519; whereas, this year, it was only £218,398.

Colonel STANLEY: Does it arise from the fact that there are more of these officers this year serving in Line regiments than were so serving last year?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I believe the reduction is on account of a transfer in Vote 1.

Earl PERCY said, that perhaps the noble Marquess would state what was the reason for the increased charge for Provisions, Forage, Lighting and Fuel?

Colonel ALEXANDER said, there was a point to which he wished to refer, and which he would apologize for mentioning—a matter which he had expected to hear brought forward by the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Herbert Maxwell). As neither the hon. Baronet nor any other hon. Member had brought it forward, he (Colonel Alexander) would take upon himself to do so. Last year the hon. Baronet had asked the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. Childers) whether he would not do something to bring about the retirement of the old Militia adjutants, such retirement having been described as a proper thing for those gentlemen who had done good service in their day, but were now almost beyond their work. In 1875, Lord Cranbrook, as he (Colonel Alexander) was aware, made an offer of retirement at the rate of 10*s*. a-day to these officers, and they rather foolishly, perhaps, declined it, or a great number of them did so. The only excuse for those who declined it must be that they had not then served so long as adjutants as they had now. Some of them had only served four or five years. He had looked up the names of these officers, and he found that there were still 23 or 24 serving whose services as adjutants varied from 12 to 22 or 23 years. Now, it must be quite evident to the Committee that if the limit of service in one battalion of Militia was fixed at five years, surely 12, or 15, or 20, or 22, or 23 years' service must be a great deal too long. The fact was, that these officers were all past their work, and some of them were very much dissatisfied, finding that they exercised no command, after having served so much longer than many of the other officers of the regiment. A feeling of that kind caused considerable friction between these officers of the Militia and the adjutants and colonels of the regimental districts. If his (Colonel Alexander's) proposal was to cost a very large sum of money, he would not venture to bring it before the Committee; but, so far from that being the case, his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Wigtonshire had shown, last year, that a distinct saving would be effected by the retirement of these officers. There would be no loss, but rather a saving of 1*s*. 9*d*. a-day, by the retirement of each of these officers. He, therefore, hoped the noble Marquess would re-consider that point, and see whether he could not offer some terms to these officers to induce them to retire. A Representative of the Government had stated just now—and he (Colonel Alexander) had taken down his words—that Line adjutants were a cardinal point of union between the Line and the Militia. They had several battalions of Militia which had no Line adjutants; and, if it was a good thing to have these officers as a cardinal point of union between the Line and the Militia, it followed, as a matter of course, that the rule ought to be made applicable to the whole of the Force, and ought to be brought about as soon as possible. It was a very bad thing to have the two systems running concurrently.

Mr. O'SHEA said, he should like to know what the standard of height in the Militia was at the present moment, because the difference between the proper strength and the effective strength, as given in print, was enormous? He wanted to know whether the standard had been lowered to the minimum?

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL said, that, without putting any slight on those adjutants to which his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Alexander) had referred, he thought there was no doubt that the Service would be much better without them. He disagreed entirely with his noble Friend (Earl Percy) in his estimate of the services of the new class of adjutants. He believed that the marked improvement that had taken place in the Militia during the last few years, was owing very much to the new blood that had been introduced into it from the Line by the adjutants under the new system, and he trusted that nothing that had fallen from his noble Friend that night would be taken by the gallant body of officers, who had to perform these duties, as any disparagement. Now, although the old adjutants had declined Lord Cranbrook's offer of 10*s*. per day, after a service of 15 years, as retirement pensions, it must be remembered that their duties had become much more arduous since that time, owing to the formation of the brigade depôt system. He supposed any one of them would be now glad to receive the terms that were then offered; and, as had been stated, it was the fact that a saving would be brought about in that way, because the double duty of adjutants of brigade depôts and adjutants of Militia regiments could not be imposed on officers under the old system, although it could be on officers under the new system. Last year, the right hon. Gentleman who was now Chancellor of the Exchequer, then Secretary of State for War (Mr. Childers), gave him this assurance. He said—

> "We are looking forward to the carrying out to the full of the system under which the Adjutants of Militia regiments will be in the same position with regard to term of service, as officers of this rank are in in the Line regiments with which the Militia battalions are connected."—(3 *Hansard*, [269] 618.)

He thought it would be to the advantage of the Service, if this body of men were disposed of in the manner which had been there pointed out.

Mr. NEWZAM-NICHOLSON said, he wished to call attention to a question he had put a short time ago, to the Secretary of State for War, as to the position of non-commissioned officers who were transferred from the Marines to the Auxiliary Forces. The fact of these men having been unable to obtain the warrant rank and increased pay that were allowed to non-commissioned officers transferred from regiments of the Line, was certainly a great grievance. In the case he had before alluded to, which come under his own immediate notice, the grievance still remained. It seemed to him to be very strange that good non-commissioned officers from a Force that had so eminently distinguished itself in Egypt, as the Royal Marines, should not be able to obtain the same rank on a transfer to the Militia as if they had come from the Line. Whether there were one such case or more, he sincerely trusted that before long he would hear that this grievance had been remedied.

Earl PERCY said, he wished to have an explanation of the figures on pages 34 and 35, relating to the Artillery Militia. Last year the number was 18,412, of whom only 9,549 came cut, or very little more than half; but, in the case of the Infantry Militia, of 119,566, 70,403 came out. That was a great deal more than half; and the Irish Militia were not in training, which increased the proportion in England and Scotland, where they were trained. Although very little more than half the Artillery Militia came out, Her Majesty's Government appeared to have increased the numbers of the Artillery very considerably, and to have decreased that of the Infantry Militia from 119,566 to 117,575. He should like an explanation of that, as it seemed to him to be very extraordinary. He should have thought that the decrease would have been in the case of the Artillery, and the increase in the case of the Infantry.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he wished to make a few observations as to the Irish Militia. Though the Committee was called upon to vote a certain sum of money for it, it appeared to him to be rather in the nature of a Force that was being kept up in order to give a certain amount of prestige to a section of the landlord class in different counties in Ireland. It was not his intention to enter at any length into this question; but he wished to point out that the social relations in Ireland had been fundamentally changed, and that the feudal ideas that suggested the policy of embattling the county strength, so to speak, under the county landlords no longer existed. There was a strong disinclination on the part of the Irish farmers and peasantry to put themselves under the leadership of those landlords who were known as the exterminators of the country. Again and again, the scandal had been seen of a great landlord, such as Lord Clanricarde, whose relations with his tenantry were a scandal to the country — ["Oh, oh!" *and cries of* "Order!"] He was absolutely correct in what he stated, and he maintained that over and over again such a scandal had been seen as a landlord of this class, in command of a regiment composed largely of his own miserable tenantry. The state of feeling in Ireland at the present moment, however, was such that it would be necessary for Her Majesty's Government to consider the propriety of remodelling the Irish Militia Force if it was to continue to exist. The Irish Militia was always disbanded, or dispensed from training, in times of agitation and disturbance. They used to be useful as an appanage of what used to be called county families, but which was not recognized in that character in the country any longer. It was desirable, therefore, that the Government should endeavour, as far as possible, to identify the Irish Militia with the institutions of the present day. It would be no use to attempt to brigade Irish county Militia regiments under Irish county landlords.

He did not say one word as to the relations between the English landlords and their tenants. The English landlords were, and always had been, the leaders of their people in the country; but, as to the Irish landlords in the Irish counties, there was an increasing objection to placing them over Irish county regiments. The rule of merit was a thing more and more introduced into the Regular Army, and that rule should be more and more introduced into the Irish Militia system, if that Militia was to be a Force which was to be useful to the nation, or to secure the respect of the world at large.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he could corroborate what had been said by the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. O'Donnell) as to the objectionable character of the landlord officers of Militia in Ireland.

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL asked if the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) was in Order in making offensive remarks about the landlords of Ireland in reference to this Vote?

The CHAIRMAN: I must say I have not heard any offensive remarks from the hon. Gentleman who just spoke (Mr. Biggar). Any objection which any hon. Member may have had to what was being said by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) should have been taken while that hon. Member was speaking.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, that what he had stated was, that the Government might be guided by views that were perfectly right in their own eyes; but between the class to which he had referred and the Irish people there was a vast gulf, and he had protested against that Force being officered by the landlords. He protested against these attempts, these small attempts, of hon. Members to pass judgment upon the action of hon. Gentlemen in this matter.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he knew something about the Militia regiments in the county of Cavan, and some of the officers were of the highest character and ability, one of them having been formerly Member for the county, and a candidate at the time when he (Mr. Biggar) was first elected. At the same time, others of the officers were gentlemen who were not entitled to the highest consideration. He was acquainted with one who certainly would not do credit to any Force. He (Mr. Biggar) had received reports from a number of different sources, to the effect that the regiment had been, from time to time, in the most disorganized state so far as the officers were concerned. Then, again, the Committee was aware that the officers of the Antrim Artillery Militia were notorious practical jokers. In the case of that regiment, the practical jokes were not, as might be expected, on the part of the young and foolish officers, but on the part of the old senior officers. The joking was carried on to such an extent that some of the officers had been compelled to retire from the regiment, and it seemed to him (Mr. Biggar) that it would be highly desirable if some of these officers were requested to retire from the Service. Then it had been reported, and he believed with truth, that the adjutant of the regiment had been for some time past receiving allowances for forage and for the keeping of a horse, though, in point of fact, he was not the owner of such an animal, and did not have one in his possesion. He believed that very recently that officer in question had attempted to make a colourable occasion for the allowance he received for the support of his horse. He (Mr. Biggar) had inquired into the circumstances, and he had ascertained that the Government had asked for information on the subject, but had not yet received sufficient to enable them to confirm his statement. However, he was informed that the inquiry which was being made on the part of the Government was not being instituted in a legitimate way—that was to say, by an officer of a suitable position to make such investigation—but by a non-commissioned officer, who had been sent from Belfast for the purpose. The report of that non-commissioned officer might be true enough; but, at the same time, it would not be entitled to so much consideration as the report of a superior officer. In the case of this forage, it had been certified for by a superior officer; and, no doubt, they must assume that that superior officer did not knowingly give an untrue return. At the same time, it was very probable he did not use sufficient care in inquiring into, or examining, that particular transaction. If these statements were true, he (Mr. Biggar) thought there should be a clean sweep made of all these officers in the

Artillery regiment. So far as he could gather from the speeches of hon. and gallant Gentlemen who belonged to Militia regiments, the Militia altogether was more ornamental than useful. Recruits were called out for one month's training, as a rule, or training of such short duration that he should think could hardly be of any value. If the training were taken for one month, with a probability of the men being afterwards put into the Line and becoming military men, it would be all well enough; but if, at the end of the period of drill, they were to be disbanded, it seemed to him that the money spent on the Force was thrown away. For these reasons, he really thought that the Committee would do well to criticize severely every Vote for such purpose as the Militia, and more especially with regard to the Militia of Ireland, because, in point of fact, they had not, in that country, suitable officers to put in command of the regiments. Some of the officers such as those described by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) had no special knowledge of military affairs; and as to the junior officers themselves, they were made up of young men who had never been brought up to any military occupation, and, in point of fact, knew as much about military affairs as did the rank and file, or certainly very much less than the adjutants of Line regiments. He had hoped that the hon. Member for Dungarvan would have moved to reduce the Vote by the sum for the Irish Militia; but, as he had not taken the trouble to do so, he (Mr. Biggar) would not push the matter further.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, that with regard to the charges of practical joking in the Antrim Militia, the matter had been investigated, and there was found to be no foundation for the allegations made. The fullest information had been given to him, and he had handed it over to the hon. Member, and he was surprised that, after having giving that information to the hon. Member, that it had not affected his tone. As to the question which had been raised with regard to the alleged incorrect Returns, he (the Marquess of Hartington) regretted very much that there appeared to be some foundation for the complaint. The subject, however, was under inquiry, not, as the hon. Member seemed to think, by a non-commissioned officer, but by a competent officer, and the facts, whatever they were, were sure to be brought to light. The standard of height for the Militiamen was 5 feet 4 inches; but commanding officers were permitted to use their discretion as to enlisting men of not less than 5 feet 2 inches. The absence of so large a number of men from training last year was due to the fact that the Irish Militia regiments were not called out. A large proportion of the Irish Militia were Artillery, and the number of men not trained was greater in that arm than in the Infantry.

MR. HARRINGTON said, he could give some experience of his own, of one of the Irish Militia regiments. The Kerry Militia assembled annually at Tralee, and their assembling was always announced the next day by the simultaneous disappearance of all the door-knockers in the town. The amusement of knocker-wrenching was not pursued by the privates in the Militia, but by the so-called gentry on the Staff, and the example which they set their men by their conduct, and their disgraceful appearance in the police-courts from time to time, was such as would justify hon. Members from Ireland—who were interested in the peace of their country—in moving to reduce this Vote by the sum which would be appropriated to the Irish Militia. If the Government were going to introduce no better system of discipline into the Irish Militia Force, and to impose no check on those young gentlemen who played at toy soldiers in Ireland, the Vote would always receive very serious opposition.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £69,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884."

MR. ACLAND said, he wished to ask for some information as to the result of the Inquiry which had been ordered last year into the condition of the Yeomanry Cavalry? There were some points in connection with it upon which he knew he should be expressing the feeling of other Yeomanry officers. It was true that that Force had been frequently spoken of with not quite so much respect as more numerous, but possibly not more efficient, Forces received. Those Forces were really not more useful than the Yeomanry might be, if adequate attention were bestowed upon it by the Government. During the last 10 years, there had been considerable changes in the Yeomanry. Shortly after the Autumn Manœuvres took place in 1872, Colonel Oakes, who was made the first Inspector of Yeomanry, established for the first time a School of Instruction at Aldershot; and since that time more than half the officers had passed the examinations. Out of 625 Yeomanry officers, including many who had actually served in the field in the Regular Army, and men who had been in regiments for 20 or 30 years, as well as men who had recently joined, 255 had obtained certificates from the School at Aldershot. That was a change which merited the attention of the Government. He also wished to draw attention to the fact that, whereas, in the old days, inspection was carried on by some smart Cavalry colonel, who went down to the place, and, having been hospitably treated by the Yeomanry officers, went away next day, telling them he had never seen such a smart body; now, the Inspecting officer spent two or three days at the place, saw how the instruction was carried out, satisfied himself whether it was efficient, then held a formal inspection, and presented an adequate Report to the Government. That was a much more efficient method of inspection. Another point which ought to be dealt with, was that the Yeomanry officers were not in the same position as the Volunteer officers, with regard to the men under their command. According to the Act of *Geo.* III., under which the Yeomanry were now serving, any Yeoman could leave his regiment upon 14 days' notice. The consequence was, that if any one of them was offended by his captain, or any of the troop to which he belonged, or felt the slightest inconvenience in attending duty, he could send in his resignation, and the officers had no hold whatever upon him, although the regiment might have gone to considerable expense upon his clothing. It would be a great advantage if the officers could have some hold on the men; and if, as was the case in the Volunteers, the men should be bound to serve for three, four, or five years, or, if they left before that time, should be required to pay £4 or £5 to the contingent fund towards the expense of their clothing. Then there was another difference between Yeomanry and Volunteers, which was constantly forgotten. It was true the Yeomanry were Volunteers; but while an Infantry Volunteer cost the Government very little, he brought nothing to the Government. He went to his drill when it suited him, and, after an hour or two of drill, went home; but the Yeoman had to provide an efficient horse, and devote it to the Service for the whole day. His horse was worth at least 7*s.* or 8*s.* a-day, but for that he received no remuneration whatever; and not only that, but many of the Yeomanry had to ride 10, 15, and even 20 miles to attend duty, and both horse and man must be fed. The Yeomanry had not only to provide that, but they had to make up for the absence of their horses from their work; whereas Volunteers were put to no expense, and regarded drill as a recreation rather than a duty. Besides that, it must be remembered that while the only wear and tear in the case of the Volunteers was that of their uniform, the Yeomanry had the wear and tear of saddlery, and that was an important item. He did not wish to ask for any great expenditure on the Yeomanry. He knew the way in which the Yeomanry had been regarded by the country in recent years; but there had been a great improvement in the Force. What he wished to show was that a very little more attention on the part of the Government with regard to the Yeomanry, and a very little more expense, would insure greater efficiency in what might be made a very useful Force. Their present pay could not be diminished in any way; 7*s.* a-day was the lowest amount for which men could be obtained with horses, and the men were well worth that amount. It was also true that, looking at the class of men in the Yeomanry, the period of drill could not be extended beyond eight days. He wished the time could be longer, but with men of 35 or 40 years of age, with responsible positions at home, it was impossible to ask them to remain away from home for more than eight days. But he thought something might be done in the way of calling out the recruits earlier, and requiring some of the officers to go and drill them. He was satisfied that the Yeomanry could be made a practical and useful body, and there was no doubt that they could be taught to ride and shoot; most of the men could do both already. And what he wished to urge was, that the Government should give some inducement to men to join the regiments; secondly, some encouragement to the men to make themselves efficient; thirdly, some more attention to shooting; and, fourthly, some control over the men by the officers. If they did that, they would find the Yeomanry become a very much more useful Force than it had been for the last 20 or 30 years. The question was, how could men be encouraged to join the Yeomanry? No one had given the Yeomanry such a severe blow as the right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Stafford Northcote) gave them, when he abolished the horse tax of 10*s*., from which Yeomen had previously been exempted. In consideration of that exemption, the men would willingly spend £2 or £3 on their drill. The only other suggestion he had heard was that the Yeomanry should be exempted from sitting on juries, and he believed that would answer the purpose. He was sure a great deal might be done to encourage the men to make themselves efficient. Under the present system of payment, a Yeomanry private who had joined only a week, got the same pay as a sergeant who had long been the right hand of his officer, or who had been in the regiment 10 or 15 years. They both got the same amount, and that was not the right way in which to treat the men; and what he wished to see was some different rate of pay for different grades of efficiency, and certainly a different rate of pay for different ranks. He would suggest that £1 should be given to every sergeant, and 10*s*. to every corporal, additional, after the permanent duty. That would not involve a very large amount for the whole Force, and it would be well worth while. Some allowance for the expense of food for the men and the horses at separate troop drills was absolutely necessary, and he would suggest an allowance of 3*s*. 6*d*. a-day per man, provided that three-fourths of the men were present at the drill. He should also like to see the pay depend to a certain extent on the efficiency in musketry. All farmers could shoot to some extent, and he did not see why we should not take advantage of that, and make them learn to shoot properly as soldiers, Volunteer officers would admit that shooting was the life and soul of the Volunteer Force. The prizes they had to shoot for were what induced the men to join that Force; and the same plan might be adopted for the Yeomanry. From actual experience in a mounted Rifle corps, he (Mr. Acland) was able to say that it was perfectly easy to carry the long Enfield rifle on the saddle without injury to man, horse, or saddle, and that was what he should like to see given to the Yeomanry. Their present carbine was of very little use beyond 500 or 600 yards. It had been proposed to do away with the Yeomanry sword; but he should strongly deprecate that step. In the first place, the Yeomanry were exceedingly fond of the sword, and the sword exercise was one in which they took great delight. In the next place, they were liable to be called out in the case of riots, and swords had a considerable moral effect over a crowd; and it was a better weapon for that purpose than the carbine, if they were called out. Although they could not be taught in eight or 10, or even 100, days to use the sword for purposes of defence or attack, they could be taught to carry it in such a way that it should be safe. There was one other suggestion, which he knew had been in the minds of Yeomanry officers. He did not wish to dwell upon it now; but there was a feeling that the Yeomanry horses might be turned to account for supplying re-mounts to the Cavalry. One practical suggestion he had heard was, that every Yeoman, whose horse had been certified as in good condition and efficient for that purpose, should receive £1 a-year on the condition that the Government should have the right of refusal whenever Cavalry horses were required. Another suggestion was, that a system of breeding should be adopted, in which stallions should be placed at points accessible to the Yeomanry, so that the produce might be available for re-mounts for the Cavalry; and another suggestion was, that all the horses used for any of the Auxiliary Forces should be registered, with a view to being purchased by the Government, if required. Anything that could be done in that way would, he believed, be an encouragement to men to join the Yeomanry. He hoped that if anything did occur to the Government, they would give the Yeomanry the benefit of it, and that they would not regard the encouragement and improvement of the Yeomanry as unworthy of their attention. The whole Yeomanry Vote was only £69,000, which only slightly exceeded the pay of the adjutants only in the Volunteers; and he did not think that, considering that the Government got men and horses of superior intelligence and energy, and capable of being taught in a much quicker time than ordinary Militia recruits, money could be spent in a better manner than upon this Force. He hoped, therefore, it would be thought worth while to give a little more and expect more in return. What he would suggest was, that if the Government were not prepared to give the Yeomanry anything in the way he had suggested at once, they would do this. During the next three or four months almost all the Yeomanry regiments would be out. All the officers would be together, and they might be consulted as to the means required to encourage the Yeomanry. If an invitation was sent out to them to send up suggestions to the War Office, and if not this year, at least early next year, a Committee was appointed, consisting of members of the Yeomanry inside this House, or out of it, or of gentlemen in the War Office, and evidence was taken from Yeomanry officers, he believed some practical result might be obtained.

VISCOUNT NEWPORT said, he rose for the purpose of asking the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War, whether there was any prospect of the recommendations of the War Office Committee, which sat to consider the question of the permanent Staff, being carried out? It was some time since that Committee, of which he (Viscount Newport) was a Member, made its Report. There were certain arrangements proposed, that the Committee believed would be beneficial to the Yeomanry, and, at the same time, some reductions were suggested. Upon those reductions the Government eagerly seized, and proceeded to carry them out with the greatest alacrity, although nothing had been done in the direction of the improvements suggested. He could assure the Committee that they would never have dreamed of proposing the reductions, had it not been believed that the counterbalancing arrangements recommended would be carried out also. He hoped some attention would be paid to the recommendation of the Committee with regard to the mounting of the sergeants. Sergeants were sent down to the Yeomanry regiments without any provision being made for mounting them, and the consequence was that the captains had to find them horses. Most of these were not trained; and the Committee would understand that an officer drilling mounted men could not perform his duty effectually unless he was mounted on a thoroughly well-broken horse. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Acland) that payment should be made for the mounted troop drills which were now compulsory. In his opinion, the Yeomanry Calvalry Force deserved some encouragement from the Government; but, at present, it seemed that the words of the noble Earl (Earl Percy) with regard to the Militia, that the Government were acting as if they were exceedingly desirous of putting an end to it, applied to the Yeomanry with still greater force.

COLONEL LEVETT said, he should like to say one or two words on points that he regarded as important in connection with the Force which formed the subject of the present Vote. The hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland) had alluded to the fact that the Yeomanry did not occupy quite so good a position in the opinion of the country as the Volunteer Force. He (Colonel Levett) believed the reason for that was to be found in the kind of weapon with which they were armed. The enormous range and power of the rifle had undoubtedly much to do with the relative positions of the Volunteers and Yeomanry; and it was upon that ground that he thought the latter were entitled to ask the Government for some assistance. The Yeomanry were told, by the visiting officers, that they must pay more attention to their shooting. But the facilities afforded by Government did not make this a very easy matter. For instance, they were only allowed 30 rounds of ball-cartridge a-year; and it was optional whether the men fired that number of rounds or not. Again, if the men attended the ranges to practice, it was done at their own expense; and not only was that the case, but the officers had to pay the expenses of the Sergeant Instructor who attended there. He ventured to suggest that a small amount of assistance from the Government in these respects would have a very beneficial effect upon the efficiency of the Force. He thought that if every man who rendered himself an efficient shot was rewarded with some mark of distinction from the military authorities —if he were allowed a small sum in addition to his pay—the result would soon show itself in the improved firing of the Yeomanry as a body. Again, the Yeomanry had to contend year after year with the difficulty of going through their training upon more or less untrained horses. A man might render himself as efficient as he pleased; he might attend regularly year after year, and be the best of swordsmen; but, if he rode a bad horse, he could never compete with a Cavalry man mounted on a thoroughly trained charger. He did not advocate the changing of the Yeomanry into a mounted Rifle corps. It was truly said the other day by Lord Wolseley, that the weapon of the Cavalry man was the sword; and he (Colonel Levett) was certainly not inclined to see any such change effected. But he thought that if the Yeomanry were encouraged to study thoroughly the light Cavalry work, for which they were fitted; if they were afforded better opportunities for drill, and were encouraged in their shooting, the country would have in them a much more valuable body of men than they would get for the money the Committee was now asked to vote. He would suggest a small increase of pay to those men who, at the range, attained a certain degree of efficiency, and that the expenses of the Sergeant Instructor who attended the range should also be paid. He sincerely hoped Her Majesty's Government would, at all events, consider the various proposals he and others had submitted to them, which, if adopted, he believed would greatly benefit the Force.

Mr. MONCKTON said, the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland) alluded to several schemes for inducing men to join the Force; and he (Mr. Monckton) would also place before the Committee a proposal that had been suggested to Her Majesty's Government, and which, if adopted, he believed, would be a great stimulus to the Force. Some time ago the proposal was made that all Yeomen who rendered themselves efficient should be excused from serving on Grand Juries. Now, that was a practical suggestion, and he was sure it would be very well received by the Yeomanry throughout the country. On the other hand, there would be some difficulty in the way of its application; because, if the immunity from serving on Grand Juries were granted, he could not help thinking that, in small counties—in Rutland, for instance—where there was a strong and loyal body of Yeomanry, undue pressure might, in consequence, have to be put upon other persons in the country who were liable to serve. One proposal that he would submit to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government was, that every Yeoman who was owner of a proper horse of 15 hands should be exempted from Carriage Duty in respect of one light cart. He believed that concession would be very gratefully received by the Force. Another suggestion, that he thought would have a very good effect, was that badges should be given for length of service; and, if it were possible, he would like to see permission given to troopers to retain the uniform after 20 years' service. He was aware that that was not done in the Line; but the position of that branch of the Service was entirely different to that of the Yeomanry. However, he merely threw this out as a suggestion, remarking, at the same time, that no expense would be incurred by its adoption, except for the outfit, which, after 20 years of service, would probably not be in very good condition. Further, he would suggest that the Government should give prizes to the owners of the best horses. No doubt, great expense was caused to captains of troops and colonels of regiments in the matter of horses and other things relating to the Force, and this would have the effect of deterring many persons in the various counties from undertaking the command of regiments who would otherwise do so, and who were most fitted for the Service. It had also been urged that there should be an increased quantity of ammunition served out to the men, and it was pointed out that at present only 30 rounds were issued. He (Mr. Monckton) thought it impossible that any man, with so small an allowance of ammunition, could make himself an efficient shot; and he heartily agreed with the proposal, that men who did make themselves efficient in this respect should receive an increase of pay. The last proposal was, that when it was thought conducive to the further efficiency of a Yeomanry regiment, the adjutant should stay with the regiment longer than the term now established. He would suggest that, on the representation of the colonel of the regiment, endorsed by the Inspecting officer to this effect, that term should be extended from five to seven years. In making these suggestions, he could not hope for the adoption of all of them. He trusted, however, that some of them would find favour; and that, at all events, Her Majesty's Government would put forward some scheme that would offer encouragement to a class of men whose services and sacrifices had not been as well recognized as they ought to have been.

MR. EVANS said, he agreed with the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just spoken (Colonel Levett), that an improvement was desirable in the shooting of the Yeomanry; he would venture to add that there was great room for it, and that, he believed, if some encoura gementwere given, a large number of regiments would render themselves efficient in that respect. He did not believe, however, in requiring men to expend a certain quantity of ammunition, because the effect of that was, that a great amount of shooting took place at the ranges, sometimes very much to the danger of those living in the neighbourhood. His object in rising was to confirm the opinion of the hon. and gallant Member for Lichfield, that a small amount of encouragement to the Yeomanry would result in a great increase of efficiency. He agreed, also, with the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Newport), that, as the Government had made the reductions in the case of the Yeomanry which the Committee recommended, it was desirable that the improvements, suggested as an equivalent, should also have been adopted; and he had no doubt that, had this been the case, increased efficiency would have followed.

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE said, he hoped the Committee would allow him to make a few observations in support of the proposals so ably advanced by his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Acland). He agreed with him, that a small concession would be sufficient to encourage men to join the Yeomanry. It was owing to the fact that little or no encouragement was given, that the officers of the Force had such immense difficulty in maintaining their regiments even in the attenuated condition they were in at present. He would like to bring before the Committee a fact that would show, in a practical way, that the Yeomanry was a Force which deserved encouragement. The members of the Yeomanry were called out for eight days' training; unlike the Volunteers, they had to leave their occupations, and remain in a town, generally one of the principal towns of the county to which they belonged, for the prescribed time. The patriotic citizens of the place, in their endeavour to assist the Yeomanry, appeared to think that, during their period of training, they were fair game, and that they ought to be mulcted to as great an extent as possible for the purpose of increasing the trade and profits of the town. That constituted a serious detriment to the Force he had the honour to belong to, and it was one which could not but militate largely against the possibility of getting recruits. It had been stated, over and over again by those who had written and spoken on the subject, that it cost the Yeomanry generally, for their eight days' training, a sum varying from £2 to £5. His contention was, that the Yeomanry, if it was a Force worthy of being kept up at all, should receive some encouragement from Her Majesty's Government. He saw that the money voted for the Yeomanry in 1882 amounted to £69,000, the total number of the Force being at that time 14,458 men, which included officers, permanent sergeants, and rank and file. Each man was paid 7*s.* a-day for the eight days' duty in the year; and that allowance for the number of men mentioned would amount to £39,000. He would take the mean between the two sums stated to be the cost out of pocket to the men, and place it at £3 10*s.* Say that each of the 14,458 men spent that amount, irrespective of their pay, and then, by a short calculation, hon. Members would see that the Force spent about £49,000 over and above the amount received for turning out. Besides that, the officers had to pay a large sum; although he did not complain, he had to pay rather more than £40 a-year to keep up his own troop. All the officers did not pay as much; but in the case of some senior officers, the amount was more. But taking the amount at the low average of £20 for each of the 625 officers in the Force, the whole cost under that head would be £12,500, which, added to the £49,000 before mentioned, would give a total of £61,500. That was the sum which the Yeomanry annually expended in the maintenance of their own Force, without any encouragement from the Government or any other source whatever; a sum only about £8,000 less than the Government paid for the whole of the Force during the year. He trusted the Government would decide, either that the Yeomanry was a Force that should be kept up, and was therefore worthy of some little encouragement, that would preserve it, at least, at its present numerical standard; or that it should be done away with altogether. The Committee should bear in mind that, for the 200,000 Volunteers in the country, there was no allied Cavalry but the Yeomanry Cavalry, and that those only numbered 14,458 men. He believed military men would agree with him that that was a very small Force of Cavalry, as compared with the number of Volunteers out to keep up for the defence of the country. The country had not a superabundance of Regular Cavalry; and his contention was, that they had not from that source Cavalry sufficient to support the Volunteers, in case it were necessary to call them out for home defence. At such a time, the country would have to fall back upon the Yeomanry, and could fall back upon that alone. Therefore, he might fairly say, that if the Government considered it necessary and good to keep up and encourage the Volunteer Force, it was equally advisable that they should do something to maintain and encourage the Yeomanry; and then it would be found that they were quite as deserving of encouragement as the Volunteers. He would conclude by calling the attention of the Committee to the words of the Inspector General of the Auxiliary Forces, spoken at a lecture delivered in the month of March last, to the effect that the Yeomanry had struggled gallantly to keep their heads above water during two or three years of depression, and that if anything could be done to make the people understand that they were a valuable branch of Her Majesty's Forces, it would, in his opinion, be a very good thing. For these reasons, he (Viscount Folkestone) hoped Her Majesty's Government would do something to enable officers who were anxious to keep up the strength and efficiency of the Yeomanry to carry out their wishes.

Mr. MONTAGUE GUEST said, he quite agreed with the remarks which had been made by the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Folkestone) with reference to the encouragement which should be given to the Yeomanry. But he did not agree with him in his calculation as to the amount which it cost a Yeomanry officer to support a troop, because he thought he heard the noble Viscount say that the captain of the troop had to pay most of the expense, and that the subalterns did not pay so much. He (Mr. Guest) had to pay £10 a-year for a house for his sergeant, and to find him a horse, and pay for his drill; and he thought the Government ought to pay something more towards such expenses for drill, and for the house in which the sergeant had to live. If ever the sergeant went out with the troop, he (Mr. Guest) had to hire him a horse and pay his expenses. The Government, surely, ought to do something towards that. He did not quite agree with what had been said as to the compulsory service of the men; because, if the men were told that they were to serve for so many years, a great number of them would say they would not join at all—they did not care to tie themselves to time. A number of men would say—"I would like to join the Yeomanry; but I do not care to tie myself for a number of years." The Government ought to give some encouragement to the Force; for, as a rule, the men were all anxious to make themselves efficient in every branch of exercise through which they could be put—as, for instance, the sword exercise and shooting. They worked exceedingly hard to make themselves efficient, and there was no body of men in the world who were able to make themselves more efficient in the short time that they had at their disposal. There were some people who said that the Yeomanry were not worth keeping up; but such people evidently did not understand what the Yeomanry were. He (Mr. Guest) first joined the Yeomanry in the year 1859, when they were a very different body of men to what they were now. At that time many of the men were old and white-haired; they were certainly not soldiers; but, in the present day, it would be difficult to find anywhere in Europe 14,000 irregular Cavalry who, for the short time they had at their disposal for drilling, were so efficient. Not only was that the case, but he might say even more. He had seen the Regular Cavalry, and he had been a soldier himself, and he could say that the horses of the Yeomanry Cavalry of England were far finer than the horses of the Regular Cavalry. [An hon. Member: Farm horses.] He begged the hon. Member's pardon; they were not farm horses; and he could say emphatically that they would be glad of a few hundreds of such horses in the Regular Service. When the question was asked—"Is the Force worth keeping up?" he could only say that, in his opinion, it was; and though he quite agreed that it was not right to spend money unnecessarily, he could not regard the Yeomanry as a mere fancy—he looked upon them as a very valuable Force. As the noble Viscount opposite had said, we were not able to spend very much money upon Cavalry, so as to have a very large Force; and if this country had some day to fall back upon its Volunteers, we should be placed in this position—that we should have 200,000 ably officered and efficient Volunteers, who would require to have Cavalry to co-operate with them, for we could not possibly do without Cavalry. Where, then, were these Cavalry to come from? For it must be remembered that it was impossible to make a Cavalry soldier in a moment. We should want Cavalry to support our Volunteers, and where should we get them? The only Force upon which we could fall back would be the Yeomanry; and he quite agree with a remark which had been made by one hon. Member, that since a regular school of Cavalry had been started at Aldershot there had been a great deal more efficiency among the officers, who had worked themselves up considerably and did know their duty. For some years past, he might say, the officers had been good, active men, and most anxious to become real good soldiers. He, therefore, hoped that Her Majesty's Government, if they meant to keep up the Force, would give some real encouragement to it such as was worthy of it; and he hoped that, if this was not done this year, it would, at all events, be done next.

Mr. A. F. EGERTON said, he had had the honour of serving in the Force for 30 years; and he would like to say a word or two as to the expense to which the men were put when on duty. He had understood his noble Friend (Viscount Folkestone) to say that every man spent some £2 or £3 over and above the sum allowed him by the Government. His (Mr. Egerton's) experience was against that view, for he had known men in his own regiment pass through their period of duty, and bring home money to their wives, out of the sum of 7*s.* per day which was allowed them. He did not say all did that; but his point was that the sum allowed was an adequate sum. Then, as to the shooting of the Yeomanry. The difficulty in that respect was the difficulty of providing ranges. In the regiment which he had the honour to command, with six troops, there were only three troops which could command ranges; so that the shooting was in abeyance in three out of the six troops. That was a difficulty in regard to which the Government might possibly be able to give some assistance. It could only be met by an increased expenditure. If the ranges were at a distance, it was necessary to take the men to them; and it was impossible to expect that the Yeomanry officers should pay the expenses. Another point on which he would like to say a word was as to the preliminary drills which were compulsory before any man could go and draw money on permanent duty. There were a certain number of mounted drills which must be perfected by every Yeoman before he could draw any pay at all; but there was great difficulty in getting a sufficient number of men to attend the mounted and troop drills. It had been said that the proper way to meet that difficulty was to draw upon the public purse, for a very small expenditure would make a very considerable difference in the number of men who would attend this special duty. He had made a small calculation on this subject; and he believed that one day's pay for each man in the Service would insure a very much larger attendance at the mounted drills, and that would only amount to £3,500 a-year. That would be the extent of the increase, and it would give each man 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* per day for his attendance at mounted drill. A great country like this might surely stand such an increase of the Yeomanry Vote, which now stood at £69,000. Then there was a charge for the horses of the permanent sergeants. At present the captains had to pay for those horses at their own expense; but there were very few Yeomanry regiments which were not near to Regular Cavalry regiments, and it would be a very easy matter for the Regular Cavalry to provide horses temporarily for the permanent sergeants. As to the efficiency of the Yeomanry, there was a general consensus of opinion among the Yeomanry officers that the Force had become far more efficient within the last few years, and especially since the establishment of the school at Aldershot, which had made the very greatest difference in the efficiency of the body, and especially in the efficiency of the junior Yeomanry officers. There were now a great many Yeomanry officers who had never served in the Cavalry, but who were quite as good as, if not superior to, the Cavalry officers in the power of drilling their men. The Yeomanry had greatly increased instead of decreasing in their efficiency; and, with a very small increase in the Government funds that were spent upon them, that efficiency would be still further increased.

Mr. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT said, the Committee had rather been treating the subject as though there was some proposal to diminish the Vote; but that was not the case. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Egerton) had said that he had been connected with the Yeomanry for the last 30 years; but he (Mr. Davenport) had had the honour of being a member of the Force for more than 40 years, and he did not at all agree with the noble Viscount (Viscount Folkestone), who had said that if the Government would not consent to improve the Yeomanry, they ought to do away with it altogether. He (Mr. Davenport) hoped they would allow it to continue as it was, rather than take such a bold step as that. He remembered the time when the Yeomanry were spoken of in a very slighting way, both in that House and out of it; and he remembered somebody saying that the Force was one which was not required to leave the country on foreign service, except in case of invasion at home. That was one of the sarcasms that used to be levelled against the Force—attempts to make them ludicrous. But the Yeomanry had lived through that sort of thing, and he believed it was now as efficient as possible. A point on which he differed from some remarks that had been made was this—he was strongly of opinion that it would be a very great mistake to attempt to change the Yeomanry into Mounted Volunteers. They must stick to the sword. His own regiment had very often been called in to aid the civil power; and he believed it was universally acknowledged that in their services on those occasions they had done their duty very well indeed; and, although they had occasionally used the sword, they had used it with moderation. As to the remarks which had been made upon the attenuated condition of the Yeomanry, his own regiment, far from being attenuated, was now stronger than it had been for many years, and numbered 550 men.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, the noble Viscount who had spoken earlier in the discussion (Viscount Folkestone) had seemed to him to prove rather too much. It was very doubtful whether the efficiency of the Force would be greatly increased by any small expenditure such as was likely to be adopted by the House. No doubt, there were a good many well-to-do men in the Yeomanry, who were, to a great extent, officered by rich men; and both these classes were willing to spend a certain amount of money, besides giving up a certain amount of time in the Service. This was, no doubt, very valuable to the country; and it afforded to the men and officers themselves a change of occupation and of scene which was not altogether disagreeable to them, and for which they were willing to pay a certain amount of hard cash; and he doubted very much whether any moderate sum of money, such as the House was likely to grant, would be at all certain to improve the efficiency of that valuable Force. Some reference had been made to what had been done by his Predecessor in Office (Mr. Childers). He believed his right hon. Friend did, last year, endeavour to help the Committee to arrive at a conclusion, by inviting a certain number of Yeomanry officers to the War Office to discuss the question; but he believed there were great differences of opinion in what was put forward, and nothing very practical was suggested to be embodied in the form of proposals. The consequence was that when he (the Marquess of Hartington) acceded to the Office he now held, he did not find any such proposals before him for increasing the Vote, or for modifying the Vote; and the subject, therefore, had not come immediately and directly before him. Under these circumstances, it was not altogether accurate to say that the recommendations of the Committee had not been carried out. So far as his recollection served him, the amount of this Vote was now very much the same as that at which it stood some years ago—it had not materially increased nor decreased. The value of a Volunteer Cavalry Force, to act in case of need with Volunteers, was, no doubt, very great; and, if any moderate increase could be suggested for it, he could only say that it should be most favourably considered; but he wished to point out that the various suggestions which had been made that evening would involve, if carried out, a very considerable increase in the Vote, and that was a direction in which he thought very few hon. Members would be prepared to go. It must be remembered that the constitution of that House varied very greatly according to the nature of the proposals which happened to be brought before it. The House that night had been composed either of Yeomanry officers, or of Gentlemen who strongly sympathized with them, and the economists of the House had been represented in extremely small numbers. But if the Government consented to make the various alterations which had been suggested, the composition of that House would be very considerably altered, and there would be a much larger number of hon. Gentlemen in attendance prepared to make a practical protest against any very considerable increase in the Vote. And he did not know that that protest would come wholly from one side of the House, because he had observed that hon. Gentlemen opposite were becoming spirited advocates of economy; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) took the Government to task only last Tuesday for their extravagance. Of all the suggestions which had been made that night, it appeared to him that only one was of a practical character, and that was with regard to drill. The demand which had been made on that point seemed to him to be fair and reasonable; and if he could see his way to meeting it he should have great pleasure in so doing. But he knew that there might be some difficulty about it; and, therefore, he could only promise that his best attention should be given to the subject.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he regretted that his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) was not present, for this would have been a good opportunity for putting into effect that hon. Gentleman's abstract Resolution in favour of economy. What was the use of these Yeomanry? A great deal had been said as to their being excellent fellows, who wanted a great deal done for them; but he altogether failed to see of what use they were. Of course, nobody who was not a colonel should talk about these matters at all; but common sense taught even civilians that 9,000 men brought in from the sheepfold and turned to soldiering were sure to be unskilful—indeed, as the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland) had said, it was hardly safe to let them have a sword. When they were called out for one week, for a picnic like the Derby, and not for soldiering, it was absurd to say that they could add to the permanent strength of the country. He had just asked the hon. Member for Buckinghamshire how long he had been in the Army, and the hon. Gentleman said 12 years. And he did not know the duty yet. All night these Yeomanry officers had been saying—"Do this for us, and do that for us. Do something or other for us, and if you don't you had better abolish us." He (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) would say, in reply to that —"All right; you had better be abolished;" and, therefore, he should take the liberty of objecting to the Vote *in toto*, hoping for the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), who was so strong an opponent of the extravagance of the Government.

MR. ACLAND said, he had not spoken of the use of the sword by the Yeomanry in the sense in which the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) had understood him. All he had intended to say was, that those Members who knew anything of a Cavalry regiment would know that when men were brought in from the sheepfold for only one week—and it was very unfortunate that they could not be got for more—it was not surprising that at first their use of the sword should not be perfectly safe.

Colonel O'BEIRNE said, he objected to the Vote. Before any money was voted for the Auxiliary Cavalry, the Regular Cavalry ought to be properly attended to. On a recent occasion, when they had to send out three Cavalry regiments to Egypt, they had, in order to enable the men to go out, to denude three other regiments of their horses. ["Question!"]

The CHAIRMAN said, he must remind the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the Vote under discussion referred to the Yeomanry, and not to the Regular Cavalry.

Colonel O'BEIRNE said, his contention was simply that the Regular Cavalry should be made thoroughly efficient before any money was voted for the Auxiliary Cavalry.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said, that, whatever might be thought of the Yeomanry Cavalry, there was no doubt that the discussion in regard to it had been somewhat protracted. He was quite persuaded that it would shortly become a question whether the Force ought not to be allowed to die a peaceful death. The question asked by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) was a most pertinent one—namely, what was the use of the Yeomanry Cavalry, and what reliance could be placed upon it in time of need? It had been asserted, in some quarters, that the Force did add strength to the Army and defence of the country; but nine out of every ten of the speakers in the present debate rather regarded the Yeomanry as an ally of the Civil power in case of an outbreak amongst the people. He ventured to say that the great mass of the people of the country looked with great disfavour and suspicion upon the Force, and in the very strongest manner deprecated its use, when it was, unfortunately, found necessary for a military force to co-operate with the Civil power. So far as the Northern Counties were concerned, Peterloo was by no means wiped out of the memories of the people. Where it was necessary to employ a military force for the maintenance of order, it was infinitely better that a handful of Regular soldiers, who were not liable to use their swords indiscreetly, should be employed, than a whole regiment of Yeomanry. What possible service could this Force be in time of war? He could not imagine it facing any foe, except it be a body of Frenchmen of about equal number, who had never been on horseback before. It was admitted that they were only trained for eight days in the year, and that it seldom happened they had the same horses two years in succession. He was proud of the county he came from. In that county there were not many men who played at soldiers; but there were people who had to pay taxes, and who felt very strongly against any waste of money in this direction. The county certainly possessed a regiment of Yeomanry which trained at Harrogate. That annual training was made the occasion of a gathering of the fair sex and idle people; but, so far from the Force being seriously regarded as of any use, there was not one man in 50, out of the Force, who considered it was of the slightest value whatever. Hon. Gentlemen who were connected with Yeomanry regiments had admitted that the Force was not of the slightest value; because every one of them had said that, if it could not be made more efficient, it had better be abolished. The hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Acland) gave the Force such a character that he (Mr. Illingworth) wondered the Minister of War would have anything more to do with it. The hon. Gentleman told them that a man could even leave the Force on 14 days' notice if he disliked his officer, or had any other cause of dissatisfaction. They heard a great deal in the House about patriotism, and they had heard hon. Members who were officers in the Force complain that such an enormous charge as £10 a-year were laid on some officers. Surely £10 was a paltry sum to pay for the honour of the office held by those hon. and gallant Gentlemen. It appeared to him (Mr. Illingworth) they purchased very cheaply the marvellous distinction of being at the head of this still more marvellous Force. If such an incident as the removal of the horse tax had seriously interfered with the numbers and the efficiency of the Force, that fact alone afforded a strong proof of the folly of maintaining any such institution as the Yeomanry Cavalry. Did the removal of the horse tax involve any new tax? Nothing of the kind; but, because relief was given to those who owned horses, the numbers of the Force, they were told, decreased. He considered it was the duty of hon. Members to take up a position of opposition to Estimates of this kind. The Force did not commend itself to the great mass of the people of the country; and within a comparatively short time the Government would be pressed to abolish the Force, which, he believed, was mainly kept up for the amusement of a number of gentlemen who belonged to a class not very oppressively employed, and who wanted some occupation of a gentlemanly and easy character during a part of their leisure time. He believed that if the country were polled nine-tenths of the people would willingly vote for the abolition of the Force.

SIR PHILIP MILES said, he could not agree with one remark the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) had made. As an old Cavalry officer, he must say he considered the Yeomanry Cavalry a very valuable Force. It was all very well to say they were fine weather soldiers; but he could not imagine any body of men who, in case of an invasion of the country, would be more useful in their own country, in which they knew every road and bye road.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 126; Noes 21: Majority 105.—(Div. List, No. 99.)

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

MEDALS BILL.—[BILL 188.]

(*Mr. Courtney, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. COURTNEY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was introduced, after mature consideration, to meet the great evil of making, and putting in circulation, medals which were imitations of the current coin of the Realm, and which did not constitute any offence against coinage in the present law. The attention of the Government had been drawn by the authorities of the Mint to the extent these medals had been put in circulation; but there had been a good deal of uncertainty as to whether they should take any measures to put a stop to the evil. It was now, however, proposed to make it a misdemeanour to possess, without reasonable excuse or justification, any medal resembling a coin, or bearing superscriptions such as those on the Queen's coins. He would admit that it was a difficult matter to word an Act of that kind so that it should operate fairly; but he was sure the principle of the Bill would not meet with any objection in any part of the House. He, therefore, confidently proposed the second reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Courtney) had said the Bill had been brought in after great deliberation. He should not have thought it, if the hon. Gentleman had not taken the trouble to inform the House of the fact; because, in the first place, the Bill overthrew, in a simple line, the great principle of our Criminal Law, that a man must be proved guilty, and not himself prove his innocence. They had not heard a single word of explanation as to the practical reason why the Bill was introduced, or what the evils were against which the Bill proposed to contend. If any person—

> "Makes, or has in his possession for sale, or offers for sale, or sells, any medal, cast, coin, or other like thing, wholly or partially of metal, or any metallic combination, and resembling in size, figure, and colour any of the Queen's current gold or silver coin, or having thereon a device resembling any device on any of the Queen's current gold or silver coin, or being so formed that it can by gilding, silvering, colouring, washing, or other like process, be so dealt with as to resemble any of the Queen's current gold or silver coin,"

he should be liable to one year's imprisonment. There were many things which resembled coins, which were used as medals or ornaments, and all these would come under the Bill. Ancient coins, for instance, would come under the Bill. In its present shape, he could not approve of the measure.

MR. COCHRAN-PATRICK said, he agreed with the hon. Gentleman the

Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Courtney) that it was not easy to frame a measure to put down illegal coinage. It appeared to him that the present Bill would fail in the object the hon. Gentleman had in view, and that, on the other hand, it might be attended with results which the hon. Gentleman had not in contemplation. He thought he was right in conjecturing that the occasion of this measure was a sentence in last year's Report of the Deputy Master of the Mint. In that Report reference was made to the prevalence in the country of what were known as "Hanoverian medals." Those medals bore on one side a likeness of the Queen, and on the other side an equestrian figure altogether different from any device on the current coin of the Realm. The medals, however, were very common; and the Deputy Master of the Mint said, in his 12th Report—

> "It is clear, therefore, that the facility with which these medals can be procured is the cause of much crime. Thirty prosecutions have been taken for uttering these coins. It is doubtful whether there is any provision in the Statute now in force which makes it illegal either to make or sell them. It would appear desirable that an Act should be passed, expressly prohibiting both their manufacture and sale."

Now, it appeared to him (Mr. Cochran-Patrick) that the Bill under consideration had a much wider scope, and was much more vague in its language, than the Act which was recommended by the Deputy Master of the Mint. He would admit that, while they were trying to meet a particular evil, it was very possible to cause considerable inconvenience in other directions. The offence which was laid down by the Bill was that of having made, or being in possession of, or offering for sale, any medal, cast, or coin having a resemblance to the current coin of the Realm. Now, the 7th clause of the Coinage Act of 1861 laid down that—

> "Whoever . . . . shall import or receive into the United Kingdom . . . any false or counterfeit coin resembling, or apparently intended to resemble, or pass for any of the Queen's current gold or silver coin, *knowing the same to be false or counterfeit* . . . . shall be guilty of felony."

In the 13th section it was said that—

> "Whoever shall, *with intent to defraud*, tender, utter, or put off . . . . any medal . . . resembling in Size, Figure, and Colour the current coin . . . . shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

In both those cases a guilty knowledge or intention was distinctly laid down; but, under the present Bill, the mere possession of a medal or coin was to be an offence, though a person might be in possession of it quite innocently. The Bill might be attended with effects not desired or intended by the Government. Results not intended might be easily avoided by an alteration of the language; and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would, in Committee, turn his careful consideration to the subject.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he thought the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cochran-Patrick) had not carefully studied the Bill. If a person made or sold medals which were liable to be used for an illegal purpose he was liable to imprisonment. Such was the simple intention of the Bill, and it appeared to him the House ought to support it.

Earl PERCY said, he did not read the Bill in the same way as the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman). The Bill said that any person who made, or had in his possession, or offered for sale, or sold, any coin which resembled the current coin should be guilty of an offence. What he should like to know from some authority was, the meaning of the word "resemblance." Every old coin resembled, in some respects, Her Majesty's coin; and, therefore, anything more ridiculous than the Bill as it stood could not be conceived.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, everybody knew that there were coins made to look as much like sovereigns as it was possible. Those things were the means—the manufacturer did not himself utter them—those things were the means by which the unwary were deceived. The uttering of these medals was a very mischievous kind of fraud, and did a great deal of harm to innocent people. It was the resemblance of these medals to real coin that did all the mischief; and, therefore, their manufacture ought to be stopped. In fact, the word "resemblance" was the essence of the Bill. He thought that, in the same way, they ought to stop the manufacture of anything looking like a bank-note. In Committee the language of the Bill could be altered if it was thought necessary. He hoped that now the House would not reject the second reading.

Mr. WARTON said, a more ridiculous, contemptible, or absurd Bill was never introduced, not even by a private Member, on a Wednesday. After the passing of such a Bill as the present, it would be illegal to possess many kinds of counters used in a round game of cards. Anything circular resembled the Queen's coin. He could not help thinking that it was simply a love of legislation which prompted the Government to introduce such a miserable Bill as the present.

Mr. MOLLOY said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, when he got up to make the matter plain, and explain why the Bill had been introduced, only told them what was the case at the present time. He (Mr. Molloy) considered that the law was now sufficiently strong to cover illegal coinage; and he would ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman's attention to what the Bill really did. If the Bill were put in force, it would be an offence for a man to possess a Napoleon, because it resembled in appearance a coin of this Realm. ["No!"] If the right hon. and learned Gentleman would take the trouble to read the Bill, he would see that the possession of a Napoleon would subject a man to 12 months' imprisonment. The Bill said—

> "If any person, without due authority or excuse (the proof whereof shall lie on the person accused), had in his possession a medal resembling the Queen's coin."

["For sale!"] Of course, for sale; no one kept Napoleons for the sake of keeping them. If a man in this country, therefore, had a Napoleon in his possession, he would be liable to 12 months' imprisonment. There were gold coins in Greece, and the possession of one of such coins would subject the possessor to 12 months' imprisonment. The Bill, in fact, was so absurdly, so idiotically drawn, that one was at a loss to imagine where it was picked up. It would be a wise thing, for the sake of the legislative dignity of the House of Commons, if the Government withdrew the Bill, and re-introduced it in a shape consistent with the dictates of common sense.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Farrer Herschell) said, he could assure the House that the mischief at which the Bill was aimed was no imaginary one. During the 10 years from 1868 to 1878, 10 per cent of the total number of prosecutions for uttering bad coins were in respect of uttering Hanoverian medals, and the prosecutions had even increased since 1878. As the law stood at present, it was impossible to touch the people who made them. There was no useful or beneficial purpose served by making them; they were the means of fraud, and they did no good. There was only one object in making medals like sovereigns, and that was to enable people to commit fraud. The Law Officers had, in certain cases, been obliged to advise that prosecutions should not be taken against the manufacturers, though they knew there were considerable consignments of them from this country to the Continent, in order that they might be passed off. If people wanted medals, let them have them unlike sovereigns. The exact wording of the Bill could be fully discussed in Committee, though he did not believe it was open to the objection taken by certain hon. Members. He could not understand how anyone could say that a Napoleon would come under the Bill. It was different in size, and did not at all resemble a sovereign.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER supported the second reading. The hon. Member for the King's County (Mr. Molloy) had directed attention to matters which deserved consideration in Committee; but, certainly, a case had been made out for legislation. If the Bill was badly drawn, the best course to pursue would be to allow it to go into Committee, and there make the required Amendments.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

LAND IMPROVEMENT AND ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND) BILL.

(*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

[BILL 189.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred till Thursday next."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he would move that the Order for the Second Reading be discharged. The Bill had not been printed, and it was not a good example to set, for the Government to bring in Bills, and place them on the Orders of the Day before they had been printed. This was the third time during this week that the same course had been taken, the other occasions being those on which the Board of Works (Ireland) Bill and the Charitable Trusts Bill were put down for second reading. The House was being treated not only with scant courtesy, but with unfairness. If the same thing were done by private Members, it would certainly be resented by the Government. He would move that the Order be discharged, in consequence of the Bill not having been printed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Member (Colonel King-Harman) proposes to take a course which is most unusual, and without precedent. I understand the hon. Member in charge of the Bill only proposes to postpone this stage of the Bill.

MR. COURTNEY: Yes; till Thursday next.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he would not have called attention to the case, had it been an isolated one. In consequence of the New Rules of Procedure, hon. Members had to be exceedingly careful how Bills were brought in, and they had to remain night after night to watch the proceedings.

MR. TOTTENHAM asked the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill whether, before Thursday, the Bill would be printed and distributed?

MR. COURTNEY said, the action taken by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman) considerably surprised him. The course taken in respect of the Bill was one of a usual kind. Leave was given to bring in the Bill, and a day fixed for second reading. It was hoped that, in the interval, the Bill would be printed and circulated; and it was never intended to take the second reading on the day fixed if the Bill had not been printed. When the Bill was called just now, he (Mr. Courtney) at once moved that it be deferred till Thursday; and he hoped that before next Thursday it would be in the hands of hon. Members. It would be very inconvenient to prevent Bills being brought in unless they were ready to be printed and circulated. The hon. and gallant Gentleman was hardly correct in his reference to the Charitable Trusts Bill, because that Bill was printed before the Whitsuntide Holidays. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Leitrim (Mr. Tottenham) might rest assured that before the second reading of the Bill was taken ample time would be given for its perusal.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he thought there was no fault to find with the course suggested by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Courtney); but there was one remark of his to which he (Mr. R. N. Fowler) must take exception, and that was that the Charitable Trusts Bill was in the hands of hon. Members before the recent Holidays. It was perfectly true the Bill was distributed during the Recess; but it stood for second reading on Monday the 21st instant. When he asked the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) if he intended to bring it on on that day, he expressly said he did. They had certainly reason to complain that the Government proposed to move the second reading of a Bill which had only been delivered during the Recess, and which, of course, hon. Members had had no opportunity of considering.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS said, he received the Charitable Trusts Bill on the Saturday before the Recess.

MR. WARTON said, that the Charitable Trusts Bill was distributed on the 12th, and it was put down for second reading on the 21st, the day the House re-assembled. If such proceedings were adopted by the Government, it would be his duty to block second readings. Such sharp practices were unworthy of Members of even the present Government.

MR. MOLLOY asked if the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Courtney) would promise not to take the Bill on Thursday, if it was not then in the hands of Members?

MR. COURTNEY: Yes; I promise that.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Second Reading *deferred* till *Thursday* next.

MOTION.

TRAMWAYS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 4) (SOUTH SHIELDS, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JOHN HOLMS, Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the

Board of Trade under "The Tramways Act, 1870," relating to South Shields Corporation Tramways, and Wolverton and Stony Stratford Tramways, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. John Holms and Mr. Chamberlain.

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 25*th May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment (61); Local Government Provisional Orders * (54).

Second Reading—Committee negatived— Customs and Inland Revenue *.

Committee—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) * (27).

Third Reading—Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act (1882) Amendment (Audience of Solicitors) * (34); Medical Act (1858) Amendment (52), and *passed*.

NEW GUINEA.

PAPER PRESENTED.

Further Correspondence relating to New Guinea (in continuation of [C.—1566.] of July 1876).

The Earl of CARNARVON said, in regard to the Papers presented by the noble Earl as to the annexation of New Guinea, he would like to ask, Whether these Papers contained all the information in reference to the subject; and, if not, how soon their Lordships might expect to have them in their hands?

The Earl of DERBY: When the Papers relating to the recent action of the Government of Queensland with regard to New Guinea are received, I shall be prepared to lay them on the Table without loss of time; but, as yet, they have not been received. Looking at the date of departure of the mails, I find there is no probability that they will be here for a fortnight. The Papers which I have laid on the Table contain all the Correspondence antecedent to the period of the annexation.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE AND ENLISTMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 61.)

(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of NORTHBROOK, in rising to move that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that it was introduced for the purpose of making certain alterations in two Acts of Parliament—the Naval Discipline Act of 1866, and the Naval Enlistment Act of 1853. Under the latter Act, men were engaged from the age of 18 for the term of 10 years. The Bill gave power for them to engage for 12 years. At the end of that period men would be allowed to re-engage for a further period of 10 years. Thus, under the Bill, the whole time of service would be enlarged from 20 to 22 years. One advantage of the change would be to reduce the amount payable in pensions; and that more than compensated the disadvantage of a slight decrease in the numbers of the Pensioner Reserve. It was hardly necessary to say that the new Regulations as to length of service and pension would not affect any man or boy now in the Navy, but would only apply to new entries. The other part of the Bill proposed numerous Amendments in the Naval Discipline Act of 1866, which had been in force for a considerable time. Many inconveniences had been found in the present state of the law which would now be remedied. He would have been glad if he could have introduced a Bill for consolidating all the Acts relating to naval discipline and enlistment; but that would be a very long and complicated Bill, and it had been thought desirable to pursue the not unusual course of first of all introducing an amending Bill. In the present condition of Public Business he regretted to say it would be impossible for him to indicate when a consolidating measure would be brought forward; but, to prevent inconvenience, the present Bill had been so drafted that every section that had been amended had been re-enacted; and if the Bill passed, the Naval Discipline Act would hereafter be printed as amended, and not in its old form, showing the exact state of the law. Among the alterations he would mention the most important. It was proposed, first of all, to make certain changes in the proceedings and powers of ordinary courts martial, for the purpose of facilitating the trial of offences and preventing delay. It would be no longer necessary that there should be three ships assembled together in order to hold a court martial. Then, in the trial of an officer of the rank of lieutenant and under, the presence of a captain would suffice without that of a commander. Then power was given to hold a court martial on shore instead of on shipboard, which, in some cases, would be desirable. Then, as flogging had been practically abolished by the action of Parliament as regarded the sister Service, and by the orders of successive Boards of Admiralty, it was thought desirable that certain powers should be given to summary courts martial, and they had been inserted in the Bill. No doubt, the conduct of our bluejackets had, on the whole, been excellent; for example, during their three weeks ashore at Port Said, a place of very doubtful reputation, there was not a single case of punishment. But it would not be right to conceal the fact that, during the last five or six years, there had been a considerable increase in the number of the serious offences of striking or threatening a superior officer, and wilful disobedience to orders. The Bill conferred on the Navy, for the purpose of dealing with such cases, powers similar to those contained in the Army Discipline Act of 1881 with respect to the Army. In some respects, those powers were greater than the corresponding powers given to the Army, and in others less. They were confined to cases of mutiny, striking a superior officer, and certain military offences; but the power of dealing with the most serious offences was not confined to "active service." Ships in commission were, for practical purposes, always on active service, and the powers of summary courts martial would extend to all ships in commission. Corporal punishment would be abolished; and, the punishment of solitary confinement having become practically obsolete, it was proposed by the Bill to abolish it altogether by legislation. It was further proposed to give a power to summarily punish minor offences to officers in command of tenders and boats on detached service, as well as to officers in command of forces on shore. This latter proposal would meet the difficulty that had arisen during the recent operations in Egypt, and enable the officer in command of a force of Marines on shore to deal with the men under him. The Bill also provided that no sentence of imprisonment with hard labour should exceed two years. This would bring the Naval Criminal Law into harmony with the Civil Criminal Law as regarded the length of sentences. It was further proposed that where a sentence of imprisonment was pronounced at a place where there was no prison in which the sentence could be carried out, the punishment should not be held to begin until the offender reached a place where a prison existed; provided, however, that the offender was not subject to imprisonment during the voyage. If their Lordships were good enough to read the Bill a second time on that occasion, he should be most happy to afford any further information that might be desired with regard to the measure in Committee. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH said, while admitting that some of the provisions of the Bill would be beneficial, he did not think that this was a good time for quite getting rid of corporal punishment in the Navy, though it was not an agreeable subject to discuss. As their Lordships were aware, the punishment had not been abolished by law, though Orders of the Board of Admiralty had virtually abrogated it. But was this the time for giving it up altogether? In his opinion, the noble Earl had made out a very bad case for its entire abolition. What was the result of the action of the Admiralty in this matter? Was not this shown by the admission of the noble Earl, that during the last three or four years the offence of mutiny had largely increased?

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK said, that he had stated that the offence of striking a superior officer had increased; not the offence of mutiny.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH wished to know what more mutinous act could be committed than that of striking a superior officer and this offence had increased 10 per cent since the punishment had been abolished? The offence of theft on board ship had also largely increased. He could not conceive why, when Judges and magistrates could award corporal punishment, the power should be taken away from officers. His experience was that for a certain class of offences there was no greater deterrent than corporal punishment. He firmly believed that the opinion of all Naval non-commissioned officers and sailors were in favour of the retention of the punishment, and that its abolition, for all times and under all circumstances, would strike a serious blow at discipline. He also saw with regret that it was proposed to take away the power of reprimand from commanding officers. He would like to know what power officers would have on boat service?

The Earl of NORTHBROOK explained, that the power to reprimand would not be restricted, but extended by the proposed clause.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

House adjourned at Five o'clock,
to Monday next, a quarter
before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 25th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills — *Ordered—First Reading* — Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) (Kingston-upon-Hull, &c.)* [199]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) (Haslingden, &c.)* [200].

First Reading—Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 4) (South Shields, &c.)* [198].

Second Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3)* [172]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2)* [177]; Tramways Provisional Orders* [167].

Report— Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders* [153]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law)* [149]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders* [147].

QUESTIONS.

NAVY—THE DOCKYARDS—SHIPWRIGHTS.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether any decision has yet been taken as to improving the pay and position of the leading men of the shipwrights in Her Majesty's dockyards?

Sir THOMAS BRASSEY: Sir, the pay and position of the leading men of shipwrights have been carefully considered by the recent Committee on the Constructive Department of the Navy. No decision has yet been taken.

POST OFFICE—THE PARCELS POST.

Mr. WARTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether, in fixing the scale of charges by weight, for the carriage of parcels by the parcel post, he will consider the propriety of allowing a small proportionate excess over each pound in weight in respect of the coverings in which such parcels are wrapped?

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, the weights for parcels were fixed in the Schedule to the Parcels Post Act passed last Session; and I do not think it would be expedient to alter them in the manner suggested by the hon. and learned Member.

LAW AND POLICE—THE WANDSWORTH POLICE COURT.

Mr. WARTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the condition of Wandsworth Police Court; and, whether steps can be taken to remedy the same?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I answered this Question on March 12, and I am afraid I cannot now give a more satisfactory reply to it.

ARMY (THE EGYPTIAN EXPEDITION)—THE VETERINARY REPORT.

Dr. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that copies of the Report of the principal Veterinary Surgeon of the British Army in Egypt, on the Egyptian Campaign, have been supplied to the orderly rooms or officers of the cavalry regiments engaged in that Campaign; and, if so, whether he will lay the Report before Parliament?

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER: In reply, Sir, to my hon. Friend, I have to say that Copies of the Report in question have been forwarded to the commanding officers of regiments of Cavalry, as well as to Veterinary Surgeons for their professional information; but, being a purely Departmental Report, furnished for the information of the Secretary of State, it is not proposed to lay it upon the Table of the House.

LUNACY ACTS—CASE OF HUGH FLANAGAN.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Lord Advocate, Will he inquire into the circumstances under which Hugh Flanagan, a lunatic, was removed under warrant from Glasgow Asylum to Ballyshannon Workhouse as a pauper, the fact of lunacy being only referred to in an indistinct endorsement in red ink which the master said he overlooked; whether he is aware that Flanagan was discharged immediately from the workhouse, and murdered his father; and, whether he will suggest to the Scotch Lunacy Board the propriety of communicating beforehand with the Irish Lunacy Board in all similar cases in which it is proposed to transfer an insane person from Scotland to Ireland, in order that arrangements may be made to receive the patient direct into the proper asylum?

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. Balfour): Sir, I have inquired into the case of Flanagan, and find that he was removed on the 21st of December, 1882, from the Greenock Parochial Asylum, where he had been under treatment, to the Union Workhouse, Londonderry, under a warrant of two Justices of the Peace for the City of Glasgow. The authority for transferring an insane pauper from Scotland to Ireland does not rest with the Lunacy Board. I am informed by that Board that the present arrangements by which pauper lunatics are removed from an asylum to a workhouse are not satisfactory. They consider that a lunatic ought to be removed from an asylum to an asylum, or, at least, that sufficient notice of the removal ought to be given to some Irish authority. The rule is that a written statement of the condition of the pauper is handed to the Irish local authorities, which ought, in ordinary cases, to be a sufficient security against the paupers being released when not in a fit condition. I am not prepared to say that without legislation we can insist on further precautions; but we shall consider what can be done.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with reference to the case of Hugh Flanagan, who was sent from the Lunatic Asylum at Glasgow as a lunatic in charge of warders and placed in Ballyshannon Workhouse, and who, having been discharged in error by the master, murdered his father, John Flanagan, on Tuesday the 17th April, Whether it is true that the police were informed of the murder immediately after it occurred, and at once communicated with the coroner by telegraph; whether the coroner fixed the following Thursday for the inquest, but neither came nor sent notice until late in the evening of that day; whether he is aware that the parish priest who attended to officiate at the funeral, and the people who came to assist at it, after waiting for hours at great inconvenience, had to go away; whether the inquest was eventually held on the next day, Friday, without the coroner, by two magistrates, and what was the cause of the coroner's non-attendance; whether he is aware that the murdered man went three days in succession to try and get his son committed to an asylum as a dangerous lunatic; and, if he will ascertain whether the magistrates who refused to commit him inquired into the facts of the case?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I have already answered the greater part of this Question. The Coroner was prevented by illness from attending at the time appointed; and two magistrates held the inquest, as empowered by law, after the lapse of two days. I am informed that it is not the case that the murdered man had applied three days in succession to try and get his son committed as a dangerous lunatic. On the occasion when such an application was made, the magistrates, I am informed, fully investigated the case. I have already explained to the hon. Member, in reply to a former Question, why they refused the application; and, however unfortunate their decision was—viewed in the light of subsequent events—it is difficult to see how they could have acted otherwise, if, as reported to me, neither they, nor the doctor who examined the man before them, believed him to be insane.

NAVY—FIRST-CLASS PETTY OFFICERS.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether Her Majesty's Government have as yet come to any decision as to the claims of the executive First Class Petty Officers of the Navy?

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir, this Question has been for some time before the Admiralty, and the consideration which has been given to it has disclosed considerable difficulties, as to which the opinion of Naval officers is by no means unanimous. I hope, however, that we shall be able to come to a conclusion during this year.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS—SHILLELAGH UNION.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If, as President of the Local Government Board, he has directed any steps to be taken regarding the action of the clerk of Shillelagh Union in his capacity of returning officer at the late election of poor law guardians?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Local Government Board, who, I presume, have now obtained the answer for which they were waiting, have directed their Inspector to hold an inquiry as to the correctness of the course adopted by the Returning Officer in the case of Mr. Fleming, whom he refused to recognize as duly qualified to nominate a candidate at the late election.

IRELAND—LAW AND JUSTICE—CONVICTIONS AT WICKLOW ASSIZES.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the case of two young lads, named Conroy and Hayes, or Hynes, who were convicted at the last Summer Assizes, held in Wicklow, on a charge of posting a threatening letter to the Ovoca Postmaster, and who have just been liberated from Wexford Gaol on the expiration of their sentence of nine months' imprisonment; whether it is true that they were convicted solely on the evidence of two other lads, named Thomas Thorpe and William J. Thrubshaw; whether it is a fact that these lads recently made a false charge against two men, named Fahy and Doyle, of attempting to murder them by drowning in the Ovoca River; whether it is true that their evidence was directly contradicted by several witnesses, and the men instantly acquitted; whether a summons was taken out by the defendants Fahy and Doyle against them for perjury, but withdrawn on the undertaking that the Crown would prosecute; whether the Crown have done so or have proceeded on a different charge—namely, that of writing threatening letters to several persons, including the Lord Lieutenant and the local sub-inspector; and, whether, if the facts are as stated, he will take proper steps to have the Law fully vindicated, and the two lads, who have undergone imprisonment on false evidence, compensated for their suffering?

Mr. TREVELYAN: It is the case, Sir, that two young men named Hynes and Conroy were convicted of sending a threatening letter to the Ovoca Postmaster; but it is not true that they were convicted solely on the evidence of Thorpe and Thrubshaw. There was corroborative testimony by other witnesses. Thorpe recently charged two men named Fahy and Doyle with having tied a rope round him and thrown him into the river. The case was fully investigated at the Petty Sessions, and, Thorpe's statement being uncorroborated, informations were refused. Summonses for perjury were taken out against Thorpe—not, as alleged in the Question, by the men he had accused, but by two little girls who were witnesses in the case. The sub-inspector explained to the magistrates that the proceedings were informal and premature, and the case was dismissed—the police undertaking to prosecute in the usual way, if, after due inquiry, it should seem proper to do so. In the meantime, the two boys, Thorpe and Thrubshaw, had been arrested on the further charge of sending threatening letters to the Lord Lieutenant and the sub-inspector, and this case is now pending. It will be before the magistrates at Ovoca on Wednesday next.

BURIAL ACTS — CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES—RHOS, DENBIGHSHIRE.

Sir ROBERT CUNLIFFE asked the President of the Local Government

Board, with reference to the recent consecration of Rhos Cemetery, Whether his attention has been called to a letter in the "Times" of May 24th, signed "J. Carvell Williams," relating to such consecration; whether it is a fact, as stated in that letter, that the Vicar of Rhos in his correspondence with the Secretary of State suppressed the fact that the Burial Board had passed a resolution against consecrating half the cemetery, and that the vestry, when appealed to, had passed a resolution by 350 to 4 against consecrating any portion of the cemetery; whether he gave the Secretary of State to understand that the consecration of one-half of the ground had been approved by a resolution of the Board passed on 18th July 1882; whether he will cause further inquiry to be made into the subject; and, whether the Secretary of State objects to lay upon the Table of the House the Correspondence between himself and the Vicar of Rhos with regard to such consecration?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, my attention has been called to the letter referred to in the first part of the Question; and there can be no doubt that there were considerable discrepancies between the statements in that letter and those in the letter of the vicar to which I referred a few days ago. The vicar's attention has been called to these discrepancies; and he has been asked for any observations which he may have to offer on the matter. With regard to the production of the Correspondence, it cannot be laid upon the Table while communications are still passing.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—GUARDIANS OF THE POOR, WESTMINSTER.

Dr. FARQUHARSON asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. J. Rees, Vestryman, and one of the recently elected Guardians of the Poor of St. James's, Westminster, who was recently for the second time summoned to Great Marlborough Street Police Court, and there fined at the instance of St. James's Vestry for his neglect in removing nuisances from the houses of his tenants; whether the said Mr. J. Rees is one of the persons alleged to have been guilty of undue influence in the recent election of Guardians for that parish, as set forth in a letter addressed to him by certain of the ratepayers of that parish, bearing date the 12th ult.; whether he will direct an official inquiry to be made into the conduct of such election; whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the qualification of Mr. Robert Cocks, one of the recently elected Guardians of the said parish, with the view of deciding whether he is legally qualified to sit and vote as a Guardian; and, whether the authority under which he claims to sit and vote has been supplied to him by the above named Mr. J. Rees?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the Board have no information as to whether Mr. Rees has been fined, as stated by my hon. Friend; but, assuming that he has, it would not render him legally disqualified for serving as a Guardian. The Board received a letter, dated April 12, with reference to the election of Guardians; but they do not find that Mr. Rees is mentioned in it. At present the Board are in communication with the Returning Officer on the subject of the election, and have not yet determined whether there is any sufficient ground for an official inquiry. The Board are empowered by 5 & 6 *Vict.*, c. 57, s. 8, when any question arises as to the right of a person to act as an elected Guardian, if they shall see fit, to inquire into the circumstances of the case, and to determine the question. The Board have not received any communication calling in question the right of Mr. Cocks to act as a guardian; and in the absence of any appeal to them under the Statute the Board would not be prepared to take any action in the matter.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—THE RATHDOWN GUARDIANS.

Mr. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has seen the following statement in the Dublin papers of the 24th instant—

> "Yesterday, at the weekly meeting of the Guardians, of Rathdown Union, Sir George Hodson, Bart. (chairman) resigned the chair, in consequence of the Report of Mr. Finlay, the auditor, on the recent surcharge, and the refusal of the Local Government Board to interfere in the matter;"

whether he is aware that Sir George Hodson has guided the business of the Union for forty-five years, and possesses the full confidence of the guardians and ratepayers; and, whether, as President of the Local Government Board, he will cause the offensive expressions of the auditor to be withdrawn?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have seen the newspaper reports of the matter referred to. The Local Government Board informed me that the payment disallowed was wholly illegal; and the auditor was bound, in the fulfilment of his duty, to make the surcharge. The Local Government Board have no power to reverse the decision of the auditor. I am aware of the position so long occupied by Sir George Hodson in connection with the Union, and I am sure he possesses the full confidence of the Guardians and ratepayers. With regard to the alleged use of offensive expressions by the auditor, I cannot but think that there has been some misunderstanding which is capable of being removed. The Local Government Board inform me that they imagine that Sir George Hodson and the Guardians did not clearly comprehend the purport of the letters which they received at their last meeting; and the Board will address the Guardians on the subject again before their next meeting.

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Mr. Errington has at any time received money from the public funds for the payment of his expenses incurred by his mission to Rome?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, in consequence of a statement made on February 14 last year by my hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) that he knew, as a fact, that Mr. Errington's expenses were paid by Her Majesty's Government, an unqualified contradiction was given on the subject in "another place" on February 16; and it was stated by Lord Granville that, neither directly nor indirectly, had Mr. Errington received, at any time, money from the public funds, or from Her Majesty's Government, or from any Member of it, for any purpose whatever. That statement is equally true now; and my reply to the noble Lord is, therefore, a distinct negative.

GOVERNMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND MADAGASCAR—AGREEMENT FOR REGULATING THE TRAFFIC IN SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Mr. CROPPER asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any Treaty arrangement has been made with the Government of Madagascar respecting the future import Duty on rum and on other intoxicating liquors?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Yes, Sir; an agreement has been arrived at in regard to this question; and a Convention, similar to that concluded with Siam, will be signed immediately.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS — PREMATURE DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS—THE ARMY MEDICAL INQUIRY.

Dr. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the aspersions cast upon certain medical officers through the premature publication in the "Times" of portions of the evidence given before Lord Morley's Commission, he will be good enough to say whether or not Lord Wolseley's evidence regarding his conversation with Drs. Beath and Veale is contradicted by the evidence of these gentlemen; whether, after his visits to the field hospitals at Ismailia and Cairo, referred to in the "Times," Lord Wolseley telegraphed home on September 30th, "The Medical Department is working to my entire satisfaction;" and, whether, with regard to the severe strictures passed on Dr. O'Leary in the extract from the evidence of General Sir Drury-Lowe, there has not been a mistake of identity, and the charges thus irregularly published were, in fact, brought against the wrong man; also whether, in view of the aspersions cast upon the Army Medical Department through the premature publication in the "Times" of certain portions of the Report of Lord Morley's Commission, and of the evidence on which it is founded, he will have the goodness to say whether the Commissioners unanimously state—

> "That they doubt whether on any previous occasion the wounded were so quickly collected from the field of battle, so well treated in the field hospitals, or removed to the rear with so little suffering,"

as was the case after Tel-el-Kebir;

> "That the allegations that there was a deficiency in the supplies of medicines and medical

comforts to the front refer exclusively to the first week of the campaign, when there was the greatest difficulty in providing troops in advance with food or even ammunition?"

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER: Sir, I venture to make an appeal to my hon. Friend to postpone this and the following Question, on the ground that they will be answered by the Report itself. The Report and the Evidence will be, we hope, in Members' hands on Tuesday next. I am, however, in a position to state that there is evidence in conflict with the extracts which have been already published. We can only hope that the public will suspend their judgment until the whole of the case is before them.

SOUTH AFRICA—CETYWAYO.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the terms and conditions of Cetywayo's restoration to Zululand, as laid down by Her Majesty's Government and assented to by Cetywayo, included an undertaking not to permit the existence of any military system within his territory; to respect the boundaries of the territories of his neighbours; not to make war on any Chiefs or people without the sanction of the British Government; and to refer any unsettled disputes with any Chief, people, or Government, to the arbitration of the British Government; and, whether by the erection of military kraals, or by attacks on his neighbours, Cetywayo has broken, or connived at the breach of, any of these conditions; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to insist on their fulfilment; or to permit them to remain a dead letter, like certain articles of the Transvaal Convention?

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: Before the Question is answered, Sir, I wish to ask you a Question on a point of Order—namely, whether the concluding words of the right hon. Gentleman's Question are not a breach of the Rules of the House against the introduction of argument into Questions?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member refers to the last two lines of the Question?

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is scarcely necessary to say that the last two lines might involve controversial questions; but, under the circumstances, I have not thought it right to interpose.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, I would refer the right hon. Gentleman, with reference to the first part of his Question, to pages 113 and 250 of the last Blue Book, where he will find the *ipsissima verba* of the conditions assented to by Cetywayo; and Papers which I laid on the Table last Monday will enable the right hon. Gentleman to judge of Cetywayo's behaviour since his restoration. The latter part of the Question, although I would not venture to criticize anything drafted by the right hon. Gentleman, appears to my untutored mind to read more like a Party charge than a request for information; but using what the lawyers call the *cy près* doctrine, I presume the right hon. Gentleman means only to ask whether circumstances lately reported demand, in the opinion of the Government, their active intervention. This is the same Question as was put yesterday by the hon. Baronet the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland); and I can only repeat that, in the view of Her Majesty's Government, nothing appears at present to call for such intervention.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I do not think I ever heard a more unsatisfactory reply. I wish now merely to give Notice that I shall consult with my Friends as to the best way of calling the attention of the House to the subject.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I wish to ask a Question with reference to the answer of the Under Secretary; and it is this—Whether the House is to understand that the slaughter of 6,000 of Cetywayo's followers in Zululand does not call for interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: I will only ask the noble Lord to study the conditions before putting a Question of that sort.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I will repeat the Question on Monday.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: When will the Zulu Papers to which the Under Secretary has referred be in the hands of Members?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: I cannot say. I laid them on the Table on Monday, and they were sent to the printers. I will accelerate them, of course, as much as possible.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—WATERFORD CO.

Mr. LEAMY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has received any communication from the Sub-Commissioners for Waterford County respecting the time fixed by them for resuming the hearing of Land Cases in the district of the Waterford Union?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Land Commissioners inform me that a Sub-Commission will sit at Dungarvan on the 30th of July to hear cases from such parts of the Unions of Dungarvan and Waterford as are in the County of Waterford. The arrangements for the next Circuit, to commence in September, have not yet been made; but the Commissioners think it probable that one of the first sittings will be at Waterford to hear cases from the Union of Waterford.

EGYPT—THE SUEZ CANAL—PROPOSED NEW CANAL.

Mr. NORWOOD asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it be true, as stated by the Paris Correspondent of the "Standard," on Tuesday last, that the Government have received a communication from the administration of the Suez Canal Company, soliciting the assistance of the Government in obtaining a concession from the Khedive to enable them to construct a second and parallel Canal, on the basis of a general reduction in the tolls and a considerable representation of British interests in the management of the Canal; and, if so, whether the Government will lay upon the Table of the House copies of the proposals and of the correspondence that has passed on the subject, so that an opportunity may be afforded for an expression of opinion thereon by the shipping and mercantile interests of the country, before the general meeting of the Suez Canal Company to be held in Paris on the 4th June?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, there are communications passing on the subject between the Suez Canal Company and Her Majesty's Government. I entirely agree in the spirit of the inquiry of my hon. Friend, feeling that it is most desirable, and, indeed, essential, that the commercial classes of this country in particular should have the fullest opportunity of becoming acquainted with any proposals that may be made on the subject, and with any intentions that Her Majesty's Government may form with regard to it. But, of course, the hon. Gentleman will understand that we are not entirely masters with respect to the production of such communications, inasmuch as that depends partly on the will of other persons. But we will communicate on the subject with M. de Lesseps, and inquire whether he has any objection to their production.

Mr. NORWOOD: Am I to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that he gives a general assurance that no important engagement will be made by Her Majesty's Government with the Suez Canal Company without our having an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon the subject—no important and definite engagement?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I should be most desirous not only to give that opportunity, but to have the assistance of the public opinion of the country, and the information which may be supplied to us by the most competent persons before we even think of the formation of any engagement.

SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—PAINTING BY SIR FREDERICK LEIGHTON.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK asked the First Lord of the Treasury, At whose suggestion, and upon whose advice, the proposal for a painting by Sir F. Leighton, at the South Kensington Museum, to cost £3,000, was sanctioned by the Treasury; whether the proposal for so important an expenditure was brought under the notice of himself or the Chancellor of the Exchequer; whether it is the fact that designs and cartoons for this painting have not been already prepared; and, why the proposed expenditure on account of these designs has not been included or mentioned in any Estimate submitted to Parliament?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, this is rather a Question for the Secretary to the Treasury, except as to one point involved in it—that is to say, whether any proposal for this expenditure of £3,000 on a picture by Sir Frederick Leighton was ever brought under the knowledge of myself, or of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. With regard to my own knowledge, I may say that the question would not necessarily come before me; but it would probably involve some consideration, and would be disposed of by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have inquired of my right hon. Friend, and I find that it was not made known to him. The reason was that it was granted almost as a formal complement of the engagements and arrangements that had been already formed. That is rather a long story, going back to the years 1871-2, when the designs for these works were ordered and paid for by money voted by this House, and one of the pictures has been absolutely finished. My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer was, I think, abroad at the time when the business actually passed through the Treasury; and the matter was regarded as the fulfilment of engagements that had already been formed.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay on the Table the Correspondence which has taken place on the subject?

Mr. GLADSTONE: If the right hon. and learned Gentleman will be good enough to communicate with my right hon. Friend he will give him all the details. It hardly requires, I think, that the Papers should be printed.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (IRELAND)—THE PORT OF GALWAY.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it was the intention of the authorities to abolish the post of Collector of Customs in the Port of Galway?

Mr. COURTNEY: There is a question, Sir, under consideration whether a Superintendent may not be appointed to the Port of Galway instead of a Collector. But, whatever change of title may be effected in the chief officer, the facilities at present enjoyed by trade at that port will remain undiminished.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I wish to ask the Prime Minister, Whether the statements in the Liberal papers to-day are correct, that the Prime Minister intends to call a meeting of the Liberal Party to revive their drooping spirits—["Oh, oh!"]—and whether the right hon. Gentleman intends to make on Monday a formal statement with regard to the Business of the House? [*Cries of* "Do not answer!"]

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT: I wish to ask the Prime Minister a Question, and it is this—When the Army Estimates will again be brought on? Considering the present grave condition of recruiting and the waste of the Army, and its effects on the efficiency and numbers of the Army and Reserve, the question deserves the serious consideration of this House; and I hope we may have some early day for discussing the matter.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have no doubt that my noble Friend the Secretary of State for War will consider the language which has been used by the hon. and gallant Member; but we are not in a condition, at the present moment, to make arrangements for giving another night to the Army Estimates.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Perhaps the Prime Minister will be good enough to say "Yes or "No" to the Question whether he intends to make a statement as to the Business of the House on Monday? [*Cries of* "Do not answer!"]

Mr. GLADSTONE: It may be my duty, as I intimated yesterday, to make a statement shortly. I will make the best inquiries in my power to ascertain whether it will be for the convenience of the House that Tuesday next should be devoted to the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill. In that case it will be my duty to say something on the matter. I do not know whether I shall make a statement on Monday; but it will be necessary to do so either then, or very shortly after, with reference to several important measures.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished to know whether it had been settled positively that the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill would be taken on Tuesday?

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, before that Question was answered, he wished to ask a Question with reference to a very important Notice that he had upon the Paper for Tuesday next, having regard to the condition of Egypt. The time had not come for another debate upon the political aspect of the question; but he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman whether the time had not come for the consideration of a question relating, not to Princes and Khedives, but to the social condition of the people of Egypt? The importance of the subject had been increased by the publication of

Lord Dufferin's Report. He had endeavoured to bring forward the question for the last two Sessions without any result; and he would appeal to the Prime Minister either to let him have an opportunity to bring on the question on Tuesday, or to give him another day.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, the Government desired to proceed with the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill on Tuesday. He understood the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), who had a Notice on the Paper for Tuesday, was in a compliant and complaisant mood, and disposed to promote the good purpose of the Government; and now his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had signified, though in circuitous language, a similar intention. With regard to the appeal of his hon. Friend, he was sorry that he could not undertake to offer him the facilities he desired. He could only express the hope that he might be fortunate enough to secure another opportunity of bringing forward the question in which he was interested. Under those circumstances, he thought the House might take it for granted that next Tuesday would be devoted to the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he must ask the right hon. Gentleman to give him liberty to reserve his decision in the matter.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked what Bills would be proceeded with that night?

Mr. GLADSTONE: My right hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) will proceed with the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill.

PARLIAMENT—GRANTS TO LORDS ALCESTER AND WOLSELEY.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he observed on the Paper for Monday a Notice that it was proposed to go into Committee to consider the grants of money to Lord Alcester and Lord Wolseley. As he intended to oppose the making of any grants whatever, he wished to know from the Government what would be a convenient time for him to do so?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I may explain that, in this matter, we shall have to commence *ab initio*, owing to the change of form in which these grants are to be proposed. What the Government intend is that we should take as *pro formâ* the initiatory proceedings, since we may assume that the House has already given assent to the general principle. Then, at a convenient hour, a Member of the Government will move the Instruction to the Committee which will be necessary in order to change the form of the Bill. That Motion will afford a convenient opportunity for raising a discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I presume that I should have to move an Amendment to that Instruction?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMENIA AND EUROPEAN TURKEY.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. BRYCE, in rising to call attention to the neglect of the Ottoman Porte to carry out the reforms in Armenia and Macedonia, stipulated for in the 61st and 23rd Articles of the Treaty of Berlin, and to the dangers to the peace of the East likely to result therefrom; and to move—

> "That this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will, in conjunction with the other Powers of Europe, signataries of the Treaty of Berlin, continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and in European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin,"

said, he was sorry to have to carry the House back into topics which were familiar to them two or three years ago, and which had to some extent been allowed to drop out of recollection. He held, however, that it was our duty to watch carefully the course of events in the East, the necessity for watchfulness having been proved by the serious dangers which arose in 1876, after we had for a long time neglected the affairs of the East, dangers which might have been averted by the exercise of care and caution. Taught by experience, we ought to attempt to allay the disquiet and dissatisfaction which must produce disturbance among the Eastern nationalities. The condition of the Christians in the European and Asiatic Provinces of Turkey was very unsatisfactory. In the Treaty of San Stefano, provisions were inserted by which the Turkish Government gave engagements to Russia to introduce reforms intended to secure the well-being of the Christian population. By the 16th Article of the Treaty, the Porte undertook to carry into effect the reforms required by the Armenians, and to guarantee them from the oppression of the Circassian Kurds. In the Treaty of Berlin, which superseded that of San Stefano, a similar provision was inserted. It was the duty of the European Powers to provide for the due execution of that Treaty, for they had taken from the Armenians the right of calling upon Russia to interfere in their behalf. Under the Anglo-Turkish Convention, it was the duty of England alone to enforce the introduction of the required reforms; but as that Convention excluded the interference of the European Powers in concert, and was, moreover, very difficult to interpret, he should prefer to see action taken under the Treaty of Berlin. By that Treaty a solemn engagement was entered into, by which the reforms that were formerly to be undertaken by Turkey, at the instigation and under the supervision of Russia, were to be undertaken at the instance and under the supervision of the six European Powers. Pursuing his history of the effects made by the present Government to induce the Porte to institute reforms in Armenia, he desired to pay a tribute to the extraordinary energy, foresight, and comprehensive grasp of mind displayed by the right hon. Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen) in dealing with the Turkish Government. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have seized at once the point of the situation, and to have pressed it energetically both on his Colleagues and the Ottoman Government. All these diplomatic proceedings had, however, produced no result. No reforms had been introduced into Armenia; and nothing had been done to secure order, to give security to life and property, and to render justice available to all classes. The best and most reliable evidence as to the present state of affairs was to be found in the Reports of the Consuls sent by the late Government to Armenia and Asia Minor. The evils they reported to exist were these. In the first place, robbery and murder prevailed all over the country. The Kurds were constantly coming down plundering Armenian villages and killing travellers. In the second place, there was a constant system of extortion on the part of Turkish officials; the taxes were collected in the most oppressive way, and often twice over. In the third place, there was a practical denial of justice. The Mahomedan system of law was administered; Christian evidence was, in practice, not received, and the officials, with scarcely an exception, took bribes, and, indeed, had to live on bribes, for their salaries were not paid to them. A series of the most shocking outrages were perpetrated on the religious ceremonies of the Christians; and no redress could be obtained by the unfortunate people who were the victims of gross injustice and oppression. Of course there was discontent, and possibly there might have been conspiracies, among the Armenians. Recently a number of persons in Erzeroum had been thrown into prison, although it was not shown that they had any intention to disturb public order. Perhaps it would be better if they did conspire and rise against their oppressors, because that would lead to European intervention. However, they were far from European sympathy; they were peaceful, and they were unarmed; and all they could do was to form societies with a view of attracting the notice of Europe. The system which Turkey allowed to prevail was destroying the Christian, and therewith was also injuring, the Mahomedan population of Armenia. A Turkish statesman had suggested that the way to get rid of the Armenian Question would be to get rid of the Armenians; and that was the object the Turkish Government seemed to have in view. For his own part, although we had a stronger Treaty right to interfere as regards the Christians, he desired to make his appeal on behalf of the Mahomedan population as well as the Christian. The interests of the two populations were substantially identical. All they wanted was good government. If that were only provided, they would live together in peace and contentment. If something were not done, Russia, no doubt, would step in. Russia was on the frontier. She possessed strong fortresses, had an army of 160,000 men in Trans-Caucasia, of whom it would be easy to send 50,000 or 60,000 men across the Armenian Frontier. The question would then arise, whether this country was bound, under the Anglo-Turkish Convention, to send an army to defend this frontier? If Russia were to occupy Armenia, she would have a sufficient excuse or pretext in the dangers which the present state of things presented, and in the sufferings of the people—just such a one as she had for her intervention in European Turkey six years ago. He was aware that many people thought that Russian intervention would be the best thing for the people; but, in his opinion, although a Russian occupation might prove a temporary advantage, its ultimate results would be unsatisfactory. He did not say that the advance of Russia would so seriously imperil British interests as to constitute a *casus belli.* But there would be a large party in this country which would regard with displeasure and uneasiness the advance of Russia towards the frontiers of Syria and Mesopotamia; and he could conceive that, if such an advance were threatened, there might be a Ministry in power that would take active steps to prevent it. Russia, although she had improved the condition of the Caucasian Provinces, had not the gifts to fit her for a great colonizing and civilizing Power; and he held that there would be far less hope for a permanent elevation and adequate development of the peoples and resources of Western Asia if Russia attempted to spread her thin varnish of civilization over these countries, than if the Christian peoples of the East were permitted and enabled, by security given to their lives and property, and by the re-establishment of peace and the opening up of communications, to undertake a task in which they were so much interested. If Russian intervention was to be prevented, by what means could it be prevented? They did not want any more Commissions of Inquiry or paper Constitutions, but honest men, who would do their duty by the people, and who were not liable to removal from office. Such a want could not, however, be supplied without European supervision; and that was the opinion expressed by Sir Charles Wilson, Major Trotter, Major Everett, and the other Consuls who had displayed such conspicuous zeal and ability in the discharge of their very difficult functions in Asia Minor and Armenia. The two things wanted were, that the officers of the Government, whether judicial or administrative, should be paid their salaries and have some security of tenure. They were now liable to dismissal simply because they had done their duty to the people in not extorting from them more taxes than they could pay, or because they had omitted to give a bribe to the Palace at Constantinople. The Provinces should be semi-autonomous, having a Constitution somewhat similar to that framed for the Lebanon under the auspices of Lord Dufferin some 22 years ago. One of the first requirements under such a Constitution was that the Governor should be irremovable, except by the consent of the Powers; because, otherwise, he would not be sufficiently strong to enable him to carry out reforms. In addition, there should be a provision that all revenues raised from a Province should be spent in it, except the fixed tribute sent to Constantinople, the balance being applied in carrying out useful works in the Province itself. That seemed to him to be the best practical scheme of reform that could be proposed. The condition of the country forbade political independence; but life and property ought to be rendered secure. The Turkish Empire would have a better, and, indeed, its only, chance of longer life if the prosperity of its Provinces were increased. But nothing had yet been done in that direction. He had now to deal briefly with the position of affairs in European Turkey. The 23rd Article of the Treaty of Berlin was almost identical in terms with Article 15 of the Treaty of San Stefano. Article 23 of the Berlin Treaty made provision for introducing improved local Constitutions into the European Provinces left to the Sultan. These Constitutions were to be settled with the advice of a Commission—the European Commission for Eastern Roumelia—on which first his hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth, and afterwards the noble Lord the present Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, sat as Representatives of this country. By the labours of this Commission, and largely owing to the exertions and abilities of the noble Lord, Organic Laws for the regulation of these European Provinces were framed and submitted to the Porte. The Commission sat a good many months at work on those Organic Laws. What had been the result of that European Commission and of Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin? Absolutely nothing. From the day the Commission terminated its labours up to the present time the Porte had not made a single attempt to carry out its provisions. The Organic Laws did not appear to have been so much as mentioned. In Albania, the strength and fierceness of the tribes might excuse the neglect of the Turkish Government; but with regard to Turkish Servia and Macedonia, there was every reason, looking at the miserable and helpless condition of the populations, that these administrative regulations should be carried out, yet he could not find that anything had been done. All the evils existing before the war existed there now. What would be the result if no reform was made? The same, practically, substituting Austria for Russia, as he had endeavoured to point out, would follow in Asia. Austria was suspected of designs on those European Provinces; and a better pretext could not be given her for the execution of such designs than the continuance of disorder and dissatisfaction. But any advance by Austria would be a misfortune, especially for the people of the countries referred to. The Austrian Government was extremely unpopular, and the Christian inhabitants of Turkish Servia and Macedonia would deplore any extension of Austria. Such a result, also, would mean the shutting up of markets which England now enjoyed. He thought he might safely assume that there was no difference of opinion in the House as to the behaviour of the Turkish Government, which either could not, or would not, do anything to reform itself; and it was clear that any improvement could come only from the pressure of the European Powers. When he spoke of pressure, he did not mean that Her Majesty's Government was to undertake military operations; and he did not wish to be accused of desiring to precipitate this country into entanglements which might produce further wars; but what he suggested was that we should exercise a constant and firm pressure on Turkey, and there were many ways in which this pressure might be applied, and effectually applied, short of military operations. He did not suggest that anyone should argue with the Turks on grounds of justice or humanity; but it might be put very strongly to them that their own interests pointed in the clearest possible manner to the necessity of introducing reforms; that this was their only chance of saving their Asiatic Provinces, which, otherwise, must infallibly fall into the arms of Russia. If such a course was earnestly pursued by the six Great Powers acting in concert, he was persuaded that the Turkish Government would see that it was wise and prudent to give way. The grounds on which he contended that it was the duty of England to adopt the course he had pointed out were not those of material interests. He relied, in the first place, on the general interest it had always taken in the East as a Christian, civilized, and commercial Power; and, secondly, on the grave and specific obligations it undertook towards those countries by the Treaty of Berlin. He did not complain of the past action of the Government in this matter, but he desired an expression of opinion on the matter from the House, from which the Government derived its right to represent the people of England. The House spoke with authority on these questions, and its declarations carried weight, not only in Europe, but in the East itself. Such an expression of opinion would strengthen the hands of the Government in endeavouring to bring about again the Concert of Europe for exerting pressure on Turkey, and inducing her to grant the reforms demanded; and he was certain that the House could not express its opinion in a worthier cause, or in one more calculated to bring back peace, prosperity, and happiness to those regions of Asia which were the earliest seats of civilization, and might again become the homes of powerful and progressive peoples, if only they could be secured the blessings of peace and justice. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will, in conjunction with the other Powers of Europe, signataries of the Treaty of Berlin, continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin,"—(*Mr. Bryce*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, nobody in the House had a better right to bring this subject before the House than his hon. Friend; in the first place, because of his great historical knowledge of those countries which formed part of the Turkish Empire, and not less because he was known as the author of one of the most interesting books of travel in those regions. It would be his (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice's) duty to place before hon. Members a narrative of events, taking it up from the point where his hon. Friend left it, with regard to the negotiations at Constantinople. Before, however, he dealt with the more recent stages of the narrative, he would point out that in the use of certain terms—"Armenians," for instance—there was a possibility of ambiguity of language. There was no such Province as Armenia known to the Turkish Government; and when he was at Constantinople, as Commissioner, he found some difficulty in the use of this and other geographical terms which were objected to by the Turkish Government. He was asked what he meant by "Armenia" and "Macedonia," for the Turkish Government knew nothing about them. By Armenia he meant, then, certain Turkish Vilayets which were grouped round a number of well-known places—Erzeroum, Van and Bitlis, Sivas, Kharput, Diarbekir, and Aleppo. In all those districts there was a considerable population, although, as his hon. Friend admitted, it was mixed, being partly Christian and partly Mahomedan. Accurate statistics were almost unknown in the Turkish Empire. It had been his misfortune to have to deal a good deal with statistics in Turkish matters; and he had found that the statistics made up by the Armenian Patriarch were, on the whole, trustworthy. His hon. Friend had left the narrative at the 14th of February, 1881—that was to say, the date of the last despatches presented to Parliament; and at that date, owing to the view of the German and Austro-Hungarian Governments, Her Majesty's Government came to the conclusion that it would be desirable not to press upon the Porte the necessity of Armenian reform until the question of the Greek Frontier had been settled. The year 1881 was mainly occupied with the negotiations upon the latter subject; but, unfortunately, immediately after the termination of those negotiations, certain great and complicated questions arose, which occupied the attention of diplomacy, and tended, to a great extent, to divert attention from the Armenian Question. He was, of course, alluding to the Egyptian Question. There were, besides, a great number of minor questions which came within the purview of the clauses of the Treaty of Berlin, which it was absolutely necessary to proceed with, such as that of the ownership of the Varna Railway, the Navigation of the Danube, the Frontier Questions, and many others. Nevertheless, it was found possible, on the 4th of October, 1881, to direct Lord Dufferin to agree that he and the Russian Ambassador should prepare a draft, which the other Ambassadors were found willing to accept, as the groundwork of a scheme for Armenian reform; and on the 9th of February, 1882, that scheme was submitted to the Conference of Ambassadors, and accepted by them. The scheme was brought to the notice of the Porte in due course, and from time to time, since then, the Sultan and the Porte were reminded of the necessity of some action being taken; but, nevertheless, nothing was done. There were frequent promises made by the Porte, and offers were made of sending a Commissioner to make further inquiries in Armenia; but beyond that nothing was done. It was said by the Porte that it was not convenient that the question of reform in one Province alone should be considered, and that the question ought to be considered as a whole; but when any scheme was brought forward for reforming the Empire, the Ambassadors were told that it was impossible to treat the question as a whole; so that there was nearly always a game of battledore and shuttlecock going on, and the consequence was nothing was done. He could only agree with the statement of his hon. Friend; and he believed that in the interesting, famous, and historical country of Armenia there was a condition of things painful to contemplate and realize. It was a condition of pillage, rapine, and plunder, and the Mahomedan population suffered almost as much as the Christian population. The Mahomedan population, in many cases, exasperated by suffering and oppression, had emigrated from the old Turkish Dominions, and precipitated themselves, in many cases in great want, into the comparatively well-to-do districts of Armenia. What the Turkish Government had done had almost incresed the difficulties of the situation. Men were encouraged to emigrate, and were then placed, by the direction of the Turkish Government, in districts of Asia Minor, in places where there was already a state of famine. It was almost inconceivable that such a state of things could exist; but it was the case. He might be asked, what was the result of that movement of population? He thought, on the whole, it had had a certain effect in increasing the Mahomedan element, but to no material extent; and the Christian element was equal to it in importance, if not superior, within the districts he had indicated. He had informed the House that the scheme of reform originally drawn up by Lord Dufferin and the Russian Ambassador, and agreed to by the other Ambassadors, had not been acted upon. A short time ago Her Majesty Government had recognized that fact, and asked themselves what further steps they ought to take. His hon. Friend had pointed out that the Government had a double *locus standi;* they might proceed under the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin, or under the Convention of the 4th of June, 1878, specially relating to the agreement entered into between Great Britain and Turkey for the security of all those Dominions of the Porte which were left to them in Asia Minor. The last remonstrance which had been addressed to the Porte, though known to the other signataries of the Treaty of Berlin, had been made in a greater degree upon the peculiar and sole responsibility of Her Majesty's Government, because they felt that they had a peculiar duty from which they should not shrink. Lord Dufferin was, therefore, instructed to call the attention of the Porte in the most solemn manner to the duty incumbent upon it in relation to the suffering populations of Armenia. Lord Dufferin had carried out that duty with the mingled courtesy and firmness for which he was famous in the world of diplomacy. He had been received by the Porte with promises of reforms; but time, and time alone, could show whether those promises would ever be fulfilled, and whether the paper scheme of reform which they had lately seen in the newspapers as having been promulgated by the Porte was worth more than other schemes which they had promulgated. He was aware that some hon. Members—the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), for instance—desired to treat the Porte as a convalescent who required peace and quiet; but if it appeared that the convalescent, under the present treatment, instead of getting well, became weaker and weaker, surely it was necessary to consider whether some other treatment ought not to be adopted. He would not quote the opinion of Lord Granville—it might, perhaps, be said that that opinion was not impartial; but he need go no further than Lord Granville's Predecessor to justify the observations he had made. Lord Salisbury, in a despatch which might be called the prelude to the Turkish Convention, written to Mr. Layard on the 30th of May, 1878, made the following remarks:—

> "The Government of the Ottoman dynasty is that of an ancient, but still alien conqueror, resting more upon actual power than upon the sympathies of common nationality. The defeat which the Turkish arms have sustained and the known embarrassments of the Government will produce a general belief in its decadence, and an expectation of speedy political change, which, in the East, are more dangerous than actual discontent to the stability of a Government. If the population of Syria, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia see that the Porte has no guarantee for its continued existence but its own strength, they will, after the evidence which recent events have furnished of the frailty of that reliance, begin to calculate upon the speedy fall of the Ottoman domination, and to turn their eyes towards its successor. . . . It is impossible for Her Majesty's Government to accept, without making an effort to avert it, the effect which such a state of feeling would produce upon regions whose political condition deeply concerns the Oriental interests of Great Britain. . . . There are, however, two conditions which it would be necessary for the Porte to subscribe before England could give any assurance of support."

That was the view of the Foreign Secretary of the late Government; and it accurately, so far as the need of these reforms were concerned, expressed the views of Her Majesty's Government. They were acting in the spirit of Lord Salisbury's opinion; and, as his hon. Friend had said, there was no Party difference on the point between the two sides of the House. Passing now to the other part of the question in drawing the attention of the Ottoman Porte to Armenian reforms, Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, then the right hon. Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen), pointed out, in conjunction with the other Ambassadors, that the financial part of their proposals was worthless unless protected by such safeguards as had been recommended by the European Commission of Reforms, of which he had himself had the honour to be the English Member. And here he would most willingly acknowledge the great service rendered to the country in this matter by our Consuls in Turkey, especially Mr. Sandwith, Mr. Blount, Mr. St. John, and many other gentlemen whose aid had proved of the utmost value. But before he addressed himself to the question generally, he desired to define the European Provinces. They were divided into five Vilayets—namely, Adrianople, Salonica, Kossovo or Prisrend, Janina, and Scutari; and these districts were now suffering from that system of confusion which prevailed throughout the Turkish Empire, and which had been its ruin. The financial state of these Provinces was disastrous; and this chaos arose from the system of confiscating the revenue of the Province by sending down from Constantinople what was called a "Havallé." He would read to the House a Report from Vice Consul Gatheral to Mr. Goschen, dated Angora, July, 1880, which would explain to the House the system to which he alluded. The Consul wrote—

> "These 'Havallé,' when accepted by the local Treasury, are either paid in Angora with more or less promptitude, or, as generally happens, are exchanged for fresh 'Havallé' bonds on the various sandjaks, or districts, into which the Province is divided. The results of this system are deplorable in every way, as it reduces the Provincial accounts to a condition simply chaotic, and has been carried to such a pitch that a larger amount is drawn for than the revenue supplies, and no margin is left for the current expenses of government, which are increased in obedience to orders from the Porte, on the one hand, while, on the other, the available revenue is reduced in the way indicated."

The House would see that under these conditions anything like a proper system of finance was impossible. That was really the root of the whole evil. Then there was the grievance of the constant changes in the Provincial Governors. One of the reforms which the European Commission suggested was that the Governors should be appointed for five years. But, whatever were the suggestions that had been made, the Porte had done nothing in the way of reform, but had rather gone in the contrary direction. Her Majesty's Government had been asked what they had done with regard to the 23rd Article of the Treaty of Berlin, under which the European Commission had made their recommendations. A general instruction was given to Her Majesty's Ambassador that he should omit no opportunity, when it arose, of pointing out to the Porte that those duties and obligations which were incumbent on them under that Article were obligations and duties to which this country attached the greatest importance. His hon. Friend had pointed out the great danger to the Porte which underlay the neglect to carry out the required reforms, and he was glad that his hon. Friend had done so. It was strange that the statesmen of the Porte did not look back on their history and take warning. How was it that they lost every Province which they had gained since their armies were rolled back from the walls of Vienna? They lost them because they were not able to conciliate the populations of the Provinces which were subject to their rule. Merivale, the historian, distinguished between the real Empire of Rome, which attached her conquests, and the nominal Empire of Turkey, which alienated them. Let it be hoped that even at the eleventh hour this scheme of reform would really be set in motion, and that a better state of things might begin. He was convinced that the moment was a solemn and serious one in the annals of the Turkish Empire. His hon. Friend had alluded to the 38th Article of the Treaty of Berlin, under which were to be established the junctions of the Great Trunk Railways, which would open up Turkey to travellers from end to end. He would ask hon. Members whether, when that object was realized, when commerce was developed, when the number of visitors of every nationality was increased, as it would be in an extraordinary degree, and when, as it were, light was thrown upon every corner of the Turkish Empire—he would ask whether, when that day came, it was likely that the system which his hon. Friend had described would be able to resist the glare of publicity? He made these observations with no hostile feeling towards the Turkish Empire. He desired that the Turkish Empire should reform itself; and, in calling attention to these things, he felt that he was doing the best service to that Empire. But he would appeal to the Porte. He would appeal not only to the sense of duty of the Rulers of the Turkish Empire, but ask them to consider whether, regarding the question from a merely selfish point of view, they had not got every advantage in placing themselves in a high moral and political position, so that they might no longer be the objects of the criticisms of those who took an interest in the Christian populations—so that they might not be the victims of constant discussions, not merely in the newspapers, not merely in this country and in that House, but in every country in Europe; he would also appeal to them whether it would not be a noble and great aim to set before themselves to show, what other nations of a race not dissimilar to themselves had shown —he meant the Magyars of Hungary —namely, that they could adopt European ideas and European civilization; and whether all this would not be a greater and nobler thing than to wring a large revenue or a small one, as the case might be, from oppressed Provinces and a suffering population?

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, who had the following Amendment on the Paper:—

> "That, while important stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin, which were made for the advantage of the Ottoman Empire, are unfulfilled, it is unjust to press the Armenian question; and that, in view of the active intrigues of Russia in Armenia and of France in Syria, it is inexpedient at present to embarrass the Ottoman Government,"

said, the concluding sentences of the noble Lord recalled the fact that there was a great and a powerful State which stood in need of improvement no less than Turkey; he alluded to the Government of St. Petersburg. It was the fashion among the supporters of the Government to rail against the Ottoman Empire; but they did not dare to utter one word of reprehension or rebuke with regard to the worse tyranny and outrages that prevailed in the Russian Empire. A great Prime Minister, the late Lord Derby, had denounced this policy of bullying the weak and truckling to the strong. There were several fallacies underlying the statements of the noble Lord, and of the hon. Member who had introduced the subject with much more moderation than was usually shown by his Friends. It was admitted that it would be an undesirable thing that Russia should obtain power in Asiatic Turkey. That Russia aimed to do so no one doubted. The chief fallacy of the hon. Member's argument was the supposition that any reforms in Turkey would prevent Russia attacking that country. It was as ridiculous to look for such a result as it was to think that any Government in India would prevent the Russians from some day attacking our Possessions in that country. The object of Russia was not to promote good government, but to prevent it. Russia was constantly intriguing to stir up race against race, and encouraging the Ottoman Power to maintain bad Governors, so that she might obtain the pretext she hardly required for the invasion and occupation of territory. The greatest difficulty Turkey would have in carrying out reforms would be the opposition of the Russian Government; and an illustration had just been furnished in the intrigue which had prevented Rustem Pasha being re-appointed Governor of the Lebanon—intrigues which were stimulated by France with the support of Russia. Actual brigandage, indeed, had been supported by the encouragement of the French Government. The general ground for these reforms which the hon. Member had put forward—namely, the probability that the improvement in the government of Armenia would prevent Russia from attacking it—was a reason that did not exist in practical politics. The only thing that would prevent a Russian attack was the belief that it would be unsuccessful, and that it could be resisted, either by Turkey alone, or by Turkey with the aid of England. Personally, he had never been in favour of injustice in Turkey, as had been suggested by the hon. Member; the policy he had consistently advocated was the only one that would successfully remove injustice, and that led him bitterly to oppose the War of 1877. He maintained that prior to that war Turkey had made remarkable progress in all the arts of civilization and in good government. Lord Palmerston, in 1864, said that Turkey had made more progress than any European Power. The Russians themselves were surprised at the marks of prosperity which they found in Bulgaria. The true way to obtain the development of the resources of Turkey was to prevent the increase of that antagonism of race which the natural constitution of Turkey could not possibly remove—to prevent those differences from being aggravated by foreign intrigue and invasion. The war of races in Turkey in 1877 and 1878 was encouraged, if not actually provoked, by the action of the present Prime Minister and the Liberal Party at large. They were as responsible as anyone outside Russia could be for the horrible sufferings inflicted on the Christian and Mussulman populations by that war, and the practical destruction of the hopes of Greece. As it was, the Greeks were effectually cut off from Constantinople by the Bulgarian Principalities. The Greek element had been, like the Mussulman, persecuted out of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia by the Russo-Bulgar Administration. If that war had been prevented, and the consolidation of races in Turkey had been allowed to take its natural course, the Greek element might some day have restored the supremacy of Christianity in the East. What was the present position of the Armenians? They formed hardly one-third of the population of Armenia, and were not numerous enough to bring about a popular rising. They were scattered about among alien and often hostile populations. One of the great difficulties had not been touched upon by the hon. Member; and that was the condition of the wild tribes of Armenia and Kurdistan, who were so situated geographically that Russia could at any time cause a revolt among them, either directly or through Persia. Nor was that difficulty recognized by the noble Lord, who had merely made his usual denunciation of Turkey and all her works. A kind of mutual admiration society had apparently been formed between the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets and the Government. The former flattered the Ministry, and the Treasury Bench were not slow to respond. The noble Lord had spoken of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets as if he were a Grote or a Gibbon. The hon. Member, in alluding to the Christians of Armenia, admitted that they were far outnumbered by the Mahomedans. He spoke of the magnificent future before the Christian races of Asia Minor, and said that they were the people to whom the development of the country must be left. He had listened to the hon. Member with astonishment, and wondered where those Christian races were. The fact was that, with the exception of this miserable remnant, the Christian races of Asia Minor were altogether *in nubibus*—at all events, till the Mussulmans were wiped out by the Russians. This reminded him of the curious statement made by the noble Lord as to the capacity of the Russians for dealing with Native races. With the recollection fresh in his mind of the massacre of Circassians, of the deportation of whole tribes of those gallant mountaineers, hundreds of miles from their native hills, to the unhealthy swamps of the Volga, and of the slaughter of 20,000 Turcomans, men, women, and children, by Skobeleff's armies, he might be excused for not appreciating the instances of successful administration to which the noble Lord had referred. Both the noble Lord and the hon. Member had omitted to notice the maltreatment of the Mussulman population throughout these Provinces since the present Government came into Office. For every Armenian who had suffered at the hands of the Mussulmans, 50 Mussulmans had been maltreated by the Russians; but the pseudo-philanthropists opposite had not a word to say on the subject. Nor had the country at large heard much of this, because the Government had not published the Reports of the Consuls in Bulgaria; and the unfortunate people themselves had no newspapers or other means of agitating.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE stated that the last Blue Book contained several remonstrances he had himself made on this subject.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said, he was very glad to hear that one Member, at any rate, of the Government had had the humanity to remonstrate; but the Government, as a whole, had done nothing of the kind, and the remonstrances, such as they were, were late and ineffectual. He considered it most unfair to press these conditions on Turkey—a weak and distracted Government—while they did not protest against other Powers ill-treating the Mussulman population. Then there was another aspect of the question—namely, that of justice. Various important conditions favourable to Turkey in the Treaty of Berlin had not been fulfilled; and, in the Amendment he had placed upon the Paper, he affirmed that, while important stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin, which were made for the advantage of the Ottoman Empire, were unfulfilled, it was unjust to press the Armenian Question. The stipulations referred to were the demolition of the Bulgarian fortresses, and the Turkish occupation of the Balkans. Then there was the question of Batoum, which was to be a free port, and was not to be fortified; but it was now one of the strongest fortresses on the Black Sea; and our latest news was to the effect that, instead of a practically free entry for our goods, import duties of between 30 and 50 per cent were imposed on them by the Russians. There was also the question of the Bulgarian tribute, which had not been paid. These, with the Armenian reforms, made five stipulations of the Treaty which had been neglected; and yet this question of Armenia was pressed, above all the others, merely to satisfy a certain section of hon. Members on the opposite Benches. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets had told the House a good deal about the maltreatment of the Christian population of Armenia; but could he prove that the outrages in Armenia were equal in number to the outrages in Ireland, which, in 1881, were no fewer than 4,718? Unless he could do that, surely for the present British Government to censure Turkey for misgovernment savoured very strongly of hypocrisy. He thought it would be wiser for hon. Members to endeavour to improve affairs at home before they turned their attention to the affairs of a foreign country. He must admit that, to a certain extent, Ireland had recently improved; but it was entirely under Star Chambers, secret inquisitions, and military occupation that the improvement had been brought about—a means which, if the Turks ventured to use, would bring upon them the reprobation of hon. Members opposite, from one end of the Benches to the other. And yet the Government were railing at the poor, ruined, bankrupt Turkish Empire, while they themselves were actually carrying out a more repressive policy than Turkey, and that within a few miles of the Metropolis of the Empire. Until the Government were prepared to accept remonstrances from Turkey as to their misgovernment of Ireland, it was obviously unjust for them to interfere in Turkish affairs. Then there was the question of expediency. Her Majesty's Government had practically alienated, by their constant and pointless persecution, the Turkish Government and people, the only Ally we could look to for aid when the great struggle took place between this country and Russia for the possession of our Indian Empire. It was all very well to talk about and profess sympathy with those Christian populations; but did the Government think they would receive a single jot or tittle of help at such a time from Greek, Bulgarian, or Armenian? If so, he could assure them they were mistaken. Their only hope of obtaining support and alliance in the future was to strengthen the Turkish Empire; and, while they pressed reforms upon it, prove to it —not by specious phrases, but by acts—that they were really and truly its friends, as Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Palmerston had been. But, unhappily, wherever the present Government had interfered—whether in Zululand, in Ireland, in the Transvaal, or in Turkey—their interference upon false humanitarian principles had caused more trouble and ruin than had been known since the time of Attila and Jenghis Khan. The hon. Gentleman who had introduced this subject sneered at Turkish paper Constitutions. In that respect he only followed the lead of the Chief of the Liberal Party, when he indulged in sneers at the Constitution introduced by Midhat Pasha. But he could inform the hon. Gentleman that there was no race better fitted for Constitutional government than the Mussulmans of Turkey, who were a thoughtful, sedate, and inoffensive people; and it was possible that a Turkish Parliament might set an example in moderation and wisdom to the Parliament of this country. It had been said that good Governors could not be obtained in Turkey. To that proposition he demurred, and would mention as men who had filled their posts creditably, Midhat, Ahmed Vefyk, Mouktar, and Rustem Pashas, who had all proved themselves excellent Governors of Provinces; while Her Majesty's Ministers themselves acknowledged the abilities of the new Governor of the Lebanon. If reforms could be carried out in Turkish Armenia, he, for one, should be very glad; but he would most emphatically protest against that autonomy which meant the disintegration of the Turkish Empire. Turkey could no more afford to grant autonomy to Armenia than Great Britain could to Ireland; in fact, the danger of Russian aggression would be increased if such a step were taken. Much had been made of the fact that there had been a conspiracy among the Armenians in Erzeroum. It should not be forgotten, however, that a similar conspiracy had been discovered in Tiflis, which was under Russian rule. The reason of Turkey's weakness was not the cruelty, but the mildness with which she had governed her Christian subjects in the past; while the reason Russia was strong and successful was that she forcibly assimilated her subject populations. The rule of Russia was like the rule pursued by Cromwell in Ireland; while Turkey had always tolerated Christianity in the races she had conquered; and her conduct in this matter in the 17th century had been favourably contrasted with that of the Roman Catholics and Protestants of Germany towards each other. He feared, by the appearance of the House, that the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite would be carried, and that we should one day, when struggling with Russia for supremacy in India, regret our treatment of Turkey. Bearing in mind how vast our interests were in India, he held that it would be very inexpedient to alienate from us so important a Mahomedan Power as Turkey. In conclusion, he protested that it was unjust to press this single, difficult, and troublesome question upon Turkey at the present moment, when our Government hardly raised its little finger to protect the Mussulman population from oppression, outrage, and annihilation, and when so many of the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin were completely disregarded.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, he thought that the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce) had done good service in calling attention to the subject before the House. The gravity of the situation could hardly be exaggerated, for if reforms were not introduced by the Porte, nothing could avert the downfall of Turkey. He held that it was a matter of vital importance that the reforms promised in the Treaty of Berlin to Armenia and other Provinces should be carried out, for the refusal to grant them might be made the excuse of an attack upon the Ottoman Empire. In 1880, Sir Henry Layard stated that though two years had elapsed since the Treaty of Berlin, the condition of the subject Provinces was worse instead of better; and now matters were still worse than in 1880. No one could deny that Turkish Ministers had many difficulties to contend with in commencing any reforms; but the breathing space afforded them by the intervention of the European Powers had been allowed to expire without any step being taken. They were face to face again with the same state of things which, in the year 1876, culminated ultimately in that explosion which would have brought ruination to the Turkish Empire, if it had not been saved by the intervention of the Powers with the Treaty of Berlin. The process with which they were face to face was one which might again involve complications of the gravest kind. That process must either result in an uprising on the part of the outlying Provinces of the Turkish Empire, or in its disintegration.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that there was only one thing in which he agreed with the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett), and that was in his remark that the Mahomedans were as fit for self-government as anybody else. That remark was in support of the view which the Treaty of Berlin took, that the only way to save the Turkish Empire was to establish local autonomy in the Provinces. The government of the Turkish officials was thoroughly rotten and bad, and the Pashas grew rich, while even the widows of the soldiers who had fallen in battle were left to starve. He gave every credit to the virtues of the Turkish people; but the government of the Pashas was another thing; it was the worst on the face of the world, and it was quite impossible that it could be reformed. It was, therefore, somewhat cold comfort to find that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs could only give the Pashas another eloquent warning. He quite sympathized with the Motion of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), and hoped it would be adopted; but, if he might make a criticism upon it, it was the precedence which it gave to the 61st Article of the Treaty of Berlin over the 23rd Article. That Article established definite and distinct obligations, whereas the 61st Article amounted to some indefinite promise of reform. In Armenia there was a certain antagonism of races, so much so that even if autonomy were granted it would be applied with great disadvantages. Therefore, while he entirely sympathized with his hon. Friend in the hope that means might be devised whereby the condition of the inhabitants of Armenia and Asia Minor might be greatly ameliorated, he was not at all so sanguine that it was possible to effect so great advantages in any other way as by giving real and effective force to the

23rd Article of the Treaty of Berlin. He had never been able to understand why that distinct and well-marked obligation had not been more strongly pressed upon the Turkish Government. If this country was in a position to enforce Article 23, he hoped it would not do so single-handed. Possibly, if application were made to the other Powers to join this country in enforcing it, they might say that this country had already had its share of plunder in Egypt, and they would not assist it to get more. He hoped the Prime Minister, or some other Member of the Government, would be able to throw some light upon the subject.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, this discussion has undoubtedly been distinguished, upon the whole, by a remarkable unanimity of sentiment in the House. It has been observed by the hon. Member who formed the single exception to that unanimity of sentiment (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) that the attendance of Members in the House has been very limited.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. GLADSTONE, resuming, said: The smallness of the attendance which has just been practically illustrated is due to the very unanimity of sentiment to which I have referred as prevailing on this subject. There are enough of contentious questions in this House; and the mass of Business it has to face is so great that it is no wonder that Members, on matters on which they are of one way of thinking, should retire from the House and enjoy such a period of repose as they can from time to time appropriate. That hon. Member who has, as I have said, made himself an exception, bestowed pretty copiously the benefit of his opinions upon the House, and immediately after withdrew from it. I am very sorry that he did so; because, although I do not think that anyone in this House concurs in what he says, yet, viewing the time of the night he made his speech, it is possible that some portion of it may be reported, and some portion of those out-of-doors might give a degree of credit to some of the extraordinary allegations that he made. It is the universal practice of that hon. Member to deal in large and broad assertions, and, in proportion as they are bold and even extravagant, to insist upon it that they are palpable and notorious facts known to all the world. This is a method which, undoubtedly, answers with a limited portion of the community, for they believe where there is so much smoke there must be fire, and that there is something in it, even after a liberal discount applied to the breadth of the statements of the hon. Gentleman. Now, one-half of the speech of the hon. Member was upon Russia and Ireland; and that half I will brush aside with the single remark that it has no connection with the question before us. But the hon. Member said that autonomy was the ruin of the Turkish Empire. In my opinion, the actual condition of the Turkish Empire at this moment supplies the best answer to that statement. No doubt, when autonomy is extracted from Turkey at the sword's point, that autonomy could not possibly be advantageous to the Turkish Empire. That is to say, the memory of the old wrongs remain; and I do not imagine that Bulgaria is more grateful or attached than it was five years ago. But there are other cases of autonomy in the Turkish Empire where the autonomy was not obtained at the sword's point. For example, the important Island of Crete enjoys a large measure of autonomy; and I affirm that Crete, with that autonomy, is tranquil, and not a source of danger to the Turkish Empire, which it was before the autonomy was granted. There is another notable instance in the Island of Samos, where autonomy has been long enjoyed, and where, as a consequence, no difficulty has ever arisen in carrying on the Government of Turkey, and the Island has never formed a portion of the danger which overhangs the Ottoman Empire. The hon. Gentleman says we have scoffed at the Turkish Constitution, and have done all we could to destroy it. Now, I agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down that it is exceedingly wrong to maintain that men, because they are Mahomedans, are unfit for self-government; and if the hon. Gentleman the Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) had that knowledge, which he always professes to have, he would know that we have made known our sentiments about the revival of the Turkish Constitution in terms not hostile, but highly friendly to the Government of Turkey. He says we are looking with perfect indifference on the oppression of the Mahomedans in Bulgaria.

His statistics, I believe, will not bear a better examination than any of his assertions. I have invariably stated that, while all oppression is detestable, the oppression practised by Christians upon a Mahomedan population is worse than that of a Mahomedan Government on a Christian population. I believe that is the estimate we must form in proportion as we believe the Christian religion to be a religion of light, and a religion of love. There is one point, however, which goes to the root of the whole matter. The hon. Gentleman says—"Do not be so cruel as to press upon Turkey the reform of her Government; it is not fair; go and look for purity elsewhere; consider the weakness of Turkey, and do not oppress and afflict her." The hon. Gentleman thinks himself the friend of Turkey; but, in my opinion, he is one of her worst enemies. Our contention is that it is by misgovernment that Turkey has suffered the terrible dismemberments which have again and again come upon her; and if she is to neutralize in the future those dangers from which she has so cruelly suffered, there is but one mode of doing it, and that is by endeavouring to bring her populations out of a state of discontent into a state of tolerance and content. Therefore, it would be a breach of duty on the part of the Government and of the House, if we were to show indifference to the recommendation of a course of policy to Turkey by which alone, as we believe, the hope is offered, either of maintaining the general tranquillity of the East, or of maintaining the power now wielded by the Turkish Empire. We recognize the sentiments of my hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), especially in all he said with regard to the granting of automony to Armenia. In reference to that, I will only say that, for my own part, the measure which I believe to be by far the most urgent, and by far the most valuable, at all events, in what lies near at hand, is the appointment of a good Governor with a sufficient amount of power and independence. That is really the shape in my view, and I think in the view of my Colleagues generally, in which reform is the simplest, the safest, and the most effective. Let us see what follows. We have seen admirable consequences result from it in the Lebanon, in Crete, and elsewhere; and undoubtedly the first step which it is most desirable to secure for Armenia is that which is most desirable elsewhere. Speaking generally, I acknowledge at once not only the soundness of the principles of my hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets, but likewise the moderation of language and the perfect candour with which he laid his views before the House. We acknowledge, in the fullest sense, the obligations under which we lie. I so far agree even with the hon. Member for Eye (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) that I think every Member of the Government of this country would recoil from the idea of what may be called worrying the Porte. There is no good to be done by that; but frank and kindly statements from time to time, and particularly as special occasions arise, which give an opportunity of enforcing by just and reasonable argument the views we entertain — those are ideas which we not only consider politic, but in the highest degree binding upon us. They are binding upon us under the Treaty of Berlin, and they are binding upon us in an especial degree with respect to Armenia, for these two reasons. In the first place, in the case of Armenia, we distinctly deprived the Armenians of the title which they had acquired, under the Treaty of San Stefano, to make a direct appeal to Russia single-handed to interfere on their behalf. Consequently, we have taken over the obligation which was previously incumbent upon Russia, and with respect to which, of course, there may be those who believe that Russia might be tempted to use it for purposes of her own, as well as for the general purposes of humanity. But, besides that, we have undertaken a distinct and separate obligation under what is called the Anglo-Turkish Convention. I do not propose to enter upon the merits of that Convention; but, whatever be the opinion which I, together with my present Colleagues, may have entertained of that Convention, it undoubtedly imposed on this country certain obligations. I will not now attempt to define their extent, or the contingencies on which those obligations might be modified or altered; but one obligation is clear and unquestionable from the nature and the terms of that Convention. It is our obligation to endeavour, for the advantage of the Sultan as well as for the advantage of the people, to recommend and secure good government in Armenia. We, therefore, fully accept the statement of obligations incumbent upon us, and we acknowledge the duty which we are bound, according as opportunity offers, to endeavour to perform. Then, to come to the question, what should we ask the House to do with the Motion of my hon. Friend? I believe my hon. Friend has expressed himself as very anxious that this Motion should be adopted by the House. I am persuaded that we are under no doubt as to the general views and intentions of the House, which we believe to be in perfect accord with our own and with those of my hon. Friend in this matter; and I think it is, perhaps, open to some question how far it would be advantageous for this House, without very special occasion, to place upon its Journals records of opinion such as is conveyed in this Motion. There is no objection to the Motion that I can plead, excepting one, which would be removed by the withdrawal of a few words. My hon. Friend asks the House to express its trust that Her Majesty's Government will do certain things in conjunction with the other Powers of Europe who are signataries to the Treaty of Berlin. I do not, in the least degree, object to accept from the House a general instruction as to our duties under the Treaty of Berlin, and under the Anglo-Turkish Convention; nor do I in principle object, so far as we are concerned, to accept from the House an instruction which points out to us, in a somewhat marked and definite manner, the duty of making applications to other Powers of Europe to concur with us for this purpose. But, on the other hand, I will say, and my hon. Friend may rely upon it, that it is not a subject which has escaped our notice. I may refer to what took place in 1880 with respect to the Montenegrin Frontier, and I may refer to the efforts we made to bring the Concert of Europe to bear on the settlement of the Egyptian Question, as clear proof that we do not, in the slightest degree, recede from the broad and general proposition that whenever the Concert of Europe can be had it is our duty to seek it, as frequently that Concert of Europe has been the means of obviating danger which could not otherwise have been averted. At the same time, my hon. Friend will agree with me that a latitude must be left to us as to the time and circumstances when we should make application to the Powers of Europe for this purpose; and I will venture to say that if this Motion is to be adopted by the House I will make no objection, provided my hon. Friend will agree to withdraw from it the words "in conjunction with the other Powers of Europe, signataries of the Treaty of Berlin." That will in no respect weaken the general direction of the expression by the House of the strong view it takes of the obligations of this country under the Treaty of Berlin. There will be an advantage in it, inasmuch as it will bring within the declaration of the House our obligations under the Anglo-Turkish Convention. That is the recommendation which I make to my hon. Friend, and that is the condition on which the Government will accept the Motion. While my hon. Friend recommends these reforms; while, by a declaration of this kind, he wishes to see that the Government are supported by the sympathy of the House; and while he has primarily in view the welfare of the Armenian people, and of the people of other Provinces, yet he likewise does believe that the welfare of the Ottoman Government is as much involved in the question as any other consideration, and that, by the course of improvement which he desires to recommend, and by that alone, can dangers, which I still fear may be deemed to overhang it, be averted or mitigated.

Mr. BRYCE intimated his willingness to omit the words to which the Prime Minister had taken exception.

Mr. THOMASSON asked the Government to consider whether they had the means of applying financial pressure on the Porte. There was a large sum payable in respect of Cyprus; but he did not know whether any actual payments had been made. Certainly, mere remonstrances would have no effect with the Turkish Government.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and in European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin,"—(*Mr Bryce,*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and in European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

IRELAND—UTILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

OBSERVATIONS.

DR. LYONS, in rising to move the following Resolution:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in view of the state of Ireland, that measures be taken to utilise her abundant, but dormant, natural resources, by—1st, Re-afforesting suitable tracts of her waste lands, and planting the great watersheds, in order to supply shelter and timber, and to control mountain floods, which are progressively denuding the soil, silting up primary and arterial drainage, with consequent deterioration of tillage and pasture lands, shoaling of navigable rivers, and banishment of fish further and further seaward, and by general reclamation of waste lands; 2nd, by fully developing the sea-coast and inland fisheries, with all requisite improvements in engines of capture, and piers and harbours of refuge, in order to the better food supply of the people, and the extension of the commerce in fish; 3rd, by the extension of lines of internal communication by water and land, by steam or horse power, and the construction of new routes for traffic, where necessary, by the development of the fuel resources of Ireland, and the extension of industries in mines, minerals, and agriculture: That, in the opinion of this House, means may be safely devised for the utilisation of part of the capital of thirty-two millions sterling, now lying comparatively idle in Ireland, for the development of her resources, by the issue of stock notes under the guarantee of the Irish or Imperial Revenues, and under the management of a Department of Productive Works, having the full confidence of the Country,"

said, this was not the first occasion on which he had called the attention of the House to this subject. He had done so previously; and when in Ireland last October he brought the matter forward, it excited general attention and consideration in all quarters.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

The House was adjourned at a quarter before Nine o'clock without Question first put till *Monday* next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 28th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) (59); General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Broughty Ferry Paving) * (55).

Committee—Report—Local Government Provisional Orders * (54).

Report — Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) * (27).

Third Reading—Customs and Inland Revenue *, and *passed.*

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (UNREFORMED) BILL.—(No. 59.)

(*The Earl of Rosebery.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, he need not trouble their Lorships with any remarks, beyond saying that it was practically the same measure as had passed through that House last year. Its object was simply to remove certain small and anomalous jurisdictions, to the removal of which the boroughs affected had no objection.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Rosebery.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* nex.

PARKS (METROPOLIS)—RICHMOND PARK—THE ROEHAMPTON GATE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether any arrangements have been made by which the public may gain free entrance by the Roehampton Gate to Richmond Park? That gate, at the present time, was practically at the disposal of Mrs. Prescott, who owned the lane leading from it, and who had erected a barrier just inside it; but he understood that the gatekeeper had a key of the Park gate and could admit the friends of Mrs. Prescott into the Park. The gate was two miles nearer to London than either of the other entrances to the Park, and, being adjacent to Barnes Common, it was more easily approachable. If it were opened it would be a great blessing to all classes of people, and would tend greatly to facilitate excursions to Richmond Park. It was highly desirable, therefore, that this gate should be opened to the public.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON said, he hoped his noble Friend's Question would draw the attention of the Government pointedly to this subject. At one time he had the honour of representing in the House of Commons the constituency in which this gate was situated; and 14 years ago he brought a deputation of his constituents to Mr. Ayrton, the First Commissioner of Works, when they received an assurance that the matter was under the consideration of the Administration, and that there was a hope that it would be speedily set at rest. The inconvenience was serious. It had gone on from that time to the present, and successive Governments seemed to have made no effort whatever to remove it. It was ridiculous that the rights of a private individual over some 10 yards of space should cut off the public from what would be a most important accommodation, to which the illustrious Duke the Ranger of Richmond Park had no objection. It was simply a dog-in-the-manger prevention placed in the way of the public by one selfish individual.

LORD SUDELEY said, it was understood that Mrs. Prescott was willing to sell Clarence Lane for £2,000. The First Commissioner, however, did not think it would be right that the general taxpayer should be called upon to effect a purchase of purely local interest, or to incur the permanent expense of maintaining the road hereafter. The proper course would be that those persons in the neighbourhood who were interested in the matter should themselves purchase the lane, and hand it over to be maintained by the parish. If this were done, the First Commissioner would advise the illustrious Duke, the Ranger, to open the Roehampton Gate in the same way as the other gates were opened. Unless the purchase were effected, it would be useless for him to open the gate when a closed barrier immediately met those who passed through it. As regarded the question of the gatekeeper having a key which enable Mrs. Prescott and her friends to use the gate, he could only say that although certain keys were issued in former days to some privileged persons, the system had been long discontinued, and no keys whatever were now issued. He was not aware that Mrs. Prescott had special power to use the gate, and it was understood that she never received a key.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE said, that the gatekeeper also kept the key of the barrier. Consequently, Mrs. Prescott and her friends were the only people who could use the gate at all.

LORD SUDELEY said, there were very few keys in existence, and the Chief Commissioner of Works was not aware that Mrs. Prescott possessed one, or that the gatekeeper opened the gate to those who passed the barrier.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—HYDE PARK CORNER.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL FORTESCUE asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether they will object to complete their admirable improvement at Hyde Park Corner by opening a second carriage exit close to the lodge opposite Apsley House, as there is already a second carriage entrance there for the westward traffic; or, still better, making that a second carriage entrance, and the present second carriage entrance an exit on account of the rule of the road? He congratulated the Government on the great improvement which they had effected; and he hoped they would complete that improvement by providing a second carriage exit, for which there was ample room. There was space for a carriage way of 10 feet wide, like those through the three arches, with a footway on one side.

EARL CADOGAN said, he cordially joined with the noble Earl in his congratulation of the Government upon the admirable and substantial improvement they had effected at Hyde Park Corner, and in the suggestion which he had made; but he would like to embrace that opportunity of asking the noble Lord whether the Chief Commissioner of Works contemplated taking any steps to obviate the congestion of traffic between Hamilton Place and Piccadilly? Now was the time when such steps could be taken by the Department, either by widening Piccadilly or by some other means; and without this were done the improvement which had been made would be inadequate.

Viscount SIDMOUTH asked whether the Government would postpone their decision in reference to the final disposition of the Duke of Wellington's statue until after the Notice on the Paper—but without a date—by the noble and gallant Lord (Lord Strathnairn) should have been disposed of, as the noble and gallant Lord was a great authority on the subject?

The Earl of REDESDALE (Chairman of Committees) said, that the Notice had recently been placed on the Paper for Thursday.

Lord SUDELEY: The question of making a second carriage exit from Hyde Park, opposite Apsley House, has been for some time under the consideration of the Office of Works. They have also received a very large number of other suggestions and recommendations, some practical and some very unpractical. The First Commissioner does not, however, propose to make any other alteration at Hyde Park Corner until sufficient experience has been obtained during the next few months of the result of the great alteration and improvement which have lately been carried out. In any case it would be necessary to obtain further money, and no additional Vote is intended to be taken this year. As regards the congestion of Hamilton Place, it is, no doubt, perfectly true that some accumulation of traffic exists there; but the noble Earl must admit that it is considerably less than it was before Hyde Park Corner was thrown open. The First Commissioner is watching the subject very carefully, though he does not see his way to make any proposal at present. The congestion might be very considerably altered if the Metropolitan Board of Works were to see their way to open another through route from the north to Piccadilly. There are at present only two, and a large portion of the traffic is thrown on to Hamilton Place. As the Notice on the subject of the Duke of Wellington's statue is coming before your Lordships on Thursday, I will defer my remarks upon it till that day.

House adjourned at Five o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 28th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* Civil Service Estimates—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings, Votes 15 to 18a.
Resolutions [May 24] *reported.*
Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Withdrawn*—Dudley, Sedgley, and Wolverhampton Tramways*.
Public Bills—*Ordered—First Reading*—Registry of Deeds (Ireland)* [202].
Committee—Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) [171]—R.P.
Considered as amended—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders* [147].
Third Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders* [153]; Poor Law Conferences* [187], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

INDIA — CEYLON — PRIVILEGE OF FRANKING LETTERS—THE BISHOP OF COLOMBO.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Governor of Ceylon has in compliance with the Despatch of the Earl of Derby of the 26th January, 1883, republished a list of the Government officers in Ceylon having the privilege of franking letters and omitting therefrom the name of the Bishop of Colombo; and, if not, if he will inform the House why the directions of the Secretary of State for the Colonies have been disregarded; and, whether it is the intention of the Secretary of State to allow any further delay in carrying out his instructions?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: The new list of the Government officers in Ceylon having the privilege of franking was published and issued at Colombo on the 20th of April.

IRELAND—STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION.

MR. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can state how far the recommendations of the Local Government Board, as stated in their Letter of the 18th November, 1882, addressed to the Irish Government, have been carried out as to the limiting of each party of emigrants to a number not exceeding fifteen families in each ship, and as to the emigration of whole families at a time, and the appointment of suitable agents, male and female, at the ports of embarkation and reception; and, if he will cause weekly Returns to be prepared, showing the rate at which the people are being assisted to emigrate, and the districts from which they come?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the hon. Member quotes from a letter written in the earlier stages of the proceedings. Later experience showed that it was neither practicable nor necessary to limit each party of emigrants, as proposed, to 15 families. Shipping Companies sent their vessels out of the ordinary route to enable emigrants to embark conveniently, and it could not be expected that they would do this for the conveyance of small parties. The contemplated necessity for the limitation of numbers has been obviated, in consequence of the arrangements made that no persons should be allowed to go to the United States except those who could show that they had there friends in a position to assist them. The other proposed arrangements—namely, as to emigration by families and the appointment of agents—have been carried out. I am informed that it would be very inconvenient to have weekly Returns prepared as suggested, as the time of all persons engaged in the emigration work is fully occupied, and they find it difficult to keep pace with the duties already devolving on them. I have, however, numerical Returns prepared, which will show the state of the case up to the present time.

INDIA—CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the telegraphic account of the proceedings of the Legislative Council of Calcutta on "Mr. Ilbert's Bill," which was furnished to the English Press through Mr. Reuter's agency, was authorised and its transmission directed by the Government of India; whether the expense of transmission was defrayed out of the revenues of India; and, whether, if it was so authorised, there will be any objection to lay it upon the Table of the House, so that it may be compared with any fuller reports since received?

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the summary of the Debate in the Legislative Council on Mr. Ilbert's Native Jurisdiction Bill, which was telegraphed by Reuter's Agency on 12th March, was supplied to the Agency and its transmission paid for by the Indian Government; whether several or most of the speeches in opposition to the Bill, including those of General Wilson and the Lieutenant Governor, were either entirely omitted or inadequately reported, while those made in support of the Bill were reported at much greater length; whether Reuter's Agent at Calcutta, who sent it, now states that the report "was sent on account of Government as an exposition of their views;" and, whether he will cause to be printed and laid upon the Table of the House an inadequate and impartial report of the Debate in question?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Sir, reference having been made to the Viceroy, he has replied that the telegraphic account of the debate of March 9 on the Jurisdiction Bill was authorized, and its transmission paid for by the Government of India, in the same manner as the telegraphic summary of the Budget Statement. There is no objection to laying a copy of the telegram on the Table. The full Report of the debate has been received, and will be presented to-day. Perhaps the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire will accept this as an answer to his Question also.

POOR LAW—CASE OF WILLIAM DAVIS.

MR. LEWIS asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has been made aware of the circumstances under which a pauper of the name of William Davis, with his wife and three children, were removed from Plymouth Union to that of Londonderry, which place he left fourteen years ago; whether it is true that he had resided at Plymouth ten years continuously, and at the time of his removal was engaged in weekly service, earning 22*s.* a-week, and was the holder of a tenement furnishd by himself; that about the 1st of May he was ordered to proceed to Ireland; that a few days afterwards, owing to his refusal to leave Plymouth, his wife and children were forcibly seized by policemen and placed on board ship for Dublin; that the pretence or ground for such proceedings was that during two or three months absence of Davis from work, in hospital owing to ill health early in this year, the wife was allowed out-door relief of 4*s.* 6*d.* per week; that this man had a pension as a retired gunner in the Royal Artillery, in which he served fourteen and a-half years, and had a good character and possessed two good conduct badges; whether the Plymouth guardians could not have recouped themselves the small amount of relief expended on this family by applying for repayment out of Davis's pension; whether the conduct of the Plymouth magistrates and guardians was legal; and, whether he will take any steps open to him to prevent a renewal of such proceedings under the present Law?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, in reply, said, he wrote a letter on the subject, and had received an answer only a few hours ago. On a comparison of the question and answer some legal points had arisen which would require consideration; and, therefore, he would request the hon. Gentleman to be so good as to give a little further time before requiring a definite answer.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SUB-INSPECTOR SMITH.

Mr. LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether an official inquiry into the alleged misconduct of Mr. Sub-Inspector Smith, of Moville, has recently been held; and, whether the result of that inquiry has been entirely favourable to that officer, and goes to prove that he has been attempted to be injured on account of the faithful performance of his duty in the preservation of law and order, and in the suppression of illegal proceedings?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the charges against Sub-Inspector Smith were contained in anonymous letters. He, however, courted the fullest inquiry with regard to them; and they were searchingly investigated by a Court of Inquiry which was sitting with reference to the discipline of the station. By the finding of the Court Mr. Smith was exonerated in the fullest and most emphatic terms.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SUICIDE OF SUB-CONSTABLE COLEMAN.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Under what circumstances did an Irish policeman named Coleman meet his death, on the 18th April 1883?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, Sub-Constable Coleman, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, committed suicide by cutting his throat with his own razor on the morning of the 18th of April. It does not appear that any reason can be assigned. During the previous month he had been somewhat silent and desponding; but nothing was observed in his conduct to lead his comrades to believe that he was insane.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE X.—THE VARNA RAILWAY CLAIMS.

Mr. DIXON-HARTLAND asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will state if any, and, if so, what steps are being taken by Her Majesty's Government with the view of carrying out Article X. of the Treaty of Berlin, by which the Bulgarian Government was substituted for the Ottoman Government in the liability to pay to the Varna Railway Company the annual subsidy of three and a-half millions of francs (£140,000), and which sum, guaranteed by Turkey in the original concession, is now nearly five years in arrear, and amounts to about £670,000; and, if he will state why the only Article of the Treaty of Berlin directly affecting British subjects is so long allowed to remain in abeyance?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, Her Majesty's Government have repeatedly urged on the Bulgarian Government the necessity of coming to some definite arrangement with a view to a settlement of these outstanding claims. They are at present awaiting the reply of that Government to a proposal which Her Majesty's Agent at Sofia was instructed to make on the 14th of March last, that the whole question involving the interpretation of Article X. of the Treaty of Berlin should be referred to the signatory Powers of that

Treaty, and settled in conference by their Representatives at Constantinople. Mr. Lascelles has also been instructed to press that some payment on account should be made at once to the Varna Railway Company. Some delay has been caused by recent Ministerial changes at Sofia.

Mr. DIXON-HARTLAND asked whether the noble Lord was aware that a similar answer had been given nearly six months ago; and whether the Government would press the payment of the money to the suffering bondholders, who were nearly starved out, owing to the way in which they had been treated?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, that he was fully aware of that; but there were great difficulties in the way of the Foreign Office. Would the hon. Gentleman put the Question again?

Mr. DIXON-HARTLAND asked, how soon should he repeat the Question?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, he would communicate with the hon. Gentleman.

PARLIAMENT — ALLEGED CANDIDATURE OF MR. SUB-COMMISSIONER WYLIE.

Mr. LONG asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he has heard that Mr. Wylie, a legal Sub-Commissioner under the Land Act, intends to stand at the next Election for an Ulster County, in which he was recently employed in the judicial reduction of rents; and, whether he will at once ascertain the accuracy of this report, and take steps to prevent or discourage such a grave judicial scandal?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have in my hand a copy of a letter written by Mr. Wylie to Mr. Commissioner Litton, in which he denies in the most absolute and emphatic terms that there is or ever was any foundation whatever for the rumour referred to in this Question. He expresses himself warmly at it being supposed that he would be capable of making use of his judicial position to further such an object. The noble Lord the Member for Liverpool (Lord Claud Hamilton) and the hon. and gallant Member for the County of Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) will probably think this a sufficient answer to the Questions on the same subject which stand on the Paper in their names. I think it is only fair to Mr. Wylie to add that this disavowal was quite spontaneous on his part, and was received from him several days before Notice of these Questions was given; but, as the report appeared in the newspapers, no one can wonder at the Question having been put.

Mr. GIBSON said, that, though the answer was satisfactory, he begged to give Notice that in Committee on the Corrupt Practices Bill he should move a provision to make such a thing as that referred to in the Question impossible.

PARLIAMENT—PRIVILEGE—PETITIONS—FRAUDULENT SIGNATURES.

Mr. MONK asked the Chairman of the Select Committee on Public Petitions, Whether, considering that the Committee have reported to the House in their tenth Report of this Session that, in the case of no less than twenty-eight Petitions on various subjects, many of the signatures are in the same handwriting, the Committee will take the facts into their further consideration, with a view to the suggestion of some means for preventing for the future such breaches of the Orders of the House?

Sir CHARLES FORSTER: Sir, in answer to the Question of my hon. Friend, I regret to state that not only in the 10th, but also in previous Reports during the present Session, the Committee on Public Petitions have been obliged to notice serious irregularities in connection with the signatures to the Petitions. The Report to which he more specially refers contains upwards of 30 cases where the signatures are in the same handwriting, with other informalities, such as signatures on slips of paper attached afterwards to the Petition. Such facts, no doubt, constitute a breach of the Orders of the House, which, according to our invariable practice, have been set forth in our Reports. But in answer to the further Question of my hon. Friend as to—

> "Whether the Committee will take these facts into further consideration, with a view to preventing for the future such breaches of the Orders of the House?"

I have to state that, in the opinion of the Committee, this is a Question rather for the House than for us. Our special function is to examine the Petitions to see if the Standing Orders have been complied with, and to report to the House any infraction thereof. There, properly speaking, our duty ends, though we are always ready to follow any direction of the House on the subject. I may here remind my hon. Friend that in the Session of 1879, in response to the general feeling of the House, on behalf of the Committee I proposed and carried a new Standing Order, providing that those names only should be counted as to which the addresses of the parties signing were given. This Order has been rigorously followed, though it has not hitherto answered all our expectations in correcting these irregularities. Then, again, the House has not unfrequently vindicated its privileges, on the Report of the Committee as to these tainted Petitions, by discharging the Order for their lying on the Table, while in more serious cases the offenders have been visited by severe penal treatment. Such an instance occurred in the first year of my Office as Chairman of the Committee, now nearly 20 years ago. I refer to the well-known Azim Jah Petition, where a deliberate system of fraud and forgery was proved, parties having been hired to get up Petitions by a payment of so much per sheet, and where, after full investigation, the offenders were committed to Newgate for the remainder of the Session. Certainly, if the ancient Constitutional right of Petition is not to fall into contempt, some further safeguards are required to suppress these practices. This would necessitate a revision of the Standing Orders. Looking to the period of the Session, the state of Public Business, and to the fact that the pressure of Petitions is over for the present, we think that further action had better be deferred till next Session. My hon. Friend has, however, done good service by calling attention to the subject; and we will take care, meanwhile, that full publicity is given to the Rules and Standing Orders of the House with respect to Petitions, so that all Petition-mongers may be warned as to the risks to which they expose themselves when they attempt in any way to contravene them.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—LIMERICK GAOL.

MR. SYNAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, notwithstanding that the Roman Catholics in the County Limerick Gaol are 90 per cent. of the inmates, the governor, chief warder, schoolmaster, and other high officials are all Protestant; and, whether, in consequence of the resignation of the governor, a remedy will be applied to that inequality?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the General Prisons Board inform me that of the 18 officers in Limerick Male Prison, 10 are Roman Catholics; and of the three principal officers—namely, the Governor, chief warder, and clerk, the two former are Protestants. It is impossible to appoint a chief warder who is a Roman Catholic; and I know very well the reason why. [*Cries of* "Why?"] The reason is, because there is no available officer for that position who is disposable from any other prison. A Governor has not yet been appointed; but I think it will be difficult to make arrangements by which the office can be given to a Roman Catholic.

MR. SYNAN: Can a Catholic schoolmaster be appointed?

MR. TREVELYAN: The answer I have received does not mention the schoolmaster.

MR. O'KELLY: Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House why there are no officers disposable for promotion to the position of chief warder?

MR. TREVELYAN: The reason is that the prisons ranking as first class are not very numerous in Ireland; and, consequently, the officers available for the position of chief warder are not very numerous either.

MR. HARRINGTON: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether Limerick is a first-class prison at all?

MR. TREVELYAN: It has been made a first-class prison.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. M'FARLANE.

MR. W. J. CORBET asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Lord Chancellor has come to any decision in the case of Mr. M'Farlane, the magistrate against whom a verdict was recently had for blowing up his neighbour's premises with dynamite?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the transaction referred to took place about three years ago. The action against Captain M'Farlane was for assault and trespass. The acts complained of were done in the assertion of a right of way through the plaintiff's ground, in the course of which Captain M'Farlane blew down a portion of a wall and the pier of a gate, which he alleged obstructed his right of way. The jury found that no assault was committed by Captain M'Farlane. They also found that the right of way existed, but that it was not substantially obstructed by the pier and wall referred to, and they gave a verdict for the plaintiff, with £100 damages. Nothing transpired in the hearing of the case to warrant the Lord Chancellor in withdrawing the Commission of the Peace from Captain M'Farlane.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS — FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE — THE METROPOLITAN CATTLE MARKET.

Sir SYDNEY WATERLOW asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether, seeing that the season has now arrived when the Metropolitan Cattle Market is generally largely attended by buyers from the South Coast watering places, and in view of the largely increased supply of live stock now coming from Canada (probably more than in any former year), it is not possible to place that market upon the same footing as the other large cattle markets in Liverpool, Manchester, Wakefield, &c.?

Mr. DODSON: Sir, I am sorry to say, in the present unfortunate prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in the country, the Privy Council do not deem it expedient to remove the restriction on the movement of cattle out of the Metropolis which have been exposed in the Metropolitan Cattle Market. It has happened that on each occasion when the restrictions have been modified, and animals have been allowed to be removed, though only for the purpose of slaughter, and then only by licence, that diseased animals have been moved into the country.

CHILI AND PERU—TREATY OF PEACE.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can furnish the House with any information respecting the Treaty alleged to have been completed between the Governments of Peru and Chili?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, Her Majesty's Government have reason to believe that the news which has recently appeared of the conclusion of a Convention between the Chilian Government and General Iglesias is correct; but they have no official intelligence. As, however, the authority of General Iglesias is not undisputed, it would be premature to assume that the Convention will lead to the restoration of peace between Chili and Peru.

BOROUGH BOUNDARY COMMISSION (IRELAND)—THE REPORT.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When it is proposed to give effect to the recommendations of the Borough Boundary Commissioners (Ireland), as embodied in their Report issued last Session?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I can give no pledge on this subject. Having regard to the intricacy of the interests involved, the pressure of Public Business has been too great to allow the matter being taken up this year; but the Government hope to be able to consider it carefully before next Session.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BELFAST WORKHOUSE.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that recently a female officer in the Infirmary Department of the Belfast Workhouse was detected in the act of concealing a pauper wardsman of that institution in her bedroom for immoral purposes; if so, whether, on the matter being reported to the guardians by the master, they took any steps to reprimand the female in question, or to discontinue her services; and, whether he, as a member of the Local Government Board, will undertake to have the system adopted by some unions, of employing pauper labour, discontinued, in order to prevent a repetition of such scandals, and, in this particular instance, undertake to have the officer referred to disqualified from holding any position of emolument under the Poor Law Board?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, it is the case that a few weeks ago a pauper inmate of Belfast Workhouse was found secreted in the room of one of the nurses, who at once left the employment of the Guardians and sent in her resignation. The woman having resigned, nothing further can be done; but her conduct has been noted in case she should seek employment again in the Belfast or any other Union. The Local Government Board do not think that the employment of paupers as wardsmen and wardswomen can be wholly discontinued, especially in large workhouses like Belfast; and the fact of one irregularity having occurred would not justify a change in the management of workhouses, which would entail a large expenditure in the salaries of additional subordinate officers.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. HENEAGE asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, a Copy of the Case on which a legal opinion was taken by the Privy Council as to the powers of the Government under the Act to prohibit the importation of cattle from Foreign Countries where there is reason to believe foot and mouth disease exists, and which was mentioned by Lord Carlingford in his reply to the deputation from the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture?

MR. JAMES HOWARD asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether the Privy Council is prepared to lay down any rule of action in respect of the powers vested in the Department by the Act of 1878 for prohibiting the importation of live animals from Countries where contagious diseases prevail; for instance, whether the Privy Council will put in force its powers after one cargo of animals has been landed affected with foot and mouth disease; and, if not so prepared, whether he will state how many diseased cargoes will be admitted before the Department takes the same action as it did in prohibiting importation from Portugal, Spain, and France?

MR. CHAPLIN said, he should also like to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether it is not the case that the Privy Council had undoubtedly power, under Section 35 of the Act of Henry VIII., by General or Special Order, as they may see fit, to prohibit the landing of animals from any specified country whatever?

MR. DODSON: Certainly, Sir; in answer to the first Question, I have to say that no case was stated by the Privy Council. The legal opinion referred to by Lord Carlingford to the deputation was the opinion of the Lord Chancellor, whom he had consulted. The Lord Chancellor repeated that opinion on April 16, and it will be found in the Reports of the Proceedings of the House of Lords. The existence of a power to prohibit importation from time to time from specified countries in the case of any contagious disease exists has not been doubted. That power, indeed, has been exercised against France; and I may inform the hon. Member that although France, in consequence of the action taken by the Privy Council, has recently informed us that she has adopted stringent precautionary regulations, we are about to renew that prohibition—at all events, until we see these measures fairly established and in working order. Prohibition is enforced against the importation of cattle from Germany; and we are now in communication with the German Government respecting the importation of sheep from that country. In answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard), I have to say that the Privy Council have no power to lay down one General Rule prohibiting or regulating the importation of animals from all countries in which contagious disease prevails. The powers conferred by Section 35 of the Act have been exercised from time to time as regards specified foreign countries and parts of foreign countries; and, as I have just shown, the Privy Council propose to exercise those powers as circumstances may render necessary. I should wish to add, for the assurance of hon. Members interested, that after the recent attack of foot-and-mouth disease, which entailed such heavy losses on the country, the Privy Council are more than ever alive to the necessity of proceeding with vigilance and determination in this matter.

STATE OF IRELAND—POLICE PROTECTION AT RATHFALAND, CO. CLARE.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state why the police hut erected and the constables stationed for upwards of nine months, at Rathfaland, Newmarket on Fergus, county Clare, have not yet been removed; if Mr. Denis O'Neill, for whose protection they were provided, has repeatedly declared to the authorities that he requires no such protection, and requested their removal as a useless and heavy burden upon a peaceable locality; if it is a fact that not only this district but also the surrounding places have been free from serious crime within the time which has elapsed since the erection of said hut; and if, bearing in mind the peaceful character of the neighbourhood and the cordial feelings which exist between Mr. O'Neill and the inhabitants of the locality, immediate orders will be given to remove both hut and police?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, it is the case that Mr. O'Neill states that the police at Rathfaland are not required for his protection. However, they do not appear to be there for that special object. I am informed that they are stationed there for the general preservation of the peace of the district, and that their presence is considered necessary to secure a continuance of the peaceable conditions now prevailing. The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that the cost is charged upon the locality.

JAMAICA AND THE LEEWARD ISLANDS —THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Captain PRICE asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, What is the composition of the Commission of Inquiry which, as has been stated, was examining into the question of free representation in the Island of Jamaica; and, what are its instructions, when did it commence its labours, and when may its Report be expected?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, the Commission of Inquiry consisted of Colonel Crossman, R.E., and Mr. Baden-Powell as Commissioners, with Mr. Harris, of the Colonial Office, as Secretary. Under their instructions they were to inquire into the public revenues, expenditure, debts, and liabilities of the Islands of Jamaica, Grenada, St. Vincent, Tobago, St. Lucia, and of the Leeward Islands. They commenced their work on the 6th of January in Jamaica. They have recently arrived home, and it is anticipated that their Report will be completed before the end of next month.

Mr. Kenny

EGYPT—TOULBA PASHA.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether a Petition has been forwarded to him by the Governor of Ceylon from Toulba Pasha, praying Her Majesty's Government to change the place of residence assigned to him by Her Majesty's Government, in accordance with his parole given to Lord Dufferin in December last; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intends to grant the request?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, the Petition has been received, and it was proposed to Toulba that he should proceed to the Cape of Good Hope under the same conditions as those under which he resides in Ceylon. Her Majesty's Government have, however, been informed by telegram that Toulba has declined the offer; but they have not yet received the Governor's despatch stating the reasons for Toulba's refusal.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEC. 12—CASE OF JOHN O'CONNOR.

Mr. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. John O'Connor, who had recently been imprisoned in Cork for refusing, at the secret inquiry, to give evidence outside the scope of the offence set forth in the summons, was on a few days after his release arrested in Tralee, where he had been on commercial business, and whether he was again on the following day arrested in Listowel; whether the policeman who arrested him in the latter place alleged that Mr. O'Connor was a suspicious stranger, and whether Mr. O'Connor pointed out that he was in the habit of visiting the town for the past eight years, while the constable in question was only a short while in the locality; whether the police on each of these occasions insisted upon searching Mr. O'Connor's trunks, and so spoiled two of his business days; and, whether the Government will give Mr. O'Connor any compensation for this loss of his time?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, Mr. O'Connor was arrested at Tralee, and again at Listowel. He was searched. The only luggage searched was a small hand bag. He had no trunks with him. He was in custody 40 minutes on one occasion and 20 minutes on the other. It does not, therefore, seem probable that two business days were spoilt. The arrest at Listowel was under the 12th section of the Prevention of Crime Act, which relates to suspicious strangers. Mr. O'Connor has been, I believe, in the habit of visiting most of the towns in Kerry; but he was not known to the Sub-Inspector at Listowel, who has been stationed there for the past six months.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—KERRY SUB-COMMISSION.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that cases listed for hearing before the Kerry Sub-Land Commission so far back as November, 1881, by tenants on the Crosbie Estate, have not yet been heard; whether those cases stood on the list in January last as numbers 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78, but at the recent sitting of the Commission, held in the present month, were placed back on the list to numbers 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110, and consequently did not come on for hearing; whether he can explain why those cases were placed so far back on the list as not to come before the Commission; whether it is true that, in some of those cases, the rent was increased as late as 1880, and whether this increased rent is still demanded; and, if so, whether, in the event of those tenants failing to pay any time before their cases are heard, they are liable to lose their holdings?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Land Commissioners inform me that no cases listed for hearing before the Kerry Sub-Commission so far back as 1881 remain unheard, but that there are cases which were lodged at that time still undisposed of. The facts as to the adjournment and re-numbering of certain cases are as stated, the reason of the change in the numbers being that all the earlier cases on the April list were cases adjourned from previous sittings. No cases were taken out of their turn. The Commissioners cannot say whether the rent in any of these cases had been raised in 1880, as the cases have not yet been investigated. The tenants are liable for the old rent until judicial rents are fixed.

MR. HARRINGTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether Mr. Crosbie on the last occasion, by having his name changed, succeeded in getting his cases postponed?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have no objection to inquire into the matter.

SALE OF CROWN LANDS (IRELAND)—MARYBOROUGH HEATH.

MR. GORST (for Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following paragraph in the "Leinster Gazette:"—

> "The Authorities have apparently conceived the notion of selling the great Heath of Maryborough. They have, through the Inland Revenue Department, instituted inquiries as to the probability of the adjoining owners and occupiers becoming purchasers if the common were to be offered in small lots;"

and, if there is any foundation for the statement contained in the above paragraph; and, if so, whether the Crown is prepared to show a title to Maryborough Heath?

MR. COURTNEY: I have to say, Sir, that the Crown has not conceived the notion of selling Maryborough Heath, neither has it instituted inquiries as to the probability of the adjoining owners and occupiers becoming purchasers.

EGYPT—HASSAN BEY SADYK.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Hassan Bey Sadyk, whose appointment as Governor of Sanaar is announced in the Egyptian Gazette, is the same person who was under the orders of Omar Pacha Tufti, the Governor of Alexandria, on June 11th, when the massacre in that town occurred; and, if so, whether he has ever been placed on his trial?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, Hassan Bey Sadyk was Sub-Prefect of Police at Alexandria on the 11th of June last. Sir Edward Malet informs Lord Granville that no charge has been made against Sadyk, and that he has, consequently, not been put upon his trial.

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION)—REFORM OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

MR. GORST (for Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government are taking any steps to remedy the Criminal Procedure in Egypt, under which an accused man is not allowed to bring witnesses for the defence before the Court, nor even to appear himself; and if, in the meantime, any measures are being taken to ensure fair trials throughout Egypt pending the institution of the New Law Courts?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, the procedure adopted in Egypt in criminal cases is that of the French Code; and I have already pointed out that this Code does not prevent the prisoner bringing witnesses for his defence before the Court, or appearing himself at the trial. The laws, however, relating to criminal procedure in the Native Courts of Egypt are undergoing revision at the present time; and the services of Sir Benson Maxwell have been engaged by the Egyptian Government to assist them in this task.

Mr. GORST asked if the noble Lord meant it to be understood that the political prisoners now to be tried would be tried under the law of the French Code?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, that they would have the fullest power to call witnesses at the trial. The objections made the other day only applied to what was known as the "instruction," as distinct from the trial itself.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked the noble Lord whether Mr. Mark Napier had not complained that prisoners would not be allowed to call witnesses?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE said, that he did not think that Mr. Mark Napier's statement was so carefully written as it might be, if he might say so of a man of known ability. He did not think that Mr. Napier intended to imply that the prisoners would be prevented from calling witnesses at the trial.

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND)—FEES TO COUNSEL.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return specifying the fees paid to each of the Counsel for the Crown for their services at the late Commission in Green Street, together with the fees paid to Counsel assigned for the prisoners; and, whether he will furnish a Return of the sums paid or intended to be paid to Crown witnesses in Ireland, in respect of trials at the last five Commissions in Green Street?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I find, on inquiry at the English Public Offices, that it has not been a custom to give returns of the fees paid to counsel; and the Government cannot consent to do it in this case. A Return of the sums paid to witnesses cannot be granted.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman adhere to his determination when I tell him that, according to good information I have received, the fees paid to the Attorney General for Ireland were a retainer of £1,200 and a refresher of £150?

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked if the Chief Secretary would admit or deny the statement in the newspapers that day that one informer, named Farrell, had received no less than £1,000?

[No replies were given to these Questions.]

STATE OF IRELAND—THE CONSTABULARY.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether buckshot ammunition has been supplied to a man named Michael Fitzgerald by Constable Egan, of Longhill station, county Limerick, at the public expense; and, whether licences for fowling pieces to protect their crops are refused to the surrounding farmers?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am informed that there is no foundation for the statements made in this Question.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to state the result of his inquiries respecting the statement that policemen were employed in ploughing an evicted farm on the estate of Mr. Desmond Fitzgerald at Tullyglass, county Limerick, and whether such employment has his sanction?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am informed that no policemen have been employed in this case. Perhaps the hon. Member has definite information that he would give me?

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If Lord Granville has written a letter to Mr. Errington, expressing satisfaction at the success of his representations to the Vatican respecting the state of affairs in Ireland?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No, Sir; no such letter has been written. I am asked by Lord Granville to add that, in answer to the Question put to me by the hon. Member on Thursday, I was directed by him to state that he had sent no letter of congratulation to Rome. By that Lord Granville meant to convey that he had sent no letter of congratulation to Mr. Errington, who is in Rome, or to anybody else. He wished me to express his regret that, from the fact of the answer having been more comprehensive than the Question, any trouble should have been given to the House.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I wish to ask the noble Lord, whether any Correspondence has taken place on public affairs connected with the Vatican between Lord Granville and Mr. Errington; and, if so, whether such Correspondence has been deposited in the official archives of the Department, or whether it is of a private character, and has not been deposited in the official archives for the information of future Secretaries of State? If the noble Lord cannot answer the Question now I will give Notice of it.

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I will ask my hon. Friend to give Notice of the Question.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—MODEL SCHOOLS.

Mr. LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any communications, in the nature of advice or instructions, has passed between the Lords of the Treasury and the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, as to the future application of that portion of the Vote in Supply for National Education hitherto used in support of model schools, and suggesting less expenditure thereon in future, in order to have funds to carry out certain intended arrangements for separate denominational training of teachers; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table a Copy of any such communications?

Mr. TREVELYAN: It is the case, Sir, that the Treasury, in a letter to the Commissioners of National Education, threw out a suggestion that one source of economy might be the gradual conversion of the model schools into national schools. The Commissioners, having considered this suggestion, passed a Resolution to the effect that, in their opinion, it would be highly injudicious to interfere with so important an element in the national system of education as the model schools, and that it would tend to embarrass the inauguration of the proposed training colleges.

Mr. LEWIS: Am I to understand that the Government have an objection to lay on the Table a Copy of the communication?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Yes, Sir; I think it would be extremely inconvenient to lay on the Table Correspondence between the Treasury and other Public Departments.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to give Notice, in view of the widespread interest on this subject in Ireland, that I shall move for a Copy of this Correspondence.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I ask whether the new training colleges will be treated like the Marlborough Street Schools?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The subsidy paid to training colleges in Ireland will be of precisely the same terms as the subsidy paid in England and Scotland. I believe the money will be paid out of this year's Votes.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: My Question was not whether new training colleges would be treated like training colleges in England and Scotland; but whether they would be treated in the same way as the existing training colleges in Dublin?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I think the hon. Gentleman had better ask the Question somewhat in detail. I do not know whether he refers to Lancaster Buildings.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I will put the Question on the Paper.

ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE—JUNIOR MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Mr. LEAMY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If his attention has been called to the grave cause for dissatisfaction given to the junior members of the Indian Medical Service by the enormous per centage of them at present on "unemployed pay"; if the "unemployed pay" of a surgeon in the Indian Medical Service, namely 286. 10 rupees per month, is not the lowest scale of pay awarded to any commissioned or covenanted officer in the Indian service; and, if the Government intend to take any; and, if so, what steps to remove this grievance, and to fulfil the terms of the printed conditions upon which men have been induced to enter the service?

MR. J. K. CROSS: The attention of the Secretary of State has been called to the exceptionally large number of junior medical officers in India, drawing what is called unemployed pay. This is due partly to the unusually small number of medical officers at present absent from India on furlough; partly to the large number of young officers admitted to the Service consequent on the Afghan War; and partly to the recent reduction of 22 Native regiments, with the consequent reduction of the medical staff attached to regiments. The unemployed pay of a surgeon in the Indian Medical Service is not the lowest awarded to any covenanted or commissioned officer in the Indian Service. An unemployed lieutenant would draw 256 rupees a-month; while an unemployed surgeon, if under five years' service, would draw 286 rupees; or, if over five years' service, 304 rupees a-month. The present difficulty is being met by a large decrease in the number of appointments, there having been 18 for last year and 13 for this; as compared with 39 and 49 for the two preceding years. The published conditions under which officers accept employment in the Indian Medical Service are accurately fulfilled.

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACT, 1879 —THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS—THE REGULATIONS.

SIR HENRY HOLLAND asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the Regulations prescribed for the Director of Public Prosecutions under "The Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879?"

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I believe, Sir, that the Papers were presented in 1880; but I am afraid, by some oversight, they were not printed.

MR. GORST: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman undertake that the Vote for the Public Prosecutor shall not be taken until the information required is given?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT was understood to say that the House should be supplied with the information required.

METROPOLIS — OBSTRUCTIONS IN MAIN THOROUGHFARES.

MR. GREGORY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Who is responsible for the present state of the centre of London, and for the inhabitants being deprived of the use of the main thoroughfares at a time of year when they are more required?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am afraid, Sir, I can give no other answer than that the responsibility rests with the present system of the government of London.

NAVY—EXAMINATION OF NAVAL CADETS (THE "BRITANNIA").

MR. GORST asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether any examination of the cadets on board H.M.S. "Britannia" has been held during the past year; and, whether the Reports of the Examiners can be laid upon the Table before the Vote for the "Britannia" is asked for?

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN: Sir, the cadets on board the *Britannia* are examined twice a-year; and the examinations in non-professional subjects are conducted by men of position in the Universities. It does not seem desirable that the Reports of the Examiners should be laid on the Table, as, if this practice was followed, there might be less disposition on the part of those gentlemen to give to the Board of Admiralty the benefit of their full and frank opinion on the subjects submitted to them.

MR. GORST gave Notice that when the Vote relating to this matter was brought forward he should oppose it.

EGYPT—QUARANTINE.

BARON HENRY DE WORMS asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the fact that vessels from Bombay have lately been put in quarantine by the Anglo-Egyptian authorities, although these vessels have clean bills of health and have no illness on board?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, the International Quarantine Board referred to by the hon. Member is not Anglo-Egyptian, but is composed of the delegates of the different nations interested. In consequence of the complaints received from various shipping firms in this country, Sir Edward Malet was instructed to protest against the detention of ships bound to ports of the United Kingdom with clean bills of health, and they are now allowed to pass through the Canal without delay. The general question of quarantine in Egypt is receiving the earnest attention of Her Majesty's Government.

ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN ESTABLISHMENT.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether there is any truth in the report that has appeared in the newspapers to the effect that, as the number of men required to complete the Indian Establishment is 9,000 men, it is proposed to offer a bounty of £10 to time-expired men as an inducement to extend their service for 12 years with the colours; and, whether it is further proposed to extend the same terms to time-expired men at home, and to reduce the standard of the Guards from 5ft. 8in. to 5ft. 7in. and the chest measurement from 35in. to 34in.?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: Sir, in the absence, through illness, which I much regret, of the Secretary of State for War, perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Questions of the noble Lord. The number required to complete the Indian Establishment is not 9,000, but under 5,000. Communications are taking place between the War Office and the India Office as to the expediency of offering a bounty as an inducement to men of between four and six years' service, now serving in India, to extend their Colour service at once to 10 years. In reply to the noble Lord's second Question, I may say that it is not proposed to extend the same terms to time-expired men at home. In reply to the third Question of the noble Lord, I have to say that the standard height for the Foot Guards has been already reduced from 5 feet 8 inches to 5 feet 7 inches; and the alteration of the chest measurement applies only to gunners of the Royal Artillery.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL asked if it was intended by the Secretary of State for War to make any general statement on recruiting, and if the statements in newspaper reports were founded on facts?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, that in the course of the Army Estimates the Secretary of State for War would, no doubt, make a general statement upon recruiting. He was unable to answer any Questions as to newspaper reports without dates, as he did not know to what the noble Lord alluded.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL inquired whether time-expired men in India had been offered a bounty of £5 to rejoin for another term with the Colours, and had refused?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER asked for Notice of the Question.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether the Indian bounty was to be a temporary remedy; and whether it was intended to take any other steps to remedy the shortcomings of the short service system?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER, in reply, said, that, so far as he understood the purport of the Question, he had already answered it, by saying that further communications were still pending between the War Office and the India Office on this subject.

METROPOLIS—THE COAL AND WINE DUTIES—APPLICATION FOR RENEWAL.

MR. FIRTH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, before acceding to any suggestion for the renewal of the Coal and Wine dues, he will consult the opinion of the inhabitants of the Metropolis who have no direct representation in any authority now dealing with these funds, and who are unwilling to sanction the re-grant to authorities not under their own control of taxes producing several hundred thousand pounds sterling per annum?

MR. SLAGG asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government, before giving an answer to the application for an extension of the London Coal and Wine Duties, will take into consideration the claims for exclusion from future taxation of the manufacturers and consumers of coal in the towns and places in the "outer area" of the Metropolis, who though taxed are not represented in the application of the tax; and, whether he will receive a deputation from those important interests?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he is aware that, when the Coal and Wine Duties were prolonged in 1867 for the purpose of providing moneys for improvements in the Metropolis, a compromise was agreed to by those residing outside the area of the Metropolitan Board of Works, yet liable to the Coal and Wine Duties, by which the Duties were extended one year in order to free the bridges of Staines, Hampton, and Kew, and thus in some way compensate the outer circle of coal and wine consumers for the payment of taxes from which they otherwise derive no direct benefit; and, if he will take into his consideration that any attempt to overthrow the compromise and understanding thus arrived at must result in imposing heavy taxation upon communities who are neither represented by the authority taxing them, nor benefited by the taxation imposed?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): Sir, my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury has asked me to answer these Questions. We lately received a deputation from the Metropolitan Board and the Corporation of the City of London on the subject of the renewal of the Coal and Wine Duties when they expire in 1889. Some points were raised by the deputation into which we shall have to inquire; but I may say, in general terms, that the suggestion appears to us to be altogether premature, and that if the Coal and Wine Duties should be renewed—as to which we have grave doubts—even in a restricted form, such renewal could only follow a decision by Parliament to allow the construction by the local authority of the Metropolis of some very costly communication between the districts North and South of the Thames, below London Bridge, such as has lately been under discussion. Until then, we do not think that the extension of the Coal and Wine Dues could be even considered. The question of the area within which these dues should be leviable would have to be seriously considered at the same time; and full opportunity will be given to those interested to make known their views.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—COMMUNICATIONS ACROSS THE THAMES.

Mr. RITCHIE asked, Whether the Government would not consider the propriety of giving some decision as to their views, in order that the works below London Bridge should either be proceeded with or abandoned?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, that would be putting the cart before the horse. Parliament would have first to decide whether those extensive works should be undertaken; and then it would be for the Government to say whether they would advise Parliament to assist the local authorities in the particular way proposed.

Mr. RITCHIE gave Notice that on the earliest opportunity he would move that, in the opinion of the House, increased facilities of communication between the North and South of the Thames East of London Bridge were urgently required.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will direct such arrangements as will enable the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill to be taken pari passu with the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill, or at least such as will prevent a measure of such importance being relegated to a late period of the Session, when the attendance of Members is sparse and their energies exhausted?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I cannot undertake that the Scottish Bill should go *pari passu* with the English Bill; and I think the hon. Member hardly expects that. But, undoubtedly, we shall take the best means in our power—as we place the two substantially on the same footing—to bring it forward at an early date, and to insure its having a full discussion.

POOR LAW (IRELAND) — LIMERICK BOARD OF GUARDIANS — STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a report in the "Cork Herald," May 24th, of a meeting of the Limerick Board of Guardians, in which the following passages occur:—

> "Several guardians expressed themselves to the effect that in the Union district there was, owing to excessive emigration, a great paucity of labourers, and only the old and infirm seemed inclined to remain in the country. The chairman said the emigration from Ireland had assumed such vast proportions that every five out of seven one met now in a village were either old or infirm. . . . . . Mr. M'Inerney. There are forty labourers required in my district for drainage, and other works but we can't get a man. Colonel Westropp. In my district it is the same. It is impossible to get a labourer;"

and, whether, in view of the alleged decrease of the labouring population in the most fertile districts of Ireland, the Government will persist in the policy of subsidising emigration and disregarding the demand for legislation to improve the condition of the remaining industrial population?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Limerick Union has not received any grants from Government for the purpose of assisting emigration. Such emigration as has taken place has been spontaneous, and not promoted by public funds. There is no reason to believe that, in the county of Limerick generally, there is any deficiency of labouring men. No general increase in agricultural wages has occurred, such as must have followed such a deficiency, if it existed. There may be particular places where there is a scarcity of labour; but such a scarcity, in parts of a county circumstanced as Limerick is, would afford no reasonable ground for discontinuing the assistance to emigration in other less favoured districts in Ireland, where the population is much too large, and where the emigration is a very great advantage.

WEST INDIES (JAMAICA)—EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, 1851 TO 1882.

Captain PRICE asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the total Exports and Imports of the Island of Jamaica from 1851 to the present date?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, the hon. and gallant Member will find in full detail the information which he seeks in the Statistical Abstract of the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, which is annually laid on the Table.

ARMY—LIEUTENANT GENERAL WILBY.

Captain PRICE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether compensation will be granted to Lieutenant General Wilby, C.B. for removal from the command of the Forces in Ceylon, two years before the completion of the five years for which he had been appointed, he being then only sixty-two years of age?

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER (for the Marquess of Hartington): In reply to the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport, I have to say that a Royal Warrant is under consideration, which will provide compensation for any net loss sustained by removal from a Staff appointment on account of age, as in the case referred to.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When it is proposed to take the Second Reading of the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill, which was ordered to be printed on the 16th February?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am afraid, Sir, I cannot undertake to answer this Question to-day; but I will do so to-morrow.

Mr. LEWIS gave Notice that he would ask whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill during the present Session to deal with what were known as "the peccant boroughs?"

SOUTH AFRICA—HER MAJESTY'S DOMINIONS—POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: In view of the events that have occurred, and are still occurring, not merely in the Transvaal and Bechuanaland, but also in Zululand, Basutoland, and other parts of South Africa, forming part of, or adjacent to Her Majesty's Dominions, and the statements that have been made by the Government, and the manner in which Questions on the subject have been replied to in this House, I beg to give Notice that I will take the earliest opportunity of moving—

> "That this House will immediately resolve itself into Committee with the view of taking

into consideration the condition of Her Majesty's South African Dominions, and the territories adjacent thereto."

I will also ask the Prime Minister if he can afford me facilities for bringing forward this Motion?

Afterwards,

Mr. GORST gave Notice that, in the event of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury fixing a day for the discussion of the large question of the policy of Her Majesty's Government in South Africa, he should move that the Order of the Day for the debate on the minor matter of Bechuanaland be discharged.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE "COUNT-OUT" ON FRIDAY, MAY 26.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister a Question as to the Business to-night; and, at the same time, I wish to call attention to what took place at the Sitting of the House on Friday last. At the beginning of Business on Friday last, I asked the right hon. Gentleman what Business was to be taken, and drew his attention to the fact that no Notice had been given to take effective Supply; and, therefore, presumed that other Business would be taken. I was informed that the Government intended to proceed with the Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill; in fact, that they were very anxious to go on with that measure. We proceeded with the discussion of the first Motion that had been given Notice of on the Motion to go into Committee of Supply. That was disposed of at an early hour, and there was reason to suppose that there would have been ample time for the consideration of other Business. The House was, however, counted out; and, as far as I am able to understand, no effort was made on the part of the Government to keep a House. In view of the many innuendoes and suggestions that are thrown out about Obstruction, it is just as well that attention should be drawn to this subject.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I do not quite understand the right hon. Gentleman's mode of proceeding. I suppose I must understand his remarks as being in the nature of a Question, and that I must myself cast them into the form of a Question, though they were rather in the nature of a charge.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: I meant to ask what Business was to be taken to-night.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The right hon. Gentleman did what he seldom does—he forgot the object for which he rose. With regard to the Business of this evening, we propose to go on with Supply, and then to proceed with the Irish Constabulary Bill. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to ask whether any efforts were made to keep a House on Friday. What happened was this:—At 8 o'clock I rose to address the House on the subject of Armenia. The House was counted immediately after my rising, and the number present was, I think, a little over 40, of whom 18 were Members of the Government—not, I think, a bad proportion; of the remaining 24 or 25, two belonged to the Opposition; the other 23 being on this side of the House. Under these circumstances, I think that is a tolerable indication that efforts were made by the Government, and that it was their misfortune, not their fault, if the House was counted. I admit that I myself left the House at half-past 8. I was not, therefore, in the final count; but I understand that the number of Members present in the final count was 35, of whom 16 were Members of the Government. We regretted the count very much. We set up Supply a second time immediately. The reason why we did not put down effective Supply was, because we were under a strong impression that the Motion of the hon. Member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons) would be discussed for nearly the whole evening.

Mr. RITCHIE asked whether they were to understand that the promise of the Government to keep a House was limited to the attendance of the Members of the Government only, or were they to understand that the Government had no power to obtain 40 supporters when they desired to keep a House?

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN asked if it would be possible to record the names of Members present when the House was counted out. If that were done, he thought it would be found that some Gentlemen who were very fond of talking about Obstruction were very often absent when the House was counted.

Mr. GLADSTONE: As to the question of printing the names, that is a matter which depends upon the machinery of the House, and not on the will of the Government. With regard to the Question put by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie), I do not understand that the engagement of the Government is confined to official Members; but the hon. Gentleman must know that my noble Friend near me (Lord Richard Grosvenor) is able to bring stronger pressure to bear on official than on non-official Members. My noble Friend reported to me on Friday night that, from the strong feeling of the independent Members, as they are called, he should have the greatest possible difficulty in keeping a House.

Mr. GORST wished to point out that the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government had forgotten to answer the Question which the Leader of the Opposition forgot to put.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The hon. and learned Gentleman has evidently forgotten to listen to my reply.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—SEIZURE OF THE "KERRY SENTINEL."

Mr. PARNELL wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he could give any information to the House as to the suppression by the police of Mr. Harrington's newspaper, the "Kerry Sentinel," and the seizure of the printing press and other plant connected with the establishment?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, this being the case of a judicial inquiry still pending, it is not possible to say very much with regard to it; but I think I can say enough to answer the natural inquiry of the hon. Member. On Sunday, the 20th of May, certain notices were posted about Tralee of a nature which I do not think it necessary for me to bring before the House; but they were notices of a most serious and improper nature—I might really apply to them much stronger epithets—and, if I read only a sentence or two from them, they would, I am sure, excite a feeling in the House of something like horror. [*Cries of* "Read!"] I do not wish to raise a debate on any judicial question—at all events, on any points upon which hon. Members who raised this question are aggrieved; but the notice was treasonable, and something very like murderous in its nature. This notice was, as the authorities believed, printed in the office which published *The Kerry Sentinel*. That office was searched, and the press and types which, in the opinion of the Government, were the instruments by which this notice was printed, were seized under the 14th section of the Prevention of Crime Act. That section ordains that arms, ammunition, papers, documents, instruments, or articles suspected to be used, or to be intended to be used, for the purpose of, or in connection with, any secret association existing for criminal purposes when seized shall be forfeited to Her Majesty. The Government Advisers were clearly of opinion that under this section the press and type with which they believed the notice to have been printed might be seized. It must be remembered I am not speaking now of this notice, as re-printed in *The Kerry Sentinel*, in common with a great many other newspapers; but as to the notice itself, with regard to its being afterwards posted in the neighbourhood of Tralee, having been printed by this press, an operation which, in the opinion of the Government, constituted nothing less than a crime. For this crime they intend to proceed against individuals; and if these individuals are convicted of having printed and posted this notice, I believe it is undoubted they will be guilty of a very serious crime in the eyes of the law. The district is one which is in a very critical condition. A very serious attempt at murder was perpetrated in the county within less than 48 hours before; and a document of the nature of that which was posted about Tralee constitutes a crime of a very serious description indeed. I wish it clearly to be understood that it is on suspicion of having printed this document for the purpose of being posted about, and not because *The Kerry Sentinel* re-printed it as several other papers had done, that this seizure has taken place.

Mr. PARNELL: The right hon. Gentleman has explained very clearly, and at considerable length, the way in which the Government have thought themselves justified in using a particular section of the Crimes Act, the use of which, I venture to think, was not at all contemplated at the time the Act was passed. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in the event of guilt not being brought home to any person in the employment of Mr. Harrington, his printing press will be restored, and compensation rendered to him by the Government for this destruction of his means of livelihood?

Mr. TREVELYAN: The Government will undoubtedly feel it their duty, in that contingency, to give the matter their grave consideration.

Mr. HARRINGTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the warrant was not issued so far back as the 9th of April, although he now pretends it was issued on the day of the seizure?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the warrant was issued on the day to which the hon. Member refers. It was a perfectly regular warrant used for a perfectly regular purpose.

Mr. HARRINGTON: In consequence of the nature of the answer, and of the extraordinary charge which has been made against me as proprietor of the paper, *The Kerry Sentinel*, perhaps the House will listen to a few words of personal explanation from me. I recognize, Sir, as well as the right hon. Gentleman, the gravity of the notice which has been posted about the town of Tralee, and I agree fully with him in condemning it as monstrous. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that if he enters into debatable matter he will be doing that which is irregular.

Mr. HARRINGTON: I admit fully, Sir, that the position of the right hon. Gentleman so far has been right; and I have no desire whatever to contest the description which he has given of the notice in question. I will go a little further, and say the notice was not only of a scandalous character, but that it was in itself perfectly absurd, and contained evidence that it could not have been printed at my office. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in Order in these remarks. If the hon. Member desires to bring forward the matter, he can do so in the form of a substantive Motion with Notice.

Mr. HARRINGTON: I think there is sufficient sense of fair play in the House to allow me to make my explanation. I desire to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of drawing attention to the seizure of *The Kerry Sentinel*, which I claim to be a matter of public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should bring up in writing, the definite matter of urgent public importance which he desires to bring under the notice of the House.

Mr. HARRINGTON, accordingly, having stated the matter in writing, asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance—namely, the seizure of *The Kerry Sentinel* newspaper at Tralee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. Harrington) be now heard?

Some negative voices having been raised—

Mr. SPEAKER called on those hon. Gentlemen who supported the Motion to rise in their places.

And less than 40 Members having risen—

Mr. SPEAKER declared that the Question could not accordingly be put.

Mr. CALLAN: I beg to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether those hon. Members who wish to hear the hon. Member for Westmeath cannot now divide the House on the Motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: In answer to the hon. Member for Louth, I have to say that the Standing Order upon this matter terminates with these words—

> "Unless, if fewer than forty Members and not less than ten shall thereupon rise in their places, the House shall, on a Division, upon Question put forthwith, determine whether such Motion shall be made."

Therefore, if ten Members think proper to rise in their places, the matter may be determined upon Question put forthwith by a Vote of the House.

A Division being claimed, and 10 Members having risen—

Motion made, and Question put, "That such Motion for Adjournment be now made."—(*Mr. Harrington.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 137; Noes 135: Majority 2.—(Div. List, No. 100.)

Mr. HARRINGTON: Sir, I am deeply grateful for being afforded this opportunity of making the explanation which, if the House had permitted me, I should have made earlier, so that it might now have been at its ordinary

Business. In the most emphatic manner I wish to agree in the condemnation which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland made of the threatening notice posted up on the pillars in the town of Tralee; and I wish furthermore to state that, were I in my place as editor and proprietor of *The Kerry Sentinel*, and if the right hon. Gentleman, or any representative of his, believing that that document emanated from my office, applied to me for the necessary facilities to find out its author, I should, in the fullest possible manner, have placed every facility in his way, and would have been deeply grateful to the authorities if, having found the guilty persons in my office, they weeded them out. But the course which the authorities have taken is a very unusual, and, towards me, a very harsh and unprecedented course. Without any communication whatever with me, or with my brother, who conducts my business, or my foreman, 50 policemen entered my office, acting under a warrant signed six weeks before this threatening notice was issued. They seized not only the printed copies of my newspaper, but the type. They arrested the foreman, they turned out of the office every *employé* I had, and sent throughout the Three Kingdoms, if not over the world, the statement that I was responsible for this scandalous document. I think in no civilized country in the world except Ireland could such things occur. I do not believe that any person who knows me would concur in the infamous allegation that I or any person belonging to me could be responsible for the issue of this infamous document. I will not offend the House by reading it; but I might be permitted to read two sentences which will show that the document was a decoy, issued for the purpose of injuring me, or some other equally innocent individual, by an enemy, and not by one who agreed in the so-called sentiments expressed therein. The notice in question states that a meeting of "Invincibles" would be held in a particular street in the town, naming the street and the part of the street, and it says—"Secret drillings are going on there." Does the right hon. Gentleman affect to believe, or do the police, who moved, I presume, under his instructions, believe, that any sane man, however criminal, and desirous of attacking the Government in Ireland, would issue a *bonâ fide* notice calling a meeting of "Invincibles" at a particular place, post it on the pillars of a public building, and thus reveal the place of meeting to the police? On the face of it this notice is absurd. The police, when they originally moved under the warrant, saw the document in type in the newspaper, in which they must have seen, too, that the editor wrote condemning it. It has been said that the notice must have been printed in Tralee, because its size corresponded with the width of the columns of the local newspapers. But anyone acquainted with the technicalities of a printing office knows that type can be set up to any width. The Government, I believe, seized my paper because they saw this document in the news columns; and when they perceived their mistake, although they returned the type first, yet, true to that instinct by which they persecuted every man in Ireland on whom they lay hands, they determined not to retrace their steps, and so they again seized and carried off everything there. Perhaps I am speaking more strongly than I ought; but I must say that these proceedings by the police are not to the credit of the right hon. Gentleman. It would have been wiser and more creditable to the right hon. Gentleman, and it would have better tended to advance good government in Ireland, had the right hon. Gentleman investigated the facts, and visited on the police who acted in this manner what censure they deserved. This seizure took place on Tuesday last. On Wednesday the police surrendered to my representative in the office the type they had seized; but they went to my writing office and took away all my letters, account books, and library. For what? Simply because someone has been wicked enough, and foolish enough—criminal enough, if you will—to issue such a notice. Even if the contention of the right hon. Gentleman were correct, and that without my cognizance, or that of my representative, the document was printed in my office, as might have been done by the merest boy in the office, is it because I had an unfaithful person in my employment that the representatives of Her Majesty's Government should come into my office and seize everything absolutely which belonged to me, carry away my property, and blacken my character, which is dearer to me than anything else? I beg to move the Adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Harrington.*)

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am bound to state that the observations of the hon. Member have, to a considerable extent, disappointed the expectations which I personally, and those who had supported the hon. Member's Motion, had formed of the hon. Member's intention in rising to address the House. The suspicions of the authorities may have been erroneous—that I do not deny—but, at all events, the case is a very doubtful one, and I had thought that it had been the intention of the hon. Member to make a personal explanation in reference to this subject. It was in that belief that I and others had supported the hon. Member's Motion. The hon. Member, however, has certainly gone very much further than that in entering into a matter which is still before the Courts of Justice. I expected from the hon. Member nothing more than an assurance that he, as a Member of Parliament, disapproved strongly of this Notice, and that he knew nothing of the matter. Had the hon. Member stopped there it was an explanation which he might fairly have been permitted to make, and I should not have regretted the vote I had given in favour of his Motion.

Mr. HARRINGTON: I can assure the House that I did not intend to do more than the right hon. Gentleman has indicated. And I may say that if there is to be a judicial investigation of the matter, I shall willingly place myself at the right hon. Gentleman's disposal at any moment.

Mr. TREVELYAN: As the hon. Gentleman's intention coincided with our expectation of what he would have said when he stood up, I hope he and his Friends will now allow this debate to close, and the Business of the House to be proceeded with. The hon. Member has been permitted to say what as a Member of Parliament he might be fairly expected to say; and any prolongation of the discussion would be quite unnecessary and uncalled for.

Mr. PARNELL: I think my hon. Friend could not have done anything less than he has done as regards the nature and extent of the remarks which he made to the House. It was right that he should have expressed his abhorrence of the notice in question, his belief that nobody connected with his office had had anything to do with its publication, and his entire want of any knowledge as regards the publication of the criminal document. But it was also right that my hon. Friend—and I cannot help thinking that the House, in allowing him permission, acted to some extent from this point of view—should have an opportunity which is afforded by the Rules of the House of protesting against an act of the Executive which is entirely unprecedented even in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman has informed us that a prosecution is going to follow; but if we are to go by precedents in cases of this kind in Ireland, the only prosecution which can purge the Government from the consequences of their action will be a successful prosecution of my hon. Friend himself. No newspaper has ever up till now been seized in Ireland without its seizure being followed by a successful prosecution of the owner to test the legality of that seizure. We have not been told whether any person is to be prosecuted at all; we have not heard from the Irish Executive if there is any person charged by the local police authorities with being implicated in the publication of this most objectionable notice. The right hon. Gentleman only informed the House that a judicial inquiry was going on. Is my hon. Friend to lose his means of livelihood because the Government desires to make a judicial inquiry? Cannot the Government make a judicial inquiry without seizing the printing presses, the types, and the library of my hon. Friend—without practically suppressing his newspaper, without practically destroying his property—property that it has taken years of his life, in his humble position as a country journalist, to acquire? Cannot the Government do everything necessary to find out the authors of this infamous document without destroying the means of livelihood of my hon. Friend, and without doing that which renders freedom of the Press in Ireland a perfect farce? Now, the Government, in passing the Prevention of Crime Act, gave a material concession with regard to the Press Clauses. The

Press Clauses, as they originally stood, gave the Lord Lieutenant power to suppress any newspaper he pleased by putting the editor of such newspaper under rule of bail. Subsequently it was conceded that the Lord Lieutenant should issue a warrant, and give upon that warrant some detail of the offensive passages. This Press Clause was not considered sufficient in the present case. If the action of the Government was legal, and, no doubt, so extraordinary are the clauses of the Crimes Act that they can be used in most extraordinary directions; but if the action of the Government was legal, it is possible for them to seize the printing press and destroy the machinery of any newspaper they please without going to the trouble of observing the provisions of the Statute enacted by Parliament for the purpose of curbing newspapers. Now, I wish to point out the section of the Act under which the Government acted in this case; and I think it must have astonished the right hon. Gentleman himself to hear that the police authorities had availed of this particular section. It is Section 14, and states that from time to time, and so forth—

> "The Lord Lieutenant should have power to seize in any proclaimed district any arms, ammunition, papers, documents, instruments, or articles suspected to be used or intended to be used for the purposes of or in connection with secret societies or secret associations."

Now, would anybody in his senses have supposed that these powers were to be used for the suppression of newspapers? Seizing type and destroying the means of livelihood of members of the community. When this Bill—the Crimes Bill—was introduced into this House, the Home Secretary said this provision was to be used for the purpose of discovering the machinery of murder—the crape masks, the pistols, the daggers, and the other weapons of crime. We were told nothing then about printing presses or about public newspapers. Now, I would ask the Chief Secretary, I would ask any Member of the Irish Government in the exercise of common sense, in the exercise of ordinary judgment, which, indeed, I must say seems to be conspicuously absent from the Government of Ireland at the present time, to examine this document and say whether he thinks the members of any criminal secret organization would have printed and published such a notice as this? Why, Sir, the place in which the conspirators were to meet was published for the information of the police by these "Invincible" conspirators. The locality indicated for the meeting was the very one in which the foreman printer of the newspaper lived; and is it likely, if the paper was implicated in the publication, that they would throw suspicion on the foreman printer by assigning the locality in which he lived as the one in which these alleged illegal drills were to take place? The whole case is thoroughly preposterous. But since it is to be the subject of a judicial inquiry, I will not discuss it—I would prefer to base my contention upon the unprecedented action of the Executive, under a section of the Crimes Act, for a purpose for which it was never intended to be used when the Act was being passed. In conclusion, I submit that my hon. Friend has fairly made out his case against the Irish Executive, and that the Irish authorities have grossly abused in this instance the powers intrusted to them by Parliament for a very different purpose.

MR. BRODRICK asked the House to take note of the purpose for which this Motion had been made, and the language which had been made use of, and of the action which the Government had thought right to take in supporting the Motion for Adjournment. They had had assurances from time to time that under the New Rules the Adjournment of the House would not be moved except upon a matter of urgent public importance. Under that name they had had dragged before the House a private explanation —an explanation which was said to be legitimate by the Government; they had had an attack on various clauses of the Crimes Act—["No!"]—a distinct attack on the police in Ireland, and one of the most malicious papers in the South of Ireland advertised throughout the length and breadth of the country. ["Oh!"] It seemed to him——

MR. HARRINGTON rose to Order, and wished to know if the hon. Gentleman was in Order in speaking of a newspaper which he had never read as a most malicious newspaper?

MR. SPEAKER called upon the hon. Member for West Surrey to proceed.

MR. BRODRICK, proceeding accordingly, declared that it was an abuse of the Forms and Privileges of the House that they should be called upon to discuss at length and prejudge a judicial matter such as this was to be. If the regular Opposition had taken such a course upon so trivial a matter—for the hon. Gentleman would have had an opportunity of vindicating himself in the ordinary course—they would have been charged with being guilty of the grossest Obstruction? He submitted whether it was desirable that this precedent should be set almost at the beginning of the New Rules——

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA asked whether it was in Order for the hon. Gentleman to put such questions to the House, and virtually to ask the House to reverse the decision which it had come to?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite in Order.

Mr. BRODRICK only wished further to say that the Government had assisted the House to stultify itself by proceeding to pass, upon a Division, a Motion which less than 40 Members in the House had risen to support being brought forward.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he did not agree with the concluding words of the hon. Member who had just sat down, because it was quite plain that the House did intend, by the closing words of the Standing Order, to reserve to itself such power of deciding whether, upon a particular occasion, although 40 Members might not rise in support of the Motion, it might not still be proper to give to an hon. Member the power of speaking upon the Adjournment. But, speaking generally of the speech of the hon. Gentleman, he rose for the purpose of saying that he did not at all complain of the criticism of the hon. Gentleman upon the action of the Government in this matter. His right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary and himself had formed the best judgment they could in a case arising suddenly, one which at the moment they thought doubtful, but a case in which they thought they were best upholding the general spirit and feeling of the House by removing that doubt as far as they could. That was the whole motive that actuated his right hon. Friend and himself. Undoubtedly, when the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. Harrington) rose in his place to speak, he, for one, distinctly understood him to say that he did not rise for any controversial purpose, and that he did not intend to make a charge against the Executive Government, or against anyone. They inferred, whether rightly or wrongly, that his purpose was to disclaim, on his own part, imputations which might have grown up out of certain recent circumstances, and which he deemed injurious to his character. The exact nature of the language which the hon. Member used did not allow the Speaker to recognize the matter as within the limits of personal explanation, and the hon. Member thereupon pleaded that he ought to be allowed to speak on the Adjournment of the House. He must admit, with the hon. Gentleman opposite, that he had been somewhat disappointed in the result of the course they took; and he would go so far to meet the hon. Gentleman who had just animadverted upon their proceedings as to say that perhaps they should be very cautious indeed upon a future occasion. For, undoubtedly, he thought the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), although he had nothing to complain of at all in his finding fault with the Government, contained nothing which justified or warranted a Motion for Adjournment. With regard to what had been stated by the hon. Member for the City of Cork, he might appeal to those who thought with him, and expressed the hope that they, considering the position by which the power of making such a speech was required, would not, if he might use the expression without any disrespect, abuse the power which they had obtained. As to the hon. Member for Westmeath, he made no animadversions upon him, because his intention was to limit himself to an explanation. He (Mr. Gladstone) admitted that they had acted injudiciously on this point, whether rightly or wrongly he knew not; but they had acted in conformity with the very general course which the House was always inclined to pursue in a personal matter, and even to strain a point on behalf of individual Members to enable them to place before the House any matter that affected their personal character. It was only in the interests of general equity that he, like his right hon. Friend, asked that the debate should not be continued.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, that if the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had thought that the explanation of the hon. Member for Westmeath was to be a personal explanation he might have made a personal appeal to the House, and it would have been at once regarded, because the House never rejected an appeal of that kind, but was always most anxious and willing to listen to a personal explanation. But this case was entirely different. No one was louder in his cries of "No!" than the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister.

MR. GLADSTONE: I beg pardon, Sir. That statement is entirely without foundation.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, that if he was wrong he was exceedingly sorry; but that was his full belief. At any rate, the right hon. Gentleman did not rise in his place as he should have done. It was an afterthought—after the Speaker had stated that the Question would be put—which induced the right hon. Gentleman to change his mind and his opinion. But he wanted to go further than that; and he appealed to the Speaker, and also to the right hon. Gentleman himself whether, when the New Rules were under discussion, it was stated that there might be some particular case at some particular time when 10 Members standing up should have the opportunity of dividing the House—not to be heard, but simply to divide, to place on record what their views and opinions were with regard to those particular circumstances. That, he believed, was the understanding of the House at the time, and not that after 40 Members had not been found, 10 Members standing up should have the full opportunity of getting as many Members as they could to support them, and reversing the decision which the House had originally come to. If the Leader of the House led them into the position they were then in, he did not know where such a course might end.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, he would admit the justice and wisdom of the request that the question should not be further debated. It should be clearly recollected, however, that the hon. Member for Westmeath, was a new Member, and that he was not familiar with the Forms of the House. He (Mr. Joseph Cowen) thought, in justice to his hon. Friend the Member for Westmeath, it should be stated that he had not at first any intention of entering into the discussion of a question that was under judicial investigation. All he wished to do was to make a personal explanation. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had stated the Executive believed that from the office of *The Kerry Sentinel* had been issued a publication inciting, not merely to treasonable offences, but to murder. This was a terrible suspicion for any Member of Parliament to labour under; and his hon. Friend desired to state that he was the proprietor of the newspaper at whose office it was supposed these bills had been printed, but that he knew nothing of their publication; that he was in London when they appeared; that he had no sympathy with the announcement; and that, as far as he was able, he would assist the Government in detecting those who had been instrumental in giving publicity to the incriminated placard. This was a fair and candid statement; and if the House had permitted the hon. Member to make it, he would have done so in a few minutes, and the matter would have ended there. But the House, in a very unusual way, refuse to accord him the privilege it accorded on all other occasions to Members who, when their personal honour was at stake, asked for an opportunity for explanation. It was from the refusal of this privilege that the Adjournment was moved; and during the discussion his hon. Friend had entered at more length than he originally intended into the case which so nearly concerned his interest and reputation. But it should be remembered that he was a new Member of the House, and not versed in its Forms as older Members were; and some allowance should be made if he had gone beyond the limits that custom assigned for such remarks. All must admit the frankness and candour with which he had denied all knowledge of, and repudiated all sympathy with, the offending publication. It should be recollected, also, that in this controversy he had everything at stake. The Government suspected that an objectionable publication had issued from his office. They had not commenced proceedings in the ordinary way against him for such publication. They would have done that in this country, and it was a fair way. If the Messrs. Harrington had broken the law, by all means let them suffer for it; but to punish them before they were convicted was a strange description of justice. And that was what the Government had done. On suspicion that the circular had come from *The Kerry Sentinel* office, everything in the office had been seized by the police — presses, paper, type, books, furniture — and most of them conveyed to Dublin. And all this was done before it was proved that the hon. Member or his relatives had been guilty of the offence that the Executive suspected them of. The savings of a lifetime were at issue. It might be a matter of amusement to some hon. Members, but it was ruin to his hon. Friend. He and his brothers had honourably built up a prosperous business, and they now saw, by the action of the Irish Executive, their property scattered and the savings of years destroyed. The circular itself, apart from being criminal, was absurd; and it was unreasonable to suppose that any sensible and responsible man would sanction its publication. It was quite possible to suppose that it might have been done by an enemy of his hon. Friend. He had rivals in Tralee, and someone might have got into his office surreptitiously and used his type for the purpose of printing such a document. But it would be unfair to hold him responsible for that. Not long ago a very offensive item of intelligence was published in *The Times.* It was grossly indecent, and there was little doubt it was done maliciously. No one would hold the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter) responsible for the publication of such matter. Someone with an evil design had availed himself of the facilities of *The Times* office to annoy the proprietors. It was quite as likely in Ireland, where Party passions ran so high, that some political rival had entered the office of *The Kerry Sentinel* and used the type there with similar designs and for like ends. They could not accuse his hon. Friend of it, as he was in London, and they had his repudiation of the act. There were numerous newspaper proprietors in the House of Commons; and was it reasonable to hold them criminally responsible for the action of persons in their office who might seek to damage them by publishing illegal or offensive matter? Everyone knew that in England such a course would not be pursued. Yet in Ireland they did it, and did it without question. As far as his knowledge went, there was no case in this century in the United Kingdom where a newspaper proprietor had been used so harshly and unjustly as his hon. Friend had been; and it was natural that he should avail himself of the opportunity the Motion for Adjournment afforded to put his case before the House and the country.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he would not have spoken on the subject but for a remark made by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen). If the question had simply been whether the newspaper belonging to the hon. Member for Westmeath had printed a certain notice in regard to the "Invincibles," he should have left the matter alone; but when this newspaper was held up as one that was being conducted on principles of extreme peace and order, and when it was implied that on this solitary occasion some enemy found his way into the office and printed a few objectionable passages, he felt compelled to say that he could go much further, and could produce to the House a column and-a-half published in the paper on the 8th of May, which would fully justify any Government in seizing it.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL desired, as the only Member present on that side of the House who rose to support the hon. Member for Westmeath, to say that he thought the hon. Member was entitled, under the circumstances, to make an explanation, and he was very glad the Government supported him.

Mr. LABOUCHERE wished to ask a question of the Attorney General for Ireland, as he understood it was supposed in this case that a placard which appeared on the walls had been printed in the office of *The Kerry Sentinel.* It was customary among proprietors of country newspapers that they also carried on a general printing business in their offices. Well, in this particular case, not only was the type seized because it was supposed that this type might also have printed *The Kerry Sentinel*, but a further step took place—the actual issue of the newspaper itself was seized. What he wished to ask the Attorney General for Ireland then—because it was very important that they should understand what the law was in those matters — was whether, if the printer who printed a placard or any other document happened to be a newspaper proprietor, not only the presses and type might be seized in accordance with the law as it now stood in Ireland, but also the actual issues of the newspaper itself.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER) said, the question the hon. Member had put to him was one in respect to an alleged matter of fact about which he had not the information the hon. Member appeared to possess. He was not aware whether the issue of the paper referred to had been seized or not. If the issue of a paper containing those atrocious publications was seized, he thought that seizure perfectly justified, whether the printing presses were used for printing other things or not.

MR. HARRINGTON said, that with the permission of the House he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SUPPLY.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into the Committee of Supply."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he wished to draw attention to the grave inconvenience caused by the Government not keeping a House on last Friday night. The Prime Minister that evening, in answer to the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote), had tried to throw the responsibility on the Opposition side of the House. But the right hon. Gentleman must see that they were not bound to keep a House to pass Government measures. He should have thought that it would have been a good opportunity, when the Conservative Benches were empty, for the Government to pass some of the pernicious measures which they wished to palm off upon the country. He trusted that they would not hear again of "veiled Obstruction."

MR. GORST wished to urge upon the Government the advisability of putting Supply on the Paper on Friday nights. He was quite certain that if there had been Votes of Supply to be discussed on Friday night some progress would have been made. He hoped the Government would adopt the practice of always putting Supply on the Paper on Fridays.

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £10,726, to complete the sum for the Natural History Museum.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,193, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for maintaining certain Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade."

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he was very glad to see that this year there was a distinct reduction of expenditure under this Vote. These harbour questions were, however, likely to be complicated; for, instead of the Harbour Department of the Board of Trade being entrusted with the management of all harbours since they had been removed from the control of the Admiralty and handed over to the Board of Trade, the Home Office was now about to undertake the management of these harbours of refuge proposed to be formed by convicts at Dover, Filey, and Peterhead. On a matter of this kind he thought it was out of all question that a Department having so little technical knowledge as was possessed by the Home Office should be in a position to involve the country in a large, possibly an enormous, expenditure for harbours of refuge. He, therefore, strongly objected to any expense being incurred in reference to Dover or any other harbour, because, in his view, that port ought to pay its own expenses; and if national interests required the construction of costly harbours of refuge, the nation ought to have complete plans and a carefully-prepared Estimate, with a scheme of management, laid before Parliament. There were some harbours, however, which were not so happily situated as far as self-sustaining capacity was concerned; and, therefore, he was not able to see why the funds to be spent on the harbours of refuge should not be spared in order to make the commercial harbours what they ought to be. He hoped that while, on the one hand, a stride had been taken in the direction of reform and economy in regard to harbours, a mistaken economy would not be allowed to interfere with expenditure which, in the long run, was the truest economy in improving the commercial harbours of the country.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT wished the hon. Member the Secretary to the Treasury to say, when he rose to answer the question of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just sat down (Sir George Balfour), whether the Government had made up their minds, or had considered even, whether they intended to lay out any money at all on Dover Harbour? The question of Dover Harbour was discussed at length in the House last year, when there was a Private Bill in reference to it before the House. The question which the House had then to consider was whether it was wise or prudent to allow a Bill of that kind to pass at the instance of a private Company of promoters, in preference to taking a matter of the kind into their own hands. He should certainly have thought that it would have been not only wiser, but more in accordance with the habits of statesmen, to have taken a matter of the kind into their own hands, and so dealt with it as that the harbour could have been made suitable not only for commercial ships, but for large vessels of war suitable for national defence, such as a Government ought to make provision for in a harbour like Dover, regarded in the light of its geographical position relatively to the Continent of Europe. The President of the Board of Trade, some time back, made a long statement in the House on this subject; and, in the course of that statement, he said that no definite conclusion had yet been come to with reference to the intentions of the Government. He could not help thinking that it was time some definite conclusion was not only formed, but formulated.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the large question of making Dover Harbour or not making it was still under the consideration of the Government; and no conclusion had as yet been arrived at on the subject. Therefore it was that he was not in a position to make a statement to the Committee on the subject. A statement of the kind which was apparently wished for by the hon. and gallant Gentleman might be possible when the Committee reached Class III. of the Estimates, which related to convict labour; but it certainly could not be made until then. It was not unlikely that a large harbour of the kind to which he had alluded would be made at Dover, or, at any rate, that Parliament would be asked to vote funds necessary for the purpose; but, until that time came, it was necessary to maintain the existing harbour and quay, and the cost of this alone was that which the Vote now proposed was intended to cover. With regard to the other questions which had been raised by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, there were many matters which had yet to be decided upon by the Government; but he could assure the Committee that no one of them had been lost sight of for a moment.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked whether he was right in supposing, from what had been said by the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury, that the question involved in the Dover Harbour business was to arise on the Vote for providing the amount necessary for the maintenance of Convict Establishments?

Mr. COURTNEY said, there was a Vote of the kind which would be brought forward, and upon which the Dover Harbour question could be most properly discussed.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he could not allow the remark of the Financial Secretary as to the intention of the Government to take the discussion on the proposed harbour of refuge at Dover on an obscure Vote for £16,000, or the Convict Vote to pass, without making known this fact—that an undertaking had been given by the Government that the question of the immense outlay for constructing a large harbour of refuge at Dover should be fully discussed, or that an ample opportunity should be given to hon. Members who wished to fully discuss it in a proper and formal way. He should, therefore, feel it his duty to protest against the supposition that such opportunity was given by bringing the question forward on the Convict Vote for the sum necessary to pay the charges for Convict Establishments.

MR. COURTNEY said, he thought the occasion would be ample for the purpose.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said, he thought the course proposed by the Government, of taking the discussion in reference to Dover Harbour on the Convict Establishments Vote, was a most unfair one, and was not only unfair, but amounted to an absolute violation of the promise given by the Government, that the matter should be discussed at a time when a full attendance of Members might be present in the House.

MR. RYLANDS said, this was a matter of very considerable, he might say serious, importance, and one which, judging from experience, might involve the expenditure of very large sums of money. It would, therefore, be unfair, on the part of the Government, to ask Parliament to agree to the Vote without having had previously a sufficient time for deliberation and discussion on the subject. He understood that such opportunity would be afforded when the Votes in Class III. were reached; and he hoped the Government would take the occasion to give to the Committee much fuller information than it had at present on the subject.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, before the Vote was agreed to, he wished to express a very strong hope that the Government would lay more Papers on the Table with reference to this matter. As far as he had been able to understand the matter at present, the Vote in Class III., to which reference had been made, would, practically, commit Parliament to the making of a harbour of refuge in Dover—a difficult and complicated business, in which there was so much involved that too much care could not be taken before a responsibility of the kind was undertaken. It was, in the first place, important that there should be a proper understanding with the existing harbour authorities at Dover. Long and difficult negotiations had already taken place with regard to the making at Dover of harbours, not only of refuge, but of defence; and this had been found to be a very difficult and complicated matter—so difficult and complicated, in fact, that successive Governments had taken it up, and been compelled to lay it down again. He, therefore, thought it extremely desirable that the Committee should have the fullest opportunity of considering the information which the Government had been able to obtain, as well as the conclusion at which they had arrived. The expenditure involved would not certainly be less than £1,000,000; and he did not think the Committee should be asked to assent to such an expenditure upon the mere statements of Gentlemen so distinguished as either the President of the Board of Trade or the Secretary to the Treasury. To do this would be to involve the country in an expenditure which might turn out to be both hasty and ill-judged.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he wished to know whether the Convict Establishment, which he understood it was intended to create at Dover, was intended to be for the reception of convicts from the whole of the Three Kingdoms?

SIR GEORGE ELLIOT said, that five or six years ago a Select Committee of the House expended a great deal of time on the subject of Dover Harbour, or, rather, the making of a harbour there. He was himself a Member of that Committee; and he remembered that after having had before them, as witnesses, a number of gentlemen pre-eminent on questions of that kind, the conclusion at which the Committee arrived was that the amount of £600,000, which was stated in the Bill as being sufficient for the completion of the scheme, was altogether inadequate—a harbour at Dover being necessary, not only for commercial, but for military and naval purposes. He did not rise to oppose the present Vote—although he thought the amount asked for should have been at least £1,000,000; but rather for the purpose of protesting against a Vote of the kind being passed in Committee of the House in a slipshod way. There was one other suggestion which he would make, and it was this—a Joint Committee of both Houses was now sitting in reference to the proposal to tunnel the Channel between France and this country. It was, of course, impossible for him, or for anybody else, to say what the result would be of the deliberations of that Committee, who were giving great attention to the matters which had been entrusted to them; but he thought it might be wise to wait for the Report of the Channel Tunnel Committee before coming to any definite conclusion as far as the harbour was concerned.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, this particular Vote only seemed to involve the expenditure of a very small sum of money; but the total amount which had been expended on harbours was something very much larger than many Members of the Committee seemed to think or to know. On Holyhead Harbour, for instance, there had been spent —by the Admiralty, the Board of Trade, and the Treasury—no less than £1,902,000, and the expenditure was still going on. At Dover there had been spent more than £867,000, and large sums had been spent in other places. These items, or many of them, could not be traced, unless hon. Members had the patience to go through Parliamentary Papers of a voluminous character. Harwich Harbour, too, had had large sums spent upon it; and, in his view, it was a harbour which did not in any way justify the spending of public money upon it. The Harbour Commissioners could not even pay the interest on the loans which were made to them; and he would, therefore, move to reduce the Vote by £430, set down in the Estimate for Harwich Harbour.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,763, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for maintaining certain Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade."—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

Mr. COURTNEY said, he thought the Committee would scarcely assent to the reduction which was proposed, inasmuch as the amount was necessary to pay the interest on the loan made by the Public Works Loans Commissioners.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR pointed out that the loss on account of Harwich Harbour, instead of diminishing, went on increasing; and he saw no reason why a harbour, which was practically worthless as a commercial speculation, should be maintained out of the public funds.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 19; Noes 120: Majority 101.—(Div. List, No. 101.)

Original Question again proposed.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR wished to express his thanks to the right hon. Gentleman the late First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. W. H. Smith) for the correct view he had taken of the question of Dover Harbour. In 1873 the Liberal Government proposed to expend a sum of £10,000 on the construction of new works in connection with Dover Harbour. Their proposal was resisted by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), and it was only carried by a majority of 2; and at a later date he himself (Sir George Balfour) and the late hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Leith) almost succeeded in outvoting the Government on the subject. A change of Government took place in 1874, and the late Conservative Government took more wise steps than their Predecessors. They appointed a Select Committee to inquire into the subject, and anybody who had read the Report of the proceedings of that Committee would find that the practical result of the investigation was the condemnation of the proceedings previously taken by the Liberal Government. He believed he was correct in stating that if the present scheme of the Government were to be carried out in a way to fulfil all the conditions formerly laid down by the Admiralty as regarded the area and depth of water being sufficient for a fleet of war ships, the cost of the proposed harbour of refuge at Dover would be very little short of £5,000,000. He therefore wished the country to be aware of the full responsibility which might be thrown upon them, seeing that the smallest area of six fathoms of depth could not be less than 1,000 acres, and that that space could not be obtained at a less cost than £5,000 per acre He again thanked the right hon. Gentleman opposite for what he had stated. He quite adopted the view of the right hon. Gentleman, and he hoped the Government would be able to deal with the question in a practical and statesmanlike manner. If any hon. Member desired to have a thorough knowledge of the question, he would ask him to read the Report of the proceedings of the Select Committee of 1875, and also the views expressed at a later date by Lord Beaconsfield in regard to a Motion made upon the subject by Lord Granville.

Mr. BIGGAR said, it appeared to him that the increase in the Vote for Dover Harbour was a very large increase. He wished to know if the hon.

Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury was able to offer any explanation upon the subject? He was sure the Committee would be glad to receive any information the hon. Gentleman could give. In particular, he wished to know why the resident engineer at Dover Harbour received so large a salary as £650 a-year?

MR. COURTNEY said, he had no special information to give upon this point; but he believed that the salary of the resident engineer at Dover had been paid for many years, and he was informed that it was not more than adequate for the services rendered.

MR. BIGGAR said, that £650 a-year in the shape of salary, and £600 for allowances, might not be more than sufficient compensation for a man of the ability of the engineer of Dover Harbour; but, at the same time, why did not the Government remove that gentleman to some other place, where his abilities would be of more value, and send a cheaper man to Dover Harbour? That all this money should be spent upon a small jetty at Dover seemed to him to be most extravagant.

MR. MOLLOY said, he wished to call the attention of the Committee to the question of the over-loading of the boats which made the passage across the Channel between Dover and Calais. He wanted to know if it was not the duty of the harbour master to report all cases of the over-loading of passenger vessels between France and England, which he believed to be constantly occurring? There was also most inadequate provision made for securing the safety of the passengers in the event of an accident. He had asked a Question upon this point some time ago, and he was told that an inquiry would be made and instructions given to the proper authorities to watch over the matter, and that a statement would be made to the House upon the subject. What it apappeared to him might reasonably be done was this. The harbour master, although his attention had been called to the matter on several occasions, had not, as far as he knew, made any Report to the authorities in regard to this overloading, and in regard to the want of lifeboats and other apparatus for the saving of life in case of accident. He was able to speak upon the matter from personal experience. Last year he went over from this country to Paris, and the boat at Dover was loaded with Indian mails under the very eyes of the English harbour master. The mail packages were so extensive that they blocked up the entire space on deck up to the captain's bridge.

THE CHAIRMAN wished to point out to the hon. Member that there was no officer of this kind—in fact, there was no harbour master at all at the time the hon. Member was now alluding to.

MR. MOLLOY said, there might not have been a harbour master; but there was certainly a pier master, who superintended the loading of the mails. He was unable to say whether the officer was traffic superintendent or pier master; but, at any rate, there was an officer told off to superintend the loading of the mails, and he (Mr. Molloy) would take the present opportunity of telling them what the experience was which he derived upon the occasion he was referring to, in regard to the overloading of the packets. Before this particular boat left Dover Harbour, the mail packets were piled up in the centre of the dock, so as to fill up the whole intervening space between the two paddle boxes, and it was utterly impossible for anyone to pass for the space of two hours, and even the sailors themselves had to climb over the paddle boxes when they wanted to pass from one end of the vessel to the other. He believed that an officer was paid a high salary to look after the mails and the safety of the passengers; but on that very occasion considerable difficulty was experienced in crossing over the Channel, in consequence of the manner in which the mail packets were accumulated and carried. There were also a large number of ships crossing the Channel in different directions at the time, and it required considerable attention on the part of the captain to avoid a collision. He did not mean to say that any collision actually occurred—only that it required great attention to avoid an accident. Had a collision occurred, it would have been utterly impossible for the great majority of the passengers to have been saved. He was quite positive that the number of passengers carried on that occasion far exceeded the number for which the boat was licensed. The cabin was full, all the couches were full, the upper couches also were full; and there was a great crowd of passengers on deck. Indeed, the vessel was choked up so much by the mails, that there was really not elbow room for the passengers, and they were obliged to stand packed up like herrings in a box, instead of enjoying the comfort which ought to be given to passengers crossing the Channel. It seemed to him that the only way of drawing attention to these matters effectually was for an hon. Member to make himself a little disagreeable. If that were not done, no attention was ever paid to his complaints. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury would get up and give a smooth answer. He would say the matter should be looked into, and he would give some kind of an explanation which really meant nothing, and nothing whatever would be none unless the hon. Member complaining made himself disagreeable. Under those circumstances, he begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £200, which was the salary, he believed, of the harbour master.

The CHAIRMAN asked the hon. Member whether he meant the salary of the pier master, or that of the traffic superintendent?

Mr. MOLLOY: The traffic superintendent.

The CHAIRMAN said, there was no salary for a traffic superintendent included in the Vote.

Mr. MOLLOY: Then the resident engineer or the actual officer in charge. He would move the reduction of the whole Vote by the sum of £150.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,043, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for maintaining certain Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade."—(*Mr. Molloy.*)

Mr. J. HOLMS said, he could hardly think that the hon. Gentleman would persist with a Motion for the reduction of the Vote. He thought the Committee were indebted to the hon. Member for drawing attention to the subject of overloading. This Vote, however, was for building and maintenance, and not for the *personnel* of the Harbour. He confessed that it was most desirable to be made perfectly clear that nothing in the shape of over-loading occurred. He would take care to communicate with the proper authorities, and see that their attention was called to the matter. He fully admitted the serious evil to which the hon. Member had called attention.

Sir EDWARD J. REED said, he was under the impression that the Vote included an allowance to a traffic manager for conducting the business of the two Railway Companies.

Mr. J. HOLMS said, that was a misapprehension.

Sir EDWARD J. REED said, it was stated in a foot note that an allowance was included for the traffic managers. The Estimates were certainly not clear upon the point. They generally appeared to include an allowance for a traffic superintendent, but not a salary for a traffic manager. He should, however, like to know what was the object of having a resident engineer at Dover at all? It was quite true that Dover Pier often seemed to require more or less repairing, owing to the nature of its construction; but the remedy for that would be to construct it properly, and then it would not be necessary to keep an engineer permanently on the spot looking out for accidents. He wished to know what were the services of the engineer for which they had to pay the sum? He should also like to be told why some better arrangements could not be made to place the Harbour under the control of Parliament, or some responsible authority? He thought the present mode of dealing with the question—namely, the voting of money to be subsequently repaid by the Railway Companies—involved an unnecessary waste of the time of the Committee.

Mr. J. HOLMS said, that the engineer was appointed at Dover Harbour to superintend the works which became necessary in consequence of the storm of 1877. That storm led to a considerable amount of new work becoming necessary, and an engineer had been employed there since. The Committee would observe that the Vote was increased by something that had happened at the bar.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, he was glad that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Holms) had returned to his place, because when a question was put to the Secretary to the Treasury some time ago, in reference to the salary paid to the engineer, it was quite impossible, from the answer the hon. Gentleman gave, that he could have been properly informed in regard to all the details of the matter. It appeared that the Committee were in the strange position of being required to pay an official at Dover Harbour for the purpose of attending, among other things, to the loading of passenger boats; but that, notwithstanding, those passenger boats were habitually over-loaded. Recollecting the line the Board of Trade had recently taken, and the letter which the President of the Board of Trade had written accusing the shipowners of recklessly sacrificing human lives in the pursuit of unholy gain, it was rather remarkable to find that the Board of Trade themselves had special superintendents for whom they asked the Committee to vote salaries, but that, nevertheless, they were open to the same charge in an aggravated form.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he had been asked by the hon. Member (Mr. J. Holms) not to press the Amendment. He would be perfectly ready to withdraw it if he got a satisfactory statement from the Government; but the statement just made was exactly the same as that which was made by the President of the Board of Trade at the commencement of the Session. For the last four years attention had been called to the subject, and nothing had been done. Letter after letter had appeared in the newspapers; and now to-night, in order to get the Vote through, the hon. Member, in answer to the complaints that were made, said—"I will see about it, and I will write a letter." He (Mr. Molloy) had no confidence in promises of that kind. If the hon. Gentleman would promise the Committee that he would not only write a letter, but see that the evil was remedied, that would be a different thing. As to writing a letter in order to ascertain what the facts were, he did not see what better information the hon. Gentleman could desire than that which he (Mr. Molloy) had already given to him from his own personal experience. He had no wish to put the Committee to the trouble of a division; but unless the hon. Gentleman would make a clear and definite promise, he should certainly divide.

Mr. J. HOLMS said, he thought that an inquiry ought to be made into the allegations of the hon. Member, and he would undertake to make a full inquiry.

Mr. MOLLOY said, that was only a repetition of the answer that had been given. The hon. Member promised to make inquiry into the facts which he (Mr. Molloy) had stated. But what was the use of making such an inquiry when he (Mr. Molloy) assured the hon. Gentleman that his statement simply referred to a state of things which he had seen on board one of these ships?

Mr. RAMSAY said, the Committee were asked to vote a sum of money for the payment of the salary of an engineer who had really nothing to do. In the first place, they were called upon to expend a sum of money upon Dover Harbour, and then to pay an engineer for seeing that it was expended. He failed to see that the engineer would have any professional work; and he, therefore, thought that it was not desirable that they should pay a salary of £650 a-year for the services of this gentleman. The hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. J. Holms) might be able to explain why they were asked to vote this sum of money as a salary to an engineer; but he (Mr. Ramsay) saw nothing in the Estimate itself which showed what this sum of £650 a-year was to be voted for, seeing that the Government asked for a very insignificant sum to be expended upon the harbour.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, it seemed to him that the Treasury had gone back entirely from the position they had at first taken up. In the first place, when the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) pointed out this blemish, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Holms) said the Government were very much indebted to his hon. Friend for having called attention to the matter. They had now, however, reconsidered their position, and they wanted to make more inquiry into the facts of the case. Surely, that was a distinctly retrograde movement. When the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) called attention to the engineer's salary, the only explanation that could be given by the Secretary to the Treasury was that the salary they were asked to pay this year had really been paid for some years back, and he did not know why it should not be paid for some years to come. That was all the explanation that was given to the Committee on the subject. His hon. Friend proposed a reduction of the Vote; but he (Mr. O'Donnell) thought the Vote ought to be postponed altogether until the Treasury Bench were able to know something about it. In that event, they might have a much better guarantee for reform. If there were a division, there might or might not be a majority in favour of it. He thought it was most likely that those who were in favour of the Motion of his hon. Friend would be in a minority, but nearly a quarter of an hour would be spent in taking a division. The Government would, no doubt, gain the Vote; but the country would not get any reform. He thought it would be better to postpone the Vote until a future day, so as to enable the Government to give the Committee information as to the nature of the duties of the traffic superintendant, and in that case the House would be able to proceed with the matter in a business-like manner. The course they were now asked to take was simply like throwing out a sort of Will-of-the-Wisp to lure them from the path of reform. If an inquiry were instituted, he presumed that an officer of the Government would be taken down to Dover Pier at some time when the packets were not over-crowded, and then they would be told that the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) was labouring under an entire hallucination; and next year they would find the Secretary to the Treasury stating that the salary was paid for a number of years past, and he failed to see why it should not continue to be paid for a considerable number of years to come. Certainly, the best way to enable the Treasury to become acquainted with the matter would be to postpone the Vote until they could communicate with Dover and ascertain what the real facts of the case were. In that case Her Majesty's Government would be able to enter upon a path of reform with full information on the subject in their possession.

Sir ANDREW LUSK submitted that the Committee had discussed this Vote long enough. ["No!"] He did not think there would be any advantage derived from continuing the discussion. In regard to the question of the resident engineer, he wished to point out that the harbour of Dover had cost a great deal of money to the country in various ways, and it was necessary that there should be an engineer to judge what its condition was. To bring the question nearer home, he would ask Irish Members what they would say if there was no engineer at Kingston Harbour, or at Holyhead? What would be said if there was no engineer to look after the works in Plymouth Harbour? He was of opinion that it was their duty to maintain a resident engineer at all these places. Then, again, as to the question of the over-loading of the mail packets. He had nothing to do with the service; but he had crossed the Channel several times, and he was able to say, from experience, that the service was well and ably performed, allowance being made for the difficulty of crossing. He would ask if any accident of consequence had happened to any of the boats engaged in that service? He did not think they could be told of any accident of a serious character. They ought, therefore, to give praise to those who performed the service, especially when they remembered that it was conducted in a chopping cross sea; that the harbour which they had to make was a very small one; and that altogether the service was a most difficult one to perform well. He would ask any hon. Member to go back for the last 10 years and point to any serious accident that had happened. It was all very well to bring charges that were without foundation. If there was any fault to find it was that they had not a better harbour, and that was a fault which attached to the country itself. So far as the pier master was concerned, the country did not pay for his services, but the Railway Companies paid for the maintenance of the roads across the pier. All he asked was that hon. Members should not find fault unnecessarily and without occasion.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he had no wish to find fault with the pier master, or any other gentleman who performed that work; but he should like to know in what condition this harbour and works on the pier now were? He saw in the Vote that the amount formerly asked for repairing damages was asked for no longer, so that he might fairly presume that the repairs had been completed. The question he wished to ask was, whether the pier was actually completed, or whether the works originally contemplated were still going on? He did not say anything as to the engineer's salary, because, in regard to works such as those at Dover Harbour, he imagined that a resident engineer would always be necessary, in order to see that damage was not done, and to superintend the necessary repairs. All he wished to know was whether the contemplated enlargement of last year was still going on, or whether the works were terminated?

MR. J. HOLMS replied, that the estimated cost of the repairs which it had been necessary to make was £41,000. They had actually been completed at a cost of £22,828; and he did not think there was any prospect of a further demand being made upon the Exchequer.

MR. GILES remarked, that Dover Pier was practically finished, and he thought it was necessary to have a resident engineer. The work had cost about £2,000,000. ["No!"] He believed he was correct in saying that the actual cost was £1,900,000. ["No!"] At all events, the cost amounted to a very large sum of money. They could never foretell when they were going to have a storm; and it was always desirable, when a storm did come, that there should be an engineer on the spot to be able to look after anything that might happen. He hoped the Committee would not agree to dispense with the services of an officer of that kind, when experience had proved that the services of a resident engineer were absolutely necessary.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR observed, that the War Office had incurred very large expenses in connection with the fortified works at the end of the pier at Dover; but a resident engineer would have nothing to do with works of that kind. The expenses for the Dover Pier batteries were charged in the Army Estimates, and the officer whose salary was now in question had no control over them whatever. In regard to the repairs which had been spoken of in connection with the pier, they were very ordinary repairs, and involved work of a very simple kind, and needed because of the damage done to the parapet of the pier by the storm of a few years ago. He believed that the works had been washed away owing to improper design in laying out the pier, so as to expose it to the direct instead of the oblique action of the waves. If the pier had been properly laid out, as the experienced engineers of the Mediterranean so carefully planned their breakwaters, the force of the waves would not have been sufficiently strong to have damaged the works. He had long been of opinion that the services of a resident engineer, at a salary of £650, were not necessary. He had no wish to find fault with the individual himself. Reference had been made to the works at Holyhead, but the superintendent employed there only received £350 a-year, and at Kingston Harbour he believed the person in charge of the engineering works was paid £3 3*s.* a-week; both of these being sums very much below that received by the resident engineer at Dover Harbour. He, therefore, thought that his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Molloy) was quite right in objecting to this salary being paid to the traffic superintendent at Dover.

MR. BIGGAR said, he thought the explanation which had been given in regard to the employment of these engineers was very unsatisfactory. The hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Andrew Lusk) spoke of the works at Kingston and Holyhead. In regard to Holyhead, he did not find any charge for the salary of an engineer there, although the work at Holyhead was much larger than that which had been performed at Dover. In the one case, however, there was no permanent charge for an engineer, while in the other there was a charge of £650 a-year. He believed that, strictly speaking, the question which had been raised in regard to this particular Vote did not specially refer to the engineer at all. It referred rather to the traffic superintendent, and the pier superintendent. It seemed to him a remarkable arrangement that an officer employed to superintend the steamboats should be paid by the Government, and should also be paid by the Steamboat and Railway Companies. He thought that any superintendent employed at the instance of the Government should be altogether independent of the people who conducted the traffic, and that he should not be in their pay at all. They might just as well ask the Railway and Steamboat Companies to superintend their own work, and make a Report to the Government as to whether the work was well and properly done, as to employ a superintendent at all under such circumstances. So long as they continued the present system he was afraid they would have Reports in all cases that the vessels were not over-loaded, although it was a well-known fact that they were. There was another observation he wished to make in regard to what he had himself seen. He had had the experience of several Sessions in that House in regard to Secretaries to the Treasury, and the manner in which they explained the different Votes which came before the House. He specially remembered two Secretaries who were always prepared to give very full and accurate information with regard to the Votes—namely, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) and the late lamented Lord Frederick Cavendish. But since then—and the present Secretary to the Treasury was no exception—the hon. Gentlemen who had filled that Office had displayed considerable ingenuity and skill in not giving the information which the Committee desired. He rather suspected that the Government knew a great deal more than they were inclined to tell; and he would suggest to hon. Gentlemen opposite that when a question was asked in future they should give as much information as they could to the Committee. Such a course would be more satisfactory to the Committee, and would probably enable the Business to go on with more rapidity.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 16; Noes 82: Majority 66. — (Div. List, No. 102.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(3.) £136,880, to complete the sum for Rates on Government Property.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked for an explanation in regard to this Vote. It seemed that there was a decrease upon the Customs property included in the Vote. Would the Government explain how that reduction had been brought about?

Mr. COURTNEY said, that he was unable at present to explain the cause of the reduction; but he would make inquiries, and give the information to the hon. Member. He thought it might, in a large measure, be due to the changes in the Customs and Inland Revenue Establishments, which rendered certain buildings no longer useful, and, as a general rule, they had been disposed of.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked if the hon. Gentleman would be able to give an answer upon the Report stage of Supply?

Mr. COURTNEY: Yes.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £7,500, to complete the sum for the Metropolitan Fire Brigade.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that upon this Vote he was anxious to make a few observations in regard to the condition of the security at present afforded to the Metropolis against fire. He did not propose to detain the Committee at any length with the few words he desired to say; but it was necessary, at all events, to show that he had some reason for stopping the Business of the Committee upon this Vote; He did not desire to move a reduction of the Vote, and his reason for not taking that course was that he thought, in all probability, his argument would tend to show that a larger amount, if there was to be any contribution at all from the State, ought to be contributed in aid of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. The experience he had derived from the investigation which took place a few years ago by a Committee of the House, of which he was Chairman, afforded sufficient evidence to show that this great City was not protected from fire in the way in which it ought to be, looking at the value of the property involved, and the amount of life annually lost from the effects of fire. In making this assertion he wished, first of all, to say that he did not mean for one moment to cast the slightest imputation upon the existing Fire Brigade. They were a body of men who had done their work in the most able and most gallant manner possible. His whole contention was that they were over-taxed in that work, and that London was not sufficiently protected, either in the number of firemen or the amount of the appliances placed at their disposal. They had only to recollect the amount of property at stake. Only two years ago the value of all the property in London was estimated at £1,620,000,000. All this property was intrusted to the Metropolitan Fire Brigade to protect from the ravages of fire. In 1882 the serious fires recorded in London amounted to 164, while the slight fires numbered 1,762, making a total of 1,926 fires in that year alone. There were in the same year 36 lives lost and 175 endangered, which was more than the average of the five previous years. In the five years previous to 1882, 129 lives were lost and 794 were endangered. He merely mentioned these facts to show that the amount of danger from fire was hardly sufficiently realized, and that people did not estimate what was going on in their midst. The annual loss, both of life and property, was certainly something which ought to make them reflect seriously whether the means available for dealing with fires were sufficient, and whether the sum contributed by the State towards the maintenance of the Fire Brigade was adequate. As far back as 1876, Captain Shaw, who was the able head of the Fire Brigade of the Metropolis, stated before the Select Committee that to give a fair security against fire in the Metropolis he should require 169 stations, 200 fire-escapes, 330 engines, and 931 men, and he put the cost of a Brigade of these dimensions at something like £120,000 a-year. Now, what was actually the force at the disposal of the Fire Brigade last year, recollecting what Captain Shaw said was absolutely necessary to afford security? The force in 1882, instead of amounting to 167 stations, amounted to 70; there were only 124 fire-escapes instead of 200; 159 engines instead of 330, and only 736 men instead of the 931 which Captain Shaw considered necessary. When they remembered that in the protection of life and property from fire the great thing was to arrest its progress at the earliest possible period, he thought the Committee would see that this question of stations in the Metropolis was one of the most important items they had to consider. If they could multiply the stations largely, and distribute them well over the Metropolis, the probability was that engines might be brought to bear upon a fire at such an early period as to reduce the damage to very slight dimensions, and many of them, instead of being serious, would be numbered in the list of slight fires, many of them being extinguished by buckets of water, instead of requiring the aid of fire-engines at all. This and other questions, especially that of the number of men at the disposal of the Metropolitan Fire Brigate, weighed very strongly upon the Committee in giving their decision. It was shown conclusively that nearly the whole Brigade was swallowed up by by one large fire. That happened at the fire at the Pantechnicon. Captain Shaw stated, alluding to that fire, that he was not prepared to say what might have happened if another great fire had broken out in the Metropolis at the same time. Large fires were constantly occurring now, and there was considerable danger of their getting entirely beyond the power of the present Fire Brigade. It was a question, therefore, that might well be considered, whether the present appliances for extinguishing fires were not upon so limited a scale as to be a source of danger hereafter? As he had said, there was the danger of a large part of the Force being swallowed up by one serious fire; but there was also another danger which arose from the constant overworking of the men, and which prevented the Brigade from being maintained in an efficient condition. The Select Committee, in 1877, had it put before them, over and over again, that men had been worked from 92 up to as many as 120 consecutive hours. One witness stated that he had not been in bed for four days and three nights, but that he had been compelled to lie down in his clothes, and was liable to be called up again at any moment. The whole tendency of the Evidence went to show that, unless the whole force of the men was largely increased, the work imposed upon them was of so severe a character that it was utterly impossible for them to keep pace with it. The Metropolitan Board of Works was at present the authority which had the direction of the Fire Brigade, and was that a body which could in a proper manner carry out the duties intrusted to them? They could only do it at a cost which was enormous. Even for the limited security which they at present gave against fire the Metropolitan Board of Works spent something like £120,000 a-year in keeping up the Fire Brigade; and if they were to enlarge the Force, it must necessarily cost an enormous sum to build a sufficient number of stations for the whole of the Metropolis simply for giving London that protection which it was fairly entitled to. He thought the Committee which formerly sat upon this question, and the Committee which sat in 1877 and 1878, had come to a right conclusion when they reported that the Fire Brigade, instead of being attached to the Metropolitan Board of Works, ought to be a branch of the Police Force of the Metropolis, and for this reason:—The Police Force of the Metropolis had 158 stations, which could be, without difficulty and at a very small expense, united to the 70 existing Fire Brigade stations; and in that case they would have at once an additional number of stations actually larger than they were told was necessary for providing a fairly efficient Force. But, beyond that, they had the advantage at the present moment of 339 other standpoints scattered over the Metropolis at which constables were permanently placed, or at which they could be at a slight cost permanently placed. Captain Shaw admitted that appliances for the extinguishing of fire might be placed at these standpoints; that the police constables would avail themselves of the appliances so placed, and would use them at fires in a way which would tend to render the application of the larger material of the Brigade unnecessary. They would be able, by employing the police, to have a certain addition of 158 stations and 339 other points where appliances for the protection of the Metropolis from fire could be placed, and from which they might be used; and he believed, if that were done, they would be able to bring a fire so completely under control as to diminish very largely the number of serious fires which were constantly occurring in London. Beyond that, it must be remembered that in case of an emergency they would at once get over the difficulty now experienced owing to the limited number of men who formed the Fire Brigade, because the reserves of the police would be called in aid, and in any great emergency there would be additional men available. The only objection which seemed to taken by the police authorities of the Metropolis—Colonel Henderson and Colonel Fraser — was that there would be a divided responsibility. Now, there was great danger of something of that kind occurring; but the difficulty might be avoided by making the Brigade a branch of the Police Force under the Commissioners of Police. He was certain that the only real remedy for the complaints made in regard to efficient protection from fire was that they should take away the control of the Brigade from the Metropolitan Board of Works, not because that Body had not administered it to the best of the abilities they possessed—that was to say, their power of raising money from the rates—but because, by the transfer, they would get the efficiency they required and deemed to be necessary for the protection of London from fire, and they would get it at a cost which would be infinitesimal. They would, furthermore, provide that the work should be done in a way which should secure the complete efficiency of the Brigade. The Metropolitan Board of Works would have at once to build 99 stations, and to add 355 men to their present Force, in order to bring it up to the strength they required by the system which they themselves suggested; whereas the Commissioners of Police would have at their command the full strength of the Metropolitan Police, and all the men that were necessary. He had no wish to delay the Committee at any length, and he did not want to go, as he might have felt disposed to do upon a Motion, into a number of arguments which might be brought forward in support of his view of the matter. He had no wish to delay the progress of Supply on a question of this sort, beyond bringing it before the Committee. He had endeavoured, first of all, to show the value of the property, which was enormous, and also the amount of life which was at present annually sacrificed. Secondly, he had endeavoured to show, in regard to the efficiency of the existing Fire Brigade, that they were now attempting to protect the Metropolis from fires with a much smaller force than Captain Shaw admitted some years ago to be necessary. Further, he had shown that by making this transfer they would secure a force greater even than Captain Shaw had contemplated; that they would get ample security for the protection of the Metropolis, and that they would obtain it without incurring any extravagant cost. There was another advantage he might mention which would be derived from the transfer of the Fire Brigade to the Police. That advantage was this. The police area throughout the Metropolis was a far wider one than that of the Metropolitan Board of Works. By the transfer of the Brigade to the Police the operation of the Brigade would therefore be extended beyond the limited area of the Metropolitan Board of Works. All that area which was beyond the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works was not attended to by the Fire Brigade at present; but, by this transfer, it would be brought under the protection of the Brigade, and would obtain the same security as that which was afforded to the centre of the Metropolis. He was quite aware that he might be told that the discussion of the question was not opportune at the present moment, and that it ought to be left until the great work of reconstructing the Government of London was undertaken. But, in regard to that matter, he was quite aware, from the little experience he had had of that House, that if they waited until the measure was before the House, after having undergone the ordeal of being created in a Government Office, and then properly thought out by the House itself, they would have to wait a very long time indeed. He was also satisfied that after such a measure had been introduced, if this question should happen not to have been specially dealt with, it would stand very little chance of being satisfactorily considered. It was with that view that he was anxious to call the attention of the Committee to these points, and to suggest to the Committee and to the Government in any reconstruction or alteration of the Governing Authority of the Metropolis the Fire Brigade, at all events, ought not to be intrusted to the control of a separate body. There was already existing a Force with which it might be incorporated with advantage, and by which the security of life and property in the outlying parts of the Metropolis would also be insured. He believed that any hon. Member who studied the Evidence taken by the Select Committee in 1877 would arrive at the conclusion which he had arrived at.

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, although he appreciated the manner in which the hon. Baronet had handled this subject, he was bound to say that on every point which he had brought before the Committee he was in the unfortunate position of entirely disagreeing with him. He would remind the Committee that on a former occasion the hon. Baronet, in speaking on an Amendment, was counted out in the midst of a panegyric on the Metropolitan Board of Works; and it seemed hardly consistent that he should complain of the action of the Board on the present occasion. It appeared to him that the hon. Baronet had taken a mistaken view of this subject from beginning to end. The number of deaths from fires in the Metropolis had nothing whatever to do with the question; but he would give a list of those which had occurred during the last few years. There were 25 deaths in 1878; 32 in 1879; 33 in 1880; 40 in 1881; and 36 in 1882, which gave a total of 166 in five years, during every one of which the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, and all the appliances connected with it, were increasing. The causes that led to that number of deaths were various in their character, and showed that, in most cases, they were not preventible by any increase in the numbers or efficiency of the Brigade, but were due to accidents or carelessness, apart from any fire on the premises. Children fell into the fire, spirit lamps were upset, and explosions of gas took place, besides many other things which led to loss of life, which no Fire Brigade could prevent. The Estimate for the Brigade made by Captain Shaw in 1865 was £75,000, an amount which was afterwards cut down to £50,000. The number of men he asked for at first was 574; then it was 416; and in his third estimate it was 277. The number of engines in the first estimate was 330, in the second 140, and in the third 129. The number of stations in the first estimate was 157, in the second 125, and in the present estimate they were 57. At this moment they had 576, or two men more than Captain Shaw asked for originally; 160 engines, including four floating engines; 54 permanent stations and 12 moveable stations. The estimated expenditure of the present year was £105,116. They had also accessories of a very useful character. Since the first Motion was brought forward about the Fire Brigade, they had in use the telegraph and the telephone. They had 13 waggons for street stations, and two trollies, ladder trucks, 50 telegraph and 13 telephone wires, 13 fire alarums, and 576 firemen of all ranks. He said that these appurtenances added enormously to the efficiency of the Fire Brigade, and enabled it to cope with fires in the most prompt manner; and he would go farther, and assert that the Metropolitan Board and their Fire Brigade had ably and thoroughly done their duty. The percentage of serious fires had been reduced from 34, at which it unfortunately stood under the Companies, to 25 in 1866, to 11 in 1876, and to 9 in 1882. He asked the Committee what better test there could be of the efficiency of a Body charged with putting out fires, than to say they had done their work in the best possible way? He maintained that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade had done their best; and, if that were so, how could it be said that it was advisable to transfer their work from the Municipal Authority to a Government Department? It appeared to him that the present proposal was similar to one of the ideas lately brought before the House in regard to the theatres—that was to say, it was proposed to take away from the Municipal Authorities duties which properly belonged to them, which they were carrying out progressively to the best of their ability, and transfer them to a Department of the Government, the members of which, with all respect to that Department, were not the proper persons to have them, and who were wise enough to say that the Municipal Authorities could better do the work, and that if they should prove incompetent to deal with it they should go to the Government and ask for assistance. He admitted that the Committee referred to by the hon. Baronet did recommend the transfer of the Fire Brigade from the Metropolitan Board of Works to the Police; but they gave their opinion, he was bound to say, in direct opposition to that of persons fully qualified to form a correct judgment in the matter. He had no wish to take up the time of the Committee; but if hon. Members wished it, he would read to them the evidence of Sir Edmund Henderson and Colonel Fraser. Both those gentlemen agreed in the opinion that if the authorities did what his hon. Friend (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) now advocated, they would simply turn good policemen into bad firemen, and good firemen into indifferent policemen, and thus make a great hugger-mugger of the whole concern. Therefore, it was to be hoped that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade would be allowed to go on as they were; stopping fires, protecting lives, saving them in fire-escapes and in other ways, all over the Metropolis, and risking and losing their own lives for the public good in a manner that all must admire. The Committee had gone against all the evidence given before it except that of Captain Harris, who was in favour of the transfer of the Fire Brigade to the Police. He thought the evidence of Sir Edmund Henderson, Colonel Fraser, and Captain Shaw, the latter of whom had certainly said nothing in favour of the transfer, should have weight with hon. Members in dealing with this question. The hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) intimated that Captain Shaw had been in favour of the transfer of the Brigade to the Police; but he gave that an unqualified denial, and he had the authority of that gentleman for saying he had never made any such statement. He hoped the hon. Member would be satisfied with that denial; and, for his own part, he should remain of opinion that every witness of weight who gave evidence before the Committee was against the transfer of the Brigade to a Department of State which did not want it, and which had quite enough to do already, without undertaking additional duties that properly devolved on the Municipal Authorities.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, that, after a municipal experience of 25 years, he was able to assure the hon. and gallant Baronet who had just spoken, that he agreed with every word he had used with regard to the question before the Committee. In his own town they had taken these functions out of the hands of the Police and placed them with the Fire Brigade, since which it had worked better and more economically. But he wished to go back to a question that he himself and other hon. Gentleman on those Benches had raised on several previous occasions. Why was the Consolidated Fund to pay towards the ratepayers of London a contribution which it did not pay to the ratepayers of any other town in the country? Leeds, Manchester, Liverpool, Wolverhampton, and other great centres had to keep up Fire Brigades out of their own rates. He contended that the Metropolis should defray the cost of its Fire Brigade out of its own rates, and not come upon the taxpayers of the country generally to do it for them. As he had already said, the question had been before the House and the constituencies throughout the country again and again; and he felt so strongly the injustice involved, that he would divide the Committee against the Vote altogether.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND said, he could quite believe that the Metropolitan Board of Works did everything they could to put a stop to fires. They were entitled to speak of the increased efficiency which resulted from the use of the telegraph and telephone. But it would certainly be more by good fortune than arrangement, that they could deal effectively with two great fires at the same time. Suppose the fire at the Pantechnicon and that at Humphrey's Wharf had taken place together, he asked whether it would have been possible to put them out at the same time? Would not one of these have been left to itself? [Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: Certainly not.] If the Metropolitan Board of Works had sufficient funds and a sufficient force at their disposal for the complete discharge of their duties, why did they now obtain the sanction of the Treasury to the introduction of a Money Bill, giving them power to tax the London Fire Offices to a large extent? In the olden times the matter rested in this way. The Fire Offices paid on their own account certain sums which they were willing to subscribe towards the putting out of fires; they also supported engines of their own, and did various other things for the same object. Now, as the Fire Brigade sent their engines to any fire that occurred, it followed that the assured were paying for the unassured; this was felt to be an anomaly, and it ended in the whole matter being put into the hands of the Metropolitan Board of Works, the Companies agreeing to pay them the money they originally paid — namely, £24,000 a-year. But why was the attempt to tax those Companies made, if the system of the Metropolitan Board of Works was above all question? Captain Shaw, in his original estimate, had proposed that the number of men should be 574—the very least that would be of use; and the hon. and gallant Baronet, 15 years after that estimate was made, spoke of it as a merit that two men had been added to the Force. Since that time he believed the Metropolis had increased in size to the extent of one-third, and it was now seven years ago that Captain Shaw recommended the employment of a force of 931 men. With regard to the unqualified denial of the hon. and gallant Baronet on behalf of Captain Shaw, to the effect that he had never stated that he was in favour of a transfer of the Brigade, he would refer the Committee to the evidence of Captain Shaw, given before the Select Committee—Question 1,056. He considered the hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had done a public service that evening in bringing this matter under the notice of the Committee; and he trusted, before it was too late, that his proposal would meet with the support to which it was entitled.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, with reference to the point raised by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), the contribution was not an estimate of the present time, but of the year 1865, when the amount of £10,000 was sanctioned and fixed by Act of Parliament. The hon. Member spoke as if this sum represented the whole or, at all events, a large proportion of the expense of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade; but that was not the case. The cost of the Brigade in 1865 was £57,000; and at the present time the £10,000 in question only represented a small portion of the entire cost of £108,000. He must admit that he thought £10,000 was an exaggerated estimate for the time, when it was originally made in 1865. But it was not so now. The amount at which it was fixed in 1865 was stated to be on account of the large number and great value of the public buildings, which were scattered over a very large area of the Metropolis, and which were at that time excluded from the payment of rates. With regard to the question raised by the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), he entirely agreed—and he spoke as representing the opinion of the Secretary of State for the Home Department—with what had fallen from the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg). That hon. and gallant Member had informed the Committee that on a former occasion the hon. Baronet opposite had been counted out in the midst of a panegyric on the Metropolitan Board of Works, and had said that he had no right to complain of the Board on account of its action at the present time, arguing that it was unfair to entertain the proposal to hand over to a Government Department, however able, duties which properly belonged to the Municipal Authorities. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) could not imagine a more centralizing measure than to hand over to a Government Department the control of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. The hon. Baronet said the Police ought to be the Authority in matters relating to fires. He could only say that such was not the opinion of the Fire Authorities, the Police Authorities, or the Home Department. The hon. Baronet had quoted Captain Shaw, but that gentleman was opposed to the change, as were also the Commissioners of Police, and the Chiefs of the City Police; and it followed, therefore, that all those who best knew the working of the existing system were against the alteration which the hon. Baronet proposed to introduce. The hon. Baronet asked if the Metropolitan Board could properly discharge the duties required of it in the matter of fires? The answer to that was—"If they cannot, you ought to get a Board which can." The hon. Baronet made a point, on behalf of his view of the question, by saying that the Police area was much larger than the Metropolitan area; but that appeared rather to tell in an opposite direction. The Police area was so large that it included vast tracts of agricultural country, altogether beyond the Metropolis, and he could not think that safety in the Metropolis would be insured by sending the police-engines down to the limits of the Police area. It must be remembered that the duties of the Police in relation to fires were wholly different from those of firemen. That distinction was clearly pointed out in the General Orders. The primary duty of the Police was to preserve order, and to preserve life and and property; and it was to be regretted that year by year other duties were being thrown upon them which were calculated to diminish their efficiency for the purpose they were intended to fulfil. In the matter of fires, the Police were charged with the duty of giving alarm, of rescuing life and protecting property, regulating traffic, and keeping the ground clear for the operations of the firemen. Without the aid of the Police the firemen would be altogether unable to operate, and it must not be understood that the Police had not already their clearly defined duties with regard to fires. Again, the men of the Fire Brigade were selected on account of certain special qualifications for the duties they had to perform. The great majority of them were sailors; they were accustomed to climbing, and were, therefore, the better able to rescue life, and do what was needful for the preservation of property at great heights; and, on the whole, they were men of a very different character to those who formed the ordinary rank and file of the Police Force. In a city with a population of 4,000,000 crowds collected at fires with extraordinary rapidity; and not only was this the result of curiosity, but amongst the persons who so collected there was often a considerable number of thieves, and a great amount of pilfering took place in consequence. There was also the danger of the crowd taking advantage of the confusion caused by the fire to break into property in the neighbourhood. If the police were held responsible for the management of the Fire Brigade, he took it that, in practice, the result would be that the Fire Brigade would be nominally under the direction of the Commissioners of Police, while, as a matter of fact, it would remain an entirely separate body; in other words, there would be a state of things similar to that which now prevailed.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the right hon. Baronet had not quite understood him. His proposal would not in any way interfere with the existing duties of the Police. He proposed that the 158 stations of the Police should be availed of, and that the reserve men at those stations should be employed in case of fire.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the suburban reserves were, as a matter of fact, called upon already in the case of fires of sufficient magnitude to render that course necessary. He could not believe that the amalgamation of these two separate bodies—the Fire Brigade and the Police—would produce any saving, or tend to increased efficiency. There were three large towns in which the Fire Brigade and the Police were one organization. In Manchester the Brigade did not form a portion of the Police system; it was under the control of a Watch Committee, and for purposes of discipline it was under the Chief Constable. In Liverpool the Fire Brigade and the Police were one force. Now in Liverpool, it must be remembered, the Police Force was very much larger in proportion than it was in London; it was, indeed, larger than the Police Force and the Fire Brigade together. If, therefore, Liverpool were taken as an example, there would be no saving whatever. The Returns showed that the Liverpool system was more costly than the separate system; whether or not it was more effective, without further local information it was, of course, impossible to say. They had also the testimony of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) that the separate system had proved to be more economical as well as more effective in the town which he represented. He believed that enough had been said to show that there was great doubt as to the wisdom of the plan proposed. It was the opinion of the Government that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade was a very efficient organization; and he was not disposed to believe that any administrative improvement could be effected by the transfer of its functions to the Police. There seemed to him ample scope already for all the Police could do in the discharge of their duties, without putting further duties upon them. He thought that perhaps something more might be done in the direction of controlling fires, by keeping at the police-stations such apparatus as hose, reels, buckets, folding ladders, and other appliances that could be used with effect before the arrival of the Brigade; and in that limited sense he considered that the hon. Baronet had made a valuable suggestion to the Committee, and one which ought to receive attention at the hands of the authorities. He was also of opinion that it would be wise to instruct constables in the use of the means of saving life and property, so that their aid in this respect might be available until the engines arrived on the ground. With regard to telegraph communication between the Police at distant stations and the Brigade, that was already in operation to a certain extent, and increased rapidity of communication was the result. The system was extending, and the adoption of the suggestion under this head would simply mean the continuance of what was now taking place. The usual complaints were not of delay in the arrival of the Brigade, but of the difficulty of getting a proper supply of water; but that was not a matter that could be dealt with by placing the Fire Brigade under the control of the Police, because it was really connected with the Metropolitan water supply. But the hon. Baronet would know that in the City a large number of fires were put out by means of the hydrant system that had been established. This work, however, was complicated, and could only be done by thoroughly trained men. The beats of policemen had often to be changed; and, as that was necessary, it was hopeless to expect them, when they took a new beat, to know the position of all the hydrants and fire-plugs at a moment's notice. He doubted whether such amateur firemen as the Police would necessarily be could be of much use in an emergency; and, on the whole, he thought that it had been shown to be desirable that the arrangements with regard to the Fire Brigade should be left in the hands of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, the discussion had taken what he considered rather an irrelevant turn. He had been a Member of the Committee of which the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had been Chairman, and he felt bound to confirm what had been said by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg), who probably knew more about this question than any other Member of the House as to the opinion of the Members of the Committee. He wished the Committee to understand this—that, for very good reasons, no doubt, the people of London were perfectly well satisfied with the Fire Brigade. They had a good, an excellent, Fire Brigade, and it was no use to tell him anything to the contrary, because he was a Londoner, and knew something about London; and, besides that, was Chairman of one of the Metropolitan Fire Insurance Offices. He did not want to see the Fire Brigade under the Police. The Fire Insurance Offices being satisfied with the present management of the Brigade contributed between £25,000 and £30,000 towards that management. [An hon. MEMBER: £24,000.] Well, £24,000, be it so. The public in taxes paid £105,000, and were perfectly satisfied. If all those most interested were satisfied, why should they turn the Brigade over to the Police? It was said that if it were under the Police it would make its appearance at fires with greater rapidity; but that he absolutely denied. Did hon. Members know how rapidly it attended a fire? It was on the spot within two or three minutes of an outbreak of fire, frequently when very little of a fire was to be seen, and it was utterly impossible to accelerate its speed. See how well the Brigade managed at the great Wood Street fire, and at the big fire at Whiteley's in Westbourne Grove! The engines were on the spot immediately after the discovery of the fire at Whiteley's; but the goods were of such a highly combustible character that, in spite of all possible efforts, the conflagration got such hold in so short a space of time that all the men could do was to prevent its spread to other buildings. At the great fire in Bermondsey the engines were rapidly on the spot; no one could find fault with the men. The hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had a preconceived notion that the Police were the best persons to have to do with the extinguishing of fires; but he (Sir Andrew Lusk) did not understand why the hon. Baronet thought so. It had frequently been shown that a good policeman would make a bad fireman; but the hon. Baronet had a contrary notion, and adhered to it tenaciously, and endeavoured to convince those who differed from him against their will.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the hon. Baronet would forgive him for reminding him that out of a Committee of 27 he had been in a minority of 2.

Sir ANDREW LUSK said, the hon. Baronet had carried the Committee with him because the Members of it liked to defer to him as much as they could. The hon. Baronet, however, had failed to carry him (Sir Andrew Lusk) with him. The public were well served with a Fire Brigade, although hon. Members must not run away with the idea that he believed it could not be advantageously extended. If they wanted a larger Brigade let them increase its size, taxing the public for the additions. The public would pay as they did at present. He would not say they did not require advice gratis from hon. Members; but he would say this—that those who paid for the service of the Fire Brigade should be intrusted with the management of it. In spite of the enormous value of the property of the Government in the Metropolis—the New Law Courts, the Houses of Parliament, the Palaces and Public Offices, &c.—all that the State contributed towards the expense of the Brigade was £10,000. If they contributed according to the value of their property, the sum they would pay would not be £10,000, but £30,000. Why should not the Government be asked to contribute more than they did? He would not say the sum they contributed now was paltry; but he would certainly say that they should contribute their fair share according to the amount of their property. It was to be hoped that the answer the hon. Baronet had received from the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works would be sufficient, and that he would rest satisfied, and never bring the question forward again. He would advise the Committee to go on now with the next Vote.

Mr. DICK PEDDIE said, he did not suppose that, after the explanation given by the President of the Local Government Board, his hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton would press his Motion to a division, The President of the Local Government Board had reminded the Committee that the payment to the support of the Metropolis was provided for in an Act of Parliament. It seemed to him that, in these circumstances, the proper course was not to refuse the Vote, but to repeal the Act; and he hoped the Government would bring in a measure to that effect when they came to be in a position to carry any measures at all. There could be no doubt that there was a growing feeling in the country against the grants made from Imperial sources for the benefit of the Metropolis, and he did not think that the reason for continuing such a payment in this case made it more defensible than other grants of a similar kind. That reason was that the Government had a good deal of property in London. But there were other proprietors in London besides the Government, and he did not see why the Government, anymore than any other proprietor, should be called on to do more than to pay the rate on their property. There might have been a good reason for voting a large sum towards the Fire Brigade when Government property was exempted from rates; but now that was done away with all reason for continuing the grant was gone.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, that if the money paid by the Government was not paid as a rate upon the Government buildings, his argument was wrong to a great extent. He believed, however, that it was in respect of Government buildings.

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, the question was whether the contribution of £10,000 was a fair payment to enable the Brigade to meet its expenses? There was a Metropolitan rate of a halfpenny in the pound, which produced from £105,000 to £110,000, and the Fire Offices contributed £25,000. As to what had fallen from the hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) with regard to the advantages of transferring the duties of the Fire Brigade to the Police, it seemed to him that the proposed change would be an unfortunate one. It must be an advantage to have specially trained men in a service of this kind. An incident occurred last year which would have convinced anyone of the truth of this statement. Captain Shaw had asked him to go down to Greenwich one Sunday to observe the efficiency of the men, and he had accepted the invitation. The men were dressed in their best clothes, and least expected to be called on duty; but on the fire bell being rung, in two minutes, less ten seconds, every one of the men was dressed, the engines were got ready, the horses were harnessed, and everything was in thorough preparation. This was enough to show the efficiency of the Brigade as at present constituted; and it would be a woful mistake, without any fault to find with the Brigade, to transfer its duties to some other Force; especially would it be a mistake to transfer them to the Police, after the able speech they had had from the President of the Local Government Board. Each body had its particular office and duties—the Police to preserve law and order, and the Fire Brigade to protect life and property from fire. The amount paid by the Government was relative to the amount of their property, and the contribution of the Fire Offices was a very fair one, considering the magnitude of the interest they had in the protection of property from fire. If anything, the contribution of the Fire Offices should be increased.

MR. BIGGAR said, that as he was the only Irish Representative in the House at the present moment, he must be allowed to say a word on this subject. The question was, what right had London, more than any other part of the United Kingdom, to a special grant? So far as he could see, it had none. He failed to understand why London should have a special grant any more than Dublin, or Belfast, or any other large town in the Three Kingdoms. As had been pointed out already, the Government Offices bore their share of local taxation, and he failed to see why local authorities should not have assistance in meeting the expenses of their fire services. The Insurance Companies, very justly, paid a portion of the expense; and if all property was insured, no doubt it would be fair for them to pay the whole. He could not join in opposing the Vote.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £165,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1884, in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales during the year ended on the 25th day of March 1883."

MR. BIDDELL said, he had questioned the Government on the subject of this Vote last year, and wished again to put a query to them—namely, whether the applications for the money were much less this year than last year; and whether the Estimates had been founded on the number or the amount of the applications? Also, he should like to ask whether the Government had power to distribute this money differently, for under the present system the distribution was singularly unequal, many parishes that paid very low rates being materially assisted, while all help was refused to other parishes paying very high rates. It frequently happened that in respect of roads, formerly turnpike roads, costing £20 a-mile to repair, half the amount came from the county and a quarter from the Government, leaving the amount for the parish to pay reduced to £5 a-mile, which was, of course, much less than the repairs cost. Before the Vote was agreed to, he should like to known something about it. He desired the Government to divide this money in a much more equitable manner than it was at present divided.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that before they went any further, perhaps he might be allowed to correct the hon. Member who had just spoken as to the amount paid this year being smaller than last year. That was not the case. If they would look at the amount actually spent they would see that it was smaller last year than this. The increase was simply owing to a natural increase. As to the second question, whether, with the consent of the Treasury, they would be able to alter the conditions on which the grants were given, he supposed the Government could make an application to Parliament based on a different system. The hon. Member, however, had made no suggestion as to what the system should be; and it seemed to him (Sir Charles W. Dilke) that, no matter what the system was, they would have cases of individual hardship—that was to say, there would be a variation as contrasted with population or property, or any other test they liked to take, between one area and another. The system adopted last year was one of an elastic character, and seemed to him to be as good as any one that could be devised. At any rate, he had never seen nor heard of a better one. He had heard complaints of the working of the system in different counties, but had not, up to the present, seen a better system.

Mr. RAMSAY regretted that they should have to enter on a discussion of this subject at the present time, for he had expected when the present Government came into Office that they would not have adopted this system of Government grants in aid for objects which should be provided for by the respective localities. There was another view to take of this. Though the grant, on the whole, might be no more than equal to the demands made upon it, yet on the next page they found a very small amount put down for Scotland. He did not desire to discuss the Scotch Vote, but only to compare it with the £200,000—the gross amount—asked for England and Wales. The Vote for Scotland was not a seventh part of that amount, though, taken either by taxation, population, or area, Scotland was more than one-seventh of England. He could not, as a private Member, move to increase the Scotch Vote, and he could not now move for details as to how it was to be distributed this year. Last year he was successful in obtaining some information which, if it showed nothing else, demonstrated the impolicy of placing the management of the affairs of Scotland in the hands of those who knew nothing about the law and practice in that country. He felt it was necessary to make a protest against a Vote of this kind, and to point out that unless the grants were given equally to all parts of the Kingdom, the House was guilty of a distinct wrong in passing them. He would propose, with a view of placing the Scottish people somewhat on the same footing as the English, that instead of granting £165,000 they should vote £140,000, or a reduction of £25,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £140,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales during the year ended on the 25th day of March 1883."—(*Mr. Ramsay.*)

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, he was not satisfied with the economical principles of the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay), who, whilst not objecting to the Vote for England, moved its reduction because that for Scotland was not large enough. Would the President of the Local Government Board state on what principle the distribution was made? The Vote was introduced for the first time last year. It was then £250,000, but this year it was reduced to £200,000. Certainly the dismantled turnpike roads had not decreased, but, on the contrary, had very much increased, and it would be very satisfactory to the country generally to have a statement from the President of the Local Government Board as to the principle on which the Vote was distributed. He would say to the right hon. Baronet, what he believed was known to the Committee generally—namely, that one of the grievances of the present day was the enormous amount people were taxed for the maintenance of roads. These roads were channels of communication between one part of the country and another, and a large amount of loss had been occasioned to those who held road debentures in consequence of the disturnpiking. For many years the policy of the Department had been to take these roads up, and make communications from one part of the country to another carriage free. Last year a grant in aid was proposed, and, at the fag end of the Session, £250,000 was stated as the amount they thought the Government ought to contribute for the purpose. This year the amount was reduced to £200,000; and though the statement of the President of the Local Government Board might be correct, in many instances he did not believe the knowledge of the public grant, or the principle on which it was allocated, were made known. It would be greatly to the advantage of the public, as well as satisfactory to the Committee, if the right hon. Gentleman would give some information on this subject.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, there was a statement made last year which fully explained the matter, and there were Papers laid before the House which gave the principle of the distribution of the grant. This statement, for the convenience of the Committee and of the hon. Baronet who asked the question, he would repeat. They had to distinguish between three classes of roads—firstly, County roads; secondly, Quarter Sessions roads; and, thirdly, South Wales roads. By an Act of 1878 half the cost of all highways disturnpiked after 1870 fell upon the counties, and power was given to the counties to add main roads to the list. The sum thus paid was between £300,000 and £400,000. Last year the Government made a proposal to the House which had the effect of throwing on the Votes in Parliament half of this half, or a quarter of the whole cost of the disturnpiked highways. The grants for 1882-3 were based on the payments actually made in 1881-2. With respect to Quarter Sessions, Boroughs, and Metropolitan roads, Parliament assumed a quarter of their actual cost; and as to the third class there was a different system, Parliament assuming half the sum which since 1870 had been paid by the counties. These were the three plans—in the case of each class one system was adopted. As to the comparison of the amounts for last year and this year, that estimated or suggested to the House last year was £250,000, which included the sum for Scotland; but, roughly speaking, £50,000 of that might be said to have been returned. This year the amount taken was £225,000, or £200,000, exclusive of Scotland. That, he thought, answered the question put to him by the hon. Baronet.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, that this Vote would be more properly entitled "a Vote for giving assistance out of the Consolidated Fund to landlords whose rents were in arrear" than "a Vote in aid of disturnpiked and main roads." He would ask the Committee for a moment to consider the principle on which turnpike roads were originally made. The great bulk of the Vote was in aid of turnpike roads in counties, and the only figures the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had given were as to the aggregate cost of turnpike roads. From time immemorial the cost of the roads in the parish had devolved upon the parish. Something like 100 years ago, there was discovered a necessity for better means of communication, and the turnpike roads were constructed by means of a turnpike trust, which was empowered to levy tolls on persons using roads until the cost of making them was defrayed. Then, and not till then, the turnpike roads formed part of the parish roads, and the cost of maintaining them was thrown on the parishes. He was not defending this system. He was willing to admit that when these trusts came to an end it was a very empirical method of dealing with the roads, to throw the cost of maintaining them on the parishes. The parishes were often very small areas, the extent of road passing through them being considerable—very disproportionate to the size of the parishes. The system adopted in this country was different from that of Ireland and the various nations of the Continent. In Ireland and other countries, the whole cost of the roads, whether they were called turnpike or parish, was thrown on the county; and that, he believed, would have been the best and wisest system to have adopted in England. What was their position now? Why, at a time of great agricultural depression—though no greater than prevailed in the mining and manufacturing districts—the agricultural interest, being disproportionately represented in the House, was in a position to come and ask for a contribution out of the Consolidated Fund towards the maintenance of county roads, whilst nothing was asked on behalf of the other interests in towns and boroughs, although those interests had to construct roads and streets at enormous cost for the benefit of the whole community. In towns and boroughs the roads had to be paid for out of the local rates. ["No, no!"] He begged pardon; the Government did not assist in the maintenance of these roads. There were a few boroughs in England with turnpike roads running through them—they were so few that he could almost count them on his fingers —which were aided; but the amount they received was so small that it was a mere bagatelle, compared with the total amount paid by the Government, and with the cost of the roads and streets in the towns. On the last occasion that this subject was brought before the House, he was challenged as to whether he could name a turnpike road running through Liverpool or Manchester, in respect of which a charge was made on the Consolidated Fund. He was not very well acquainted with these places. The town he was best acquainted with was the one he represented—namely, Wolverhampton. That town had a portion of a turnpike road running through it, and the charge upon the Consolidated Fund in respect of it was about £200; whereas the real cost of maintaining the roads of the borough was £6,000 or £7,000. Why were the ratepayers in counties, whose rates were less than those towns, to receive aid from the Consolidated Fund, whilst the heavy ratepayers of the towns, who had suffered more from commercial depression than the counties, received none? He did not advocate throwing the whole cost of the maintenance of the roads of the country on the Consolidated Fund; but why, he would ask, were they to take out of the Consolidated Fund £250,000 in order to put it in the hands of the least taxed class in the community?—because the ratepayers in the counties were taxed to nothing like the amount that ratepayers in the boroughs were taxed. This assistance to the agricultural interest was one of those sops which were thrown to Cerberus last year. He was sorry this sop was thrown last year, and he certainly should give the Committee an opportunity of saying whether or not it should be thrown this year.

Mr. GREGORY said, the hon. Member for Wolverhampton had put the roads in boroughs in the same position as the main roads in the agricultural districts. In reality, they were not in the same position. The roads, for which a contribution was asked, were links in the great chains of communication from one end of the country to the other. They were originally constructed, not for parochial purposes, but as main arteries of communication, to promote Imperial objects. On this footing they were projected and constructed; on this footing they were maintained; and on that principle the Committee was asked to make this contribution. He had had some experience of this matter. When he practised before Committees he had to deal with case after case of turnpike roads, and found that generally they were constructed out of money advanced on the faith of tolls, many of them by the landowners. In many cases the tolls became insufficient for the maintenance of the roads, and the persons who had constructed them sustained considerable loss, the country, of course, getting the benefit of that loss. The question was whether the Government should pay for their maintenance now that the tolls had been abolished? And in considering this it was necessary, as he had said, to bear in mind that these roads were not constructed for parochial purposes. They had been constructed at the expense of private individuals for Imperial purposes, and handed over to the country, and all the country was asked to pay was the expense of repairs. He had had some experience, too, of roads through boroughs. The desire of the borough authorities had always been to throw the liability in respect of the roads further and further back—that was to say, to include as much of the main roads within the boroughs as they could. There were many instances of turnpike roads constructed at the expense of private individuals who had no connection with the borough, having become streets by the extensive borough boundary. For these, they had only to pay the cost of maintenance inside the boundary. The boroughs certainly had no right to complain of the liability they were under. All that was now asked for was a contribution towards the main arteries, which had been constructed, not for parochial or local purposes alone, but for public purposes and uses.

MR. DUCKHAM said, he was sorry to hear a discussion raised on this matter. The arrangement made had been a sort of compromise, by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, having proposed to put a tax on carriages, gave this subvention towards the turnpike roads—or towards the maintenance of the main roads of the country established under the Act of 1878. As a rule, the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was very accurate in the views he placed before the House; but, on this occasion, he was the reverse. The main roads were not confined to the turnpike roads of the country, but extended to every market town and every borough in the Kingdom which had its own separate Quarter Sessions. [Mr. RYLANDS: You are quite mistaken.] He was not mistaken in what he was stating. If the authorities in the different counties had not put into operation the Act of 1878, it was their fault, and not his inaccurate speaking. The Act of 1878 extended the through roads of the country through every borough in the Kingdom which had a separate Quarter Sessions. [Mr. RYLANDS: You are wrong.] He begged the hon. Member's pardon. He was quite right, as the hon. Member would see if he would take the trouble to read the Act. They had it, on very high authority, that the main roads of the country had not been maintained altogether by real property, but that personal property was also liable. That was a matter he was not going to enter upon further than to make a bare allusion to it; but he was supported in his view by a speech he had had the pleasure of hearing from the Prime Minister. He (Mr. Duckham) was certainly very much surprised at the remarks the hon. Member for Wolverhampton had made, and hoped that the Committee, if it divided, would not do so according to the lines laid down by that hon. Member. The agricultural condition of this country was very different now from what it was 100 years ago. With regard to a comparison between rates paid by urban and suburban ratepayers, he could speak with a considerable amount of experience; and he was sure that equity required that the grant which the Committee was now called upon to make was not in excess of what should be given. If some parts of the Kingdom had not put in force the Act of 1878, the fault rested with the local authorities, and not with the Government. Those who had put the Act in force had adopted the plan of rates for the main roads. There were only a few towns which had Quarter Sessions, and he found that rates were of more advantage to the ratepayers in boroughs than to those in the counties.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said, he had always been of opinion that there should be some relief in a way which would relieve all the ratepayers—say, for lunacy or poor. Of course, as the hon. Member for Wolverhampton had said, this grant was nothing less than a sop to Cerberus; but he should have said that at the time, and shown that the Government, instead of dealing with this question on a bold and intelligible principle, had simply given way to agitation. It could not, however, be denied that the agitation was founded upon grievances which fell very heavily upon certain interests. The hon. Member's complaint now came quite too late, because the Government were not going to give any further assistance to the agricultural interest in lieu of the one which he would withdraw.

MR. RYLANDS said, he thought that in consequence of the clamour made by the agricultural interest for some relief, the Government in a weak moment had given a certain sop to that interest. When the Government first proposed to increase the tax on carriages, such opinions were expressed from the Benches below the Gangway that the Government withdrew the proposal. There was no speaking about it in public, but private intimations were given, and if the proposal had been pressed Members on those Benches would have voted against it. Being quite unable to carry that tax, which would have been most injurious to an important branch of manufacture, the Government then proposed to give a substitute. He forgot exactly the circumstances; but the matter was brought forward very late in the Session, and adopted when everyone was in a scramble, and there was no opportunity to discuss the proposal of the Government. If there had been a suitable opportunity, he and the hon. Member for Wolverhampton would have opposed it *ab initio.* Why? Because they regarded it as one of those objectionable charges such as had been fastened from time to time on the Consolidated Fund in the interest of owners of property. It was very nice for them to dip their hands into the Consolidated Fund; but what was that Fund? It was a Fund to which the working classes of this country contributed a very large share. [An hon. MEMBER: No, no!] No! The working classes contributed a large proportion of the Customs and Excise, and it was upon them that the country gentlemen were seeking to fasten burdens in order to relieve their own shoulders. He objected altogether to this Vote. He had not heard the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay); but if his speech had been correctly represented, his Amendment was meant as a protest against the insufficiency of the grant for Scotland. He hoped that was not so; but he would very much rather join with his hon. Friend if he would withdraw his Amendment and join in voting against this Vote altogether, as that was the best way of dealing with it. If the hon. Member would withdraw and vote against the English Vote, he would vote with him upon the Scotch Vote. Then no party from England or Scotland could complain. He really believed that if this side of the House would, on this occasion, exhibit some of the independence that used to exist in the House, and which he should be glad to see again manifested, and if they would join with him and the hon. Member for Wolverhampton in resisting this Vote, he believed at the next Cabinet Meeting on Saturday the Government would congratulate themselves on the result. It was contrary to the principles of the Prime Minister to propose a substitute of this kind. He hoped his hon. Friends would assist the Government in getting out of the false position in which they had placed themselves by granting, in a weak moment, this substitute of £200,000. Hon. Members should read the Mid Lothian speeches as to the proper mode of relieving local burdens. Was it consistent with the Prime Minister's principles to give a lump sum of £200,000 for the relief of the counties? Not at all. If assistance was to be given it should be in a different form. He should be glad if, by rejecting this Vote, the Committee would put an end to the practice of hon. Members who constantly cried "Give, give!"

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was almost quite alone in his action. The hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had promised to support the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) in a Motion to reduce or strike out the Vote for Scotland; but he feared the hon. Member for Falkirk would not give a willing assent to that. In answer to the hon. Members for Wolverhampton and Burnley, he could only assure the Committee that this must be looked upon as, in one sense, a temporary grant. It was a grant which was subject to revision, or to a complete change in its nature. It was subject to the general consideration of the whole financial relations of the State, and the counties and the various parties in this country, which must take place when the subject of Local Taxation was examined. He hoped and believed that the question of Local Government would come before the House for consideration at an early period; and, whenever that question was dealt with, undoubtedly it must be dealt with not as one of local government alone, but of local finances, and the relations between the local and the Imperial finances. Therefore, this matter must be looked upon as a temporary grant which must continue until these relations were revised. As to the manner in which the grant was at present distributed, the hon. Member behind him had put before the Committee the principles upon which the difference occurred between one locality and another. The rates were, of course, divisible into two great classes — namely, those for local traffic, and those for through traffic on the main lines of communication between the large towns. With respect to the first, they were specially to the advantage of the particular localities. As to the second, the principle that the cost of maintaining the main roads ought not to fall upon the particular localities through which the roads passed had been recognized since 1870. The Act of 1870 provided that the cost of maintaining these roads, so far as such roads were included in the highway district, should be borne by the fund of the highway district. In 1878, by the Highways Act, a further step was taken in the same direction. By that Act the cost of maintaining such roads in case of separate highway districts was transferred to the county rate, subject only to the condition that the road should be certified by the surveyor to have been maintained in a proper condition. One effect of that had, therefore, been that the roads had been maintained in a good condition, and that was a considerable result. By the same Act the county authorities were empowered to declare their roads, whether they were disturnpiked roads or not, to be main roads, and a moiety of any such road should be maintained in the same manner as a disturnpiked road under the Act of 1870. As to roads which were distinguished as main roads, they varied considerably in different parts of the country, and that was the cause of the variation of the grants, to which hon. Members had called attention. He knew that the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had a very strong opinion upon these grants, and, generally speaking, he concurred very much with the hon. Member in his view against a system of substitutes. It was not a system of which he could approve; but, at the same time, as he had distinctly stated, the Government looked upon this as a temporary grant, and not as one which, in the long run, could be satisfactory, or which should be permanent. They regarded it as one which should continue only until the system of local taxation was dealt with.

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, the argument seemed to be that parishes were bound to maintain the roads in their districts; but to show the poverty of that argument, he had only to mention that these roads were not parish roads, but main roads, constructed for through communication for the general advantage of the public in cheapness of carriage. The mails were carried as they never could have been otherwise, and Parliament had very much constructed these roads at the expense of the whole community, in order to obtain the great benefits in which the whole country participated. It was monstrous, then, that they should throw what was for the benefit of the whole community on the localities, and ignore all the expenses now thrown upon them without any local benefit, but with some inconvenience, for the general good. It was not merely the parishes that were interested, but every individual could, at this moment, indict a parish for the non-repair of these roads. The public had, through Parliament, sanctioned the construction of these roads; the public had had the advantage of the roads; and it was monstrous that the public should not contribute in any shape to the maintenance of the roads. Whether the allocation of part of the Government funds was to be temporary or permanent was beside the question at this moment. These great expenses had to be borne, and the whole community ought to bear a portion of them.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he took it that the object of the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) in his Amendment was to secure that this contribution to the main roads should be given in the same proportion as the subsidy to the Scotch high roads. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had not taken notice of the objection raised by the hon. Member for Falkirk; and he thought the right hon. Gentleman should state upon what grounds the allocation between the two countries was made. The difference between the English and Scotch grants was as eight to one, whereas the fair ratio between the two countries would be as six or seven to one; but, however that might be, the Committee had a fair claim to some explanation from the President of the Local Government Board, or from the Lord Advocate, as to the way in which the money was allocated, and as to why a very much larger proportionate sum was given to England than to Scotland. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) in his opposition to the principle of these grants in aid, and should vote with him; but he was not sure that the Scotch Members would accept the advice of the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands).

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he could assure the hon. Member that he knew very little about the Scotch part of the case. When this Vote was revised last year, the control of the whole matter was placed in the hands of the Local

Government Board. The result was that the whole country rose in insurrection on the subject; and it appeared that, of all the Public Departments, the Local Government Board was the most unpopular in Scotland; and Scotland entirely repudiated all interference by the Board in regard to this grant, and the result was that the Board had had nothing to say to the Scotch part of the case. That was the reason why he knew little of the Scotch portion of the grant for this year. Last Session the Scotch grant fell very much short of the amount expected, but the principle upon which it was distributed was precisely the same as that which had prevailed in Scotland; and he assumed that the falling off was caused by the general average in Scotland, in the same way as in England it had told against certain counties to the benefit of others. Some counties in England had come worse off than others in connection with these matters, and so he supposed Scotland had suffered in the same way.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, this Estimate was a fair specimen of the mode in which money for public purposes was voted in that House. They had heard from the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) that the working classes of Great Britain were taxed in order to lighten the burdens on the shoulders of the landlords; and they had had the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) objecting to the Vote because it was disproportionate to the amount given to Scotland. Those hon. Gentlemen argued as if England and Scotland alone contributed to the Fund from which this grant was made; but he would remind the Committee that there was a certain Island not far from these shores, the inhabitants of which also contributed to the Consolidated Fund, although they had no place whatever in the scheme of subvention. The Committee were asked by the hon. Member for Falkirk to reduce the Vote to an extent that would make it bear the same proportion to English taxation as the Scotch Vote did. Without discussing the inequality which, in the case of Scotland, the hon. Member conceived to constitute an injustice, he (Mr. A. O'Connor) asked the Committee to consider the grievous injustice involved in the Vote to the people of Ireland. When they compared the local taxation in Ireland with that in England, it would be found that it was not England or Scotland which should receive assistance, but Ireland. The valuation in Great Britain in 1870 was £104,000,000, and in 1880 it had risen to £135,000,000, an increase of 30 per cent; while in Ireland, in 1871, the valuation was £13,200,000, and in 1881 it stood at £13,700,000—that was to say, the value of property in Ireland that could bear taxation had increased only at the rate of 4 per cent, the increased wealth of England during the same period being more than seven and a-half times as great. But in that time the population of England had increased immensely, while in Ireland it had gone on steadily decreasing, the condition of the people having become very much worse. During the year 1871 there were in Ireland in receipt of relief under the Poor Law 282,000 persons; in 10 years that number had gone up to 590,000. So that the pauper population of Ireland had in a decade increased by almost 50 per cent, while the pauper population in England had gone down very much, in face of the greatly increased valuation of property which he had already shown. In that state of affairs it was plain that it was Ireland that required assistance from the Imperial Treasury, not Scotland or England. But when they came to the particular subject of the maintenance of roads, the inequality appeared very great, because in England, out of a total local taxation of £20,800,000, he found that the highway rate only amounted to £1,021,000; whereas in Ireland, out of a total local taxation of £3,371,000, no less than £333,000 was paid from the Grand Jury Cess. It was perfectly plain that to omit Ireland from the list of communities receiving grants from Imperial taxation, while Scotland and England were included, was most unjust. He had no wish to detain the Committee unnecessarily; and would only remark that he should vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Falkirk as a protest, on the part of Irish Members, against the utterly indefensible demand that the Consolidated Fund should contribute to the maintenance of English and Scotch roads, while their own community received no assistance of the kind whatever.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, he was obliged to the hon. Member for Falkirk

(Mr. Ramsay) for the proposal he had just made, and he should certainly vote in its favour if he thought fit to divide the Committee upon it. He agreed with the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) that if it was necessary to come at all upon the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of maintaining disturnpiked roads, Scotland ought to have her full share of the grant. His own opinion was that roads were best paid for by means of tolls, because, in that case, they were kept up by those who made use of them; and therefore he regretted that in a short time every turnpike in Scotland would be done away with. That was the work of the late Conservative Government, and would never be forgiven by persons in his own county. The feeling was so strong that, under the circumstances, he was astonished to find himself there to tell the tale.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said, the Vote was another illustration of the power and skill of the landed interest in the House of Commons. He was surprised that hon. Gentlemen should so easily fall into a trap designed to enhance the value of their property by the landed class, at the cost of the taxpayers of the country. It must be obvious that every relief of this kind given out of the Consolidated Fund was really a scheme for the maintenance of rents in the country. He felt this constituted a real Irish grievance, and he regretted his hon. Friend the Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) was not there to deal with it. If Scotch Members felt it necessary to get up and propose a reduction of the Vote, on the ground that the grant to Scotland was disproportionate to that of England, how much more must Irish Members be justified in objecting to the Vote on the ground that no relief whatever was given to the Irish ratepayers, although they had to bear their full share of Imperial taxation? He was glad that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board had informed the Committee that the Vote was only a temporary one, and that its removal from the Estimates was awaiting the settlement of the larger question of Local Government and the re-arrangement of county finance. No harm would be done, in his opinion, if his hon. Friend the Member for Falkirk went to a division upon the Main Question, in order to express, on behalf of the great majority of the taxpayers and the heavily-taxed working class, their feeling against the Vote; but he hoped his hon. Friend, seeeing that the point he had raised was a very small one, would not put the Committee to the trouble of dividing on his Amendment.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, the landowners were perfectly ready to bear their hereditary burdens; but when the Government placed upon them extraordinary rates for matters not originally contemplated, it was expected that some alleviation would be proposed.

Mr. HIBBERT: The Government did not propose the rates.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, that, at all events, they persuaded the House of Commons to pass the Bill. A point which ought not to be overlooked was that a great number of these rates were imposed, not for local, but Imperial purposes, and therefore ought to have been borne by the Imperial Exchequer. It was useless for the hon. Member opposite to get up and say this was not the case. Whether the aid was to be given by subvention or not was of less importance than whether the purpose of the outlay was an Imperial or a local one. The burdens that were of a local character could easily be arranged for. He was acquainted with parts of Scotland in which the Roads and Bridges Act had done a great deal of good, and he was certain the time would come when the people of Scotland, as a whole, would thank the late Government for passing that Act.

Mr. CROPPER said, he hoped the Amendment of the hon. Member for Falkirk would not be pressed. Certainly he thought the feeling of the House, when this proposal was originally made, was that it was a fair way of meeting an acknowledged difficulty. With regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. A. O'Connor), he wished to point out that the Irish people were free from certain assessed taxes which the people were liable for in England, and which it was to be hoped would soon be given up for local purposes. It must be remembered that the subvention did promote efficiency in the case of the roads, because it was only given on proof that they were well kept up. He thought the discussion had been of use in causing it to be understood that the grant was only a temporary one.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he desired to say a few words in answer to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth). He did not intend to enter into the whole question of roads; but if there was one thing more than another which the tenant farmers required, it was an alleviation of their burdens, so far as the main roads of the country were concerned. He remembered sitting on a Committee with reference to turnpikes many years ago, and the question came before them as to the Bradford, Kirkstall, and Leeds road, and the farmers in that district protested that it would be most unwise to abolish the turnpikes, and why? On each side of the road there were mills as thick as possible all the way along, and at the back there were tracts of agricultural land, cultivated it was true, but which, as at the present time, were not paying very well. There might be times when there was distress in our manufactures, but even then those engaged in those industries were only rated for the buildings they occupied; but the farmer, under any circumstances, would have to bear the burden of the roads, and he thought no greater case of hardship could be illustrated than the one he had referred to. He, therefore, failed to see how it could be alleged that this paltry £200,000 was going to benefit the landlords. It was the scantiest and barest possible justice; and if the President of the Local Government Board had not some more satisfactory scheme to propose in the way of giving more of the public funds to the support of the main roads, some very strong complaints would be made and great disappointment would be felt.

Mr. BIGGAR contended that the ratepayers in Ireland laboured under a greater grievance than those in Scotland in this matter of maintaining the roads out of the Consolidated Fund. But he also objected, on general grounds, that the charge on account of the disturnpiked roads was not legitimate, because those roads, which before the establishment of railways were of very great importance, were not now used to anything like the same extent as before. They were formerly used as main roads; but now they were only used by the ratepayers of the district. Such things as long distance journeys by road, by cart, or waggon, were now out of the question. It was the farmers who got the benefit of the abolition of turnpikes, because, although they had the almost exclusive use of the roads, these were, to a large extent, maintained by the manufactures in the various districts.

Mr. H. T. DAVENPORT said, if he had with him the Returns furnished to him by the President of the Local Government Board of the amount of money paid by the various highway authorities in Staffordshire, he believed they would supply a contradiction of the statement of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) that the towns were not benefited by the Vote except to a very small extent. Of course, he did not rise to oppose the present Vote of £200,000, because he thought that, as a matter of fact, it was not large enough. He understood from the President of the Local Government Board that the whole of the £220,000 voted last year had been spent; but as he believed there was a large number of parishes entitled to payment under this head which had not yet received any money, it was only fair to suppose that if £220,000 was not enough to meet the claims of last year, the £200,000 now asked for would also be insufficient for the purpose.

Mr. RAMSAY said, the question raised by him was not, as the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) supposed, one of minor importance. The question was, were Members for Scotland to take the means open to them of endeavouring to secure proportionate equality in the distribution of these grants when the Votes came before them? Under the circumstances, he felt it his duty to divide the Committee on his Amendment.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, he did not wish to put the Committee to the trouble of dividing twice, and he therefore proposed to take the decision of the Committee on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Falkirk as indicative of the view of the Committee on the Main Question.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 162: Majority 113.—(Div. List, No. 103.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(6.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland during the year ended Whitsuntide 1883."

MR. RAMSAY said, he should like to receive information from someone connected with the Home Office as to what steps were taken to regulate the distribution of this amount. He endeavoured last year to bring under the notice of the Government the injustice done to Scotland in this matter; and he felt now that unless they got some assurance that the grant would be distributed on a different principle to that which had been adopted in the past, they would not be justified in voting the money for the maintenance of the roads in Scotland. Many of the counties of Scotland had never had turnpikes in them, and the Local Government Board had framed a Rule to the effect that none of the roads that were disturnpiked before a prescribed date should receive any part of the grant. It was understood that the grant should be given for the maintenance of disturnpiked and main roads, and these ran all through Scotland. The late Member for Haddingtonshire, Lord Elcho (the Earl of Wemyss), got the roads in his county disturnpiked; but, because that occurred before the prescribed date, the county did not get a sixpence. It was not the case that boroughs through which main roads passed had not made representations to the Local Government Board. The borough he represented (Airdrie) had done so. It had claimed to have a grant in respect of the roads that passed through it, which were maintained by its ratepayers, and not by the county, as they were wont to be. He felt that unless they obtained from some person on the Treasury Bench an explanation of the manner in which the grant was to be allocated, the Committee would do well to reject it altogether.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, it had already been explained more than once that evening that when the grant was made last year it was regarded as of a temporary nature. For that reason it was administered by the Local Government Board. The grant went back much farther, in so far as Scotland was concerned, than it did in England; but it was true it had left out certain counties which had anticipated the more recent legislation, and had themselves promoted Acts by which tolls were abolished. The amount actually appropriated to Scotland, he believed, was somewhere about £20,500. They were fully sensible that there was a fair case for the consideration of the grants which were left out of the allocation of last year; and, accordingly, the Vote asked for this year, and which would be administered under the direction of the Home Office, was £25,000, or £4,500 in excess of what it was last year. The hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) would see that this left a considerable margin. He was not in a position to say in what manner the money would be disposed of; but he could assure the hon. Member that the case of these counties was under favourable consideration. It was to be hoped the hon. Member would not insist on opposing the Vote, for if he did he would be resisting the granting of the means whereby the claim he made might be satisfied. He (the Lord Advocate) hoped the Committee would not have to divide on the matter.

MR. RAMSAY said, he did not think the statement which had been elicited from the Lord Advocate was at all satisfactory. The £4,500 which the Government saved from Scotland last year was justly due to those counties from which the grant had been altogether withheld. Unless, however, they could get an assurance that money would be allocated to all the counties which were not included last year, he must oppose the Vote. He did not think the ratepayers derived the benefit from these roads that it was supposed they did by hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Conservative Benches. These grants were illusory. They were allocated by gentlemen who did not know the position of the districts; and, unless they could get an assurance that this £4,500 would in future be allocated for the behoof of Scotland, he did not think it would be right to let the Vote pass. Unless he got some more definite assurance than that which he had yet received, or some more satisfactory explanation, he must resist the proposal. The original Estimate of the Government with regard to

Scotland was for £40,000; but, instead of getting the whole of that amount, Scotland, as he understood, was put off with less than half the whole amount. He would, therefore, if it was competent for him to do so, move the postponement of the Vote until they received from the Government some definite rules for the allocation of the money. Without that, the Scotch Members could not rest satisfied that the money would be justly distributed.

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL said, he was sure the hon. Member for Falkirk was right in what he had stated. Certain counties which had taken the initiative in this new system of road legislation were entirely cut off from all benefit in the Vote. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate said he would take the matter into his favourable consideration; but that was a phrase they were quite familiar with. They knew very well what "favourable consideration" meant. The right hon. and learned Gentleman was, no doubt, perfectly sincere; but hon. Members were apt to be suspicious of vague promises of this sort; and, unless they obtained a more definite assurance than they had had, that the counties which had taken the initiative in the matter would receive that consideration which was no more than their due, he should feel himself justified in going with his hon. Friend (Mr. Ramsay) in this matter.

Dr. CAMERON said, it seemed to him the argument of his hon. Friend (Mr. Ramsay) was rather illogical. He should have thought an hon. Gentleman representing a Scotch constituency would have admitted the truth of the proverb, "Half a loaf is better than no bread." He, like the hon. Gentleman, was against grants in aid, and should have been glad to have voted with him against the grant altogether, believing that these grants did no good, and always led to extravagance. He (Dr. Cameron) was opposed to them in principle; but if there was one thing which made them bearable, it was that they should be distributed to all parts of the Kingdom alike. If it was desired to give the Government more time to consider the subject, the proper thing to do would be to move to report Progress; at any rate, he could not go with the hon. Member in opposing the Scottish Vote after the English one had been passed. In addition to the complaints of some of the counties, the boroughs believed they were hardly dealt with; but, as Scotland was going to contribute its share of the grant in aid in respect of English roads, he did not see why they should hesitate to take what they could get for Scotch roads. The hon. Member, he thought, might very well move to report Progress.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the course adopted by the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) certainly astonished him. The hon. Member had proposed a reduction of the last Vote because, as he said, he wished to bring the amount voted for England into proper proportion with the amount voted for Scotland; but he had never told them he had it in his mind to move the rejection of the Scotch Vote altogether. Having done that, he (Mr. A. O'Connor) failed to see where the disproportion existed in the hon. Gentleman's mind. He had voted with the hon. Member in the last division, the object of the hon. Member being to bring the amount granted to England into fair proportion with that granted to Scotland. He would propose to do the same with the present Vote—namely, attempt to bring it down to a fair proportion with the amount voted for Ireland; and, as he found that there was to be nothing granted to Ireland, it was a fair thing to reject the Vote altogether. It would not be illogical to ask the hon. Member and his Friends to go with him into the Lobby on this matter. The objection which had been taken by the hon. Member had been answered by a Member of the Government; but no one had attempted to urge on the Irish Members, in reply to himself (Mr. A. O'Connor), that Ireland had got a single penny by the passing of the last or the present Vote. He presumed it was not from want of courtesy that he had not been answered, but from inability to find a suitable argument. In the absence of any such argument, he had no option but to insist upon the Motion of the hon. Member for Falkirk being put and voting for it.

Mr. RAMSAY: I ask leave to withdraw my Motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the Motion be withdrawn?

Several hon. Members: No.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 202; Noes 12: Majority 190.—(Div. List, No. 104.)

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

CONSTABULARY AND POLICE (IRELAND) (PAY AND PENSIONS) BILL.

(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

[BILL 171.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

MR. BIGGAR said, he desired to give Notice of opposition to this Bill, for two reasons. His first reason was, that it had previously been brought on after half-past 12, and he should object to that being done, though he should not take that objection now, as it was not yet half-past 12. His second reason was, that the Irish Police were exceedingly liberally dealt with and very well paid for the work they had to do. It was an unsound principle that members of a Public Force should receive special consideration for the performance of their duties, and especially when, as in the case of the Irish Police, they had, in some parts of Ireland, almost thrown districts into a state of mutiny. If the Government had acted rightly they would have allowed the mutineers to leave the Force and filled up their places. But even if they had thought the pay of the Police was not satisfactory they should not have almost immediately endeavoured to meet the claims of the Police. They should have waited till the Executive had had time to cool down. It was always very objectional to legislate in a state of panic, and that was especially the case in regard to the Police now. They had evidently frightened the Government; the Government had fallen down on their knees, and the result would be that for all time to come the Police would have the Government entirely at their command, when any difficulty arose to the Government. The Police were extravagantly overpaid, and this attempt to increase their pay was perfectly unreasonable. It was also preposterous to retire them when they were in the prime of life. No public servant should be allowed to retire until he had reached an age when he might reasonably expect to retire; but by this Bill it was open to a policeman to retire under 50 years of age, while in other Services the age for retirement was, in many cases, 65. That part of the Bill was quite indefensible, and he did not think the Government could offer any argument in favour of it. He would not ask the House to divide on the Motion to go into Committee. As it had gone through the farce of a second reading the matter deserved consideration, and he should allow the Bill to go into Committee and then discuss the different points.

Motion *agreed* to.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Preliminary.

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

PART I.

Royal Irish Constabulary.

Clause 2 (Revised salaries for men of the Royal Irish Constabulary).

MR. CALLAN said, he found that this clause provided that extra pay should cease after the passing of the Act. If that were agreed to, the men would be in a worse position than they now were.

MR. TREVELYAN said, he thought no constable would be in a worse position. The utmost amount of extra pay under the Proviso was £10, and that was in the case of head constables. The constable would get only £4 extra pay a-year; and he had no doubt those men would profit to the extent of £11 by this Bill. The hon. Member might set his mind at ease upon that point.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Right of constables to pensions).

MR. O'BRIEN asked how many men there were in the Force who would gain no present advantage under this Bill—that was the men who had not completed seven years service? It seemed to him that the Bill was, to a great extent, devised to punish these men, who were, to a large degree, the backbone of the agitation that had brought about this Bill.

MR. TREVELYAN said, there was no doubt that a large number of the men would not receive any present advantage under the Bill; but when it was considered who those men were, he did not think their position could be regarded as one for commisseration, but rather as one for envy, because they were men of under seven years' service—men of from 22 or 23 to 27 or 28 years of age—and, after careful examination by the Committee, the conclusion had been arrived at that those men were singularly well off, compared with other persons in their own station, and that at the age of 22 or 23 these men married and began to settle in life, and they would obtain great advantages under the Bill. At their present age their position was very desirable; and when they reached 30 years of age their position would be very much better, and would be very much improved by this Bill. The men who would gain by the Bill were the men who suffered from one defect only, and that the defect of all others most easily cured—namely, youth. The Bill was for the benefit of men who had stayed in the Force, and in benefiting them the Bill benefited the whole Service.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked whether the large proportion of constables who would receive no benefit under the Bill were not also the men who had made themselves most conspicuous in the agitation? It seemed to him to be a Bill which, in the scale of pay, was very ingeniously devised, in order to make these men the scapegoats, and to draw the sting of the agitation, and break up community of feeling and sentiment among the men—giving nothing to those men who were the backbone of the agitation, and giving a handsome increase of pay to the old and hardened and more favoured ranks of the Service, in order to keep them isolated from their comrades. If he was right in his reading of the Bill, no man was to receive any increase of pay unless he had completed seven years' service—that was to say, the young men were to be made the scapegoats; the Force was to be broken up into various categories; the married men were bought off in one way, and the head constables, who did all they could to thwart the action of their younger comrades, were to get the larger share of the advantages. It seemed to him that the younger constables were to be left out in the cold; and if they grumbled, it would be perfectly safe to dismiss them without much ceremony. What he wished to elicit was whether the men who were to receive nothing were not the men who had principally helped to bring this Bill about?

Mr. BIGGAR said, this clause provided that a man might voluntarily retire from the Police after 25 years' service and receive a pension for life. He objected to that principle, and held that so long as a man was able physically to perform his duties it was undesirable that he should be allowed to retire. Anyone who had lived in Ireland knew very well that there was a considerable number of stout, active, and intelligent men who were at the present time receiving large pensions from the Constabulary, although they were thoroughly competent to perform all the duties of the Force. One of the great aims of these men was to retire on a pension, and then take public-houses. That was their ordinary mode of selecting careers. The age at which policemen entered the Force was between 21 to 23 years, and by this clause they would be able to retire on full pensions at 46 or 48 years of age. These men were selected just because they were men of large physical power; they led a healthy life; they had very little to do; and they lived under the best possible conditions; so that at the time when they were to be allowed to retire they were of more value to the Service than they had been at any other time. No one could pretend that at the age of 46 or 48 a man was unfit for any of the ordinary occupations of life. If the limit were extended from 25 to 45 years' service that would be much more reasonable. One of the subsequent clauses of the Bill authorized the retirement of a policeman if he was unfit, from any physical cause, to perform his duties; but this sub-section enabled policemen to retire on full pension while still able to perform the duties.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 12, to leave out sub-section (a).—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the object of this Amendment was to strike out voluntary retirement after 25 years' service altogether. If that was done, no man could retire except on the ground of incapacity. The present rule as to officers and men appointed since 1866 was that they might voluntarily retire after serving 30 years. If they had been appointed before 1866, they must get a medical certificate. The Committee of Inquiry had carefully considered this question, and were in favour of the 25 years' period for retirement. This suggestion was adopted for the Bill of last year, and the principle was adopted from the principle in the Civil Service, from which a man could retire after a certain age without incapacity. These questions of retirement were extremely difficult; but, on the whole, the most practised authorities were in favour of naming an age after which a man was not likely to be efficient, and allowing him to then retire voluntarily. The period of service after which a policeman was not likely to be fully efficient was considered to be 25 years. In the Royal Navy the term was 26 years; but he thought that might be somewhat shortened. If a period was named, and then men were allowed to stay, the almost certain result would be that they would be kept on and not allowed to go until a considerably longer time had elapsed. On the other hand, the men would be discontented when they passed the age of average efficiency. Beyond that, Members of the Committee must not think that constables would be without temptation, and a very solid temptation, to remain in the Service as long as they were capable of performing the duties of the Service; because, in the first place, a man's pension would be very much less than his pay. If he retired after 25 years' service, his pension would only be 30-50ths of his pay, and the difference of two-fifths of pay, in that rank of life, was very sensible. And, in the next place, if he stayed on, not only would he earn his money for a longer time, but his pension would be considerably improved, because it would rise by additions of 1-50th until he obtained two-thirds of his pay. The Government had partly adopted the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry.

MR. BIGGAR submitted that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had given no substantial reason why the Amendment should not be adopted. The right hon. Gentleman simply said that, as a general rule, some particular time in life should be made, beyond which a man should not hold office. But he had not told them that 46 or 48 years of age was anything like a proper limit. It appeared to him (Mr. Biggar) that the limit fixed in the Bill was exceedingly low. The right hon. Gentleman had not told them why the retirement should be allowed at so early an age. As a matter of fact, if the depopulation of Ireland continued at the rate at which it had been proceeding of late, there would in future be great difficulty in getting recruits for the Police Service; but, apart from that, it seemed to him (Mr. Biggar) absurd to allow a man in the prime of life to retire from service. He should, therefore, press his Amendment.

MR. SYNAN pointed out that if the Amendment of his hon. Friend was carried there would be no limit mentioned at all, and no possibility of retirement after 30 or 40 years' service. He therefore hoped that his hon. Friend would not press the Amendment. His hon. Friend contended that the limit was too low; let him, therefore, propose to strike out the present limit, and move the insertion of one more in conformity with his views.

MR. BIGGAR said, his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Synan) misapprehended the effect of the Amendment. The Amendment only provided that a man could not get a pension as long as he was able to perform the duties of his office. If a man chose a particular profession, he (Mr. Biggar) saw no reason why, as long as a man was energetic and able to perform his duties, he should consider it any grievance that he was required to continue in the Service. Hon. Members knew perfectly well that in all cases it was the easiest thing in the world to get a medical certificate, as soon as a man's capacities became at all doubtful. He did not mean to insinuate that medical certificates were given fraudulently, but that it was a matter of ease, or comparative ease, to get them.

MR. T. A. DICKSON considered the system of voluntary retirement provided by the Bill a vital part of it. After 25 years' service a man should certainly have the option of voluntary retirement. He knew that the system was regarded by the police themselves as a great boon; and, therefore, he hoped the Committee would pass the clause without amendment.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, the duties of the Police were not those of ordinary Civil servants. The Police had arduous work to go through; and when one of them arrived at the age of 45, it stood to reason that he was not able to go across country as he was at the age of 30. At such an age as 45, a man naturally found his joints stiff.

Mr. O'BRIEN would support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cavan, unless he received some assurance with regard to the pensions of a deserving body of men who had already retired from the Service—men who had served honourably in the Force at a time when, to some extent, it was a Civil Police Force, and not a Military Garrison. He hoped that those men would not be left in any worse position because they had not made campaigns with buckshot against their countrymen, or because they were not in a position to rise in mutiny. He trusted to receive some declaration from the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that might be satisfactory in respect to the class of men he referred to.

Mr. J. N. RICHARDSON said, he had had some conversation with members of the Force during the Whitsuntide Recess; and if he at all apprehended the feeling of the Force on this point, it was that the permission to retire at their own option, after a service of 25 years, was regarded as one of the greatest boons conferred by the Bill. Indeed, several of the men expressed to him the feeling that the permission given to them to retire was even a greater boon than larger pay or larger pension. It would, perhaps, be well for some hon. Members to be aware of the fact that men desirous of retiring had a good deal of difficulty in obtaining medical certificates; there was much going backwards and forwards to Dublin, and no end of red-tape generally. He hoped the Committee would pass the clause.

Mr. LEWIS said, the remarks just made by the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien) were germane to the new clause of which he (Mr. Lewis) had given Notice. They seemed to have no bearing whatever on the matter now under discussion.

Mr. BIGGAR observed, that it had been said that this clause was very popular with the people. No doubt it was, because they were to be given considerable increase of pay and pension at the public expense. Hon. Members were not sent to Parliament to legislate for any particular class, but to do that which would be most beneficial for the British ratepayer. It seemed to him that to give a pension to a man of 45 or 48 years of age was simply preposterous. A good deal was heard about retrenchment in the public funds; but if they were to multiply indefinitely the number of pensioners, the expenditure of the Kingdom would be very largely increased before many years were over.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 190; Noes 9: Majority 181.—(Div. List, No. 105.)

Mr. BIGGAR proposed, in page 2, line 18, after "is," to insert "permanently." The sub-section provided that if a man had completed not less than 15 years service, and was incapacitated from the performance of his duty by infirmity of mind or body, he should be entitled to retire and receive a pension for life. The Committee would see that in that case 15 years' service was mentioned, and not 25, as in other cases. Considering that the service was fixed at so low a period, he considered that a man who was under 40 years of age, and whose incapacity was only of a temporary character, should be required to resume his duties when he had recovered. It was only proper that the Force should not lose the benefit of the man's service, simply because he had been temporarily disabled, and for this reason he moved the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 18, after the word "is," to insert the word "permanently."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'permanently' be there inserted."

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the Government duly recognized that the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) was, in his criticism of this Bill, actuated by public spirit. The Government were aiming at the same object; but they considered that there were conditions in the Bill by which they could attain it more effectually than it would be attained by the proposal of the hon. Member. The hon. Member would find that Clause 6, Section 1, enacted that the Inspector General must be satisfied that the incapacity was likely to be permanent before he granted a pension. He must, "yearly or otherwise, from time to time, also satisfy himself that such incapacity continues;" and if the incapacity ceased the man would either have to return to the Service or forfeit his pension. If the incapacity partially ceased the pension might be reduced. There was a defect in the Amendment as compared with the provisions of the Bill, for it was impossible to say at the time a man received an injury whether his incapacity would be permanent or not. If the Amendment was adopted, the man must either be kept on full pay or he must be dismissed with a pension. Under the provisions the Government had adopted he could neither do one or the other.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR appealed to his hon. Friend (Mr. Biggar) not to go to a division on an Amendment of this kind. He was glad to find the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary recognized the spirit in which his hon. Friend proposed the Amendment. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did not quite sympathize with the "Joseph Hume" view his hon. Friend had taken of the Bill. It seemed to him that the Government, in the pensions and other rewards which they were distributing to the Police, had taken leave of that spirit of economy which he thought had always animated the Treasury. At the same time, he considered that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had shown that the precautions which were adopted by the Government in the Bill were rather better than the precautions proposed by his hon. Friend. Under the circumstances, he should be pleased if his hon. Friend would not put the Committee to the trouble of a division.

MR. BIGGAR said, that, after the appeal made to him by his hon. Friend, and the explanations of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment. It was well, perhaps, that he should say that he was thoroughly aware there was some provision in a subsequent part of the Bill which would more or less effect the object he had in view. He was still of opinion that when a medical man had given leave to a policeman to retire on a pension after 25 years' service, he should be well satisfied that the injury received was likely to be permanent. It should not be a matter in which it was only possible that the incapacity should be permanent. The right hon. Gentleman would himself see that when a man had once left the Service it would be very difficult, indeed, to get him back. Seeing that the Inspector General was required to make examination from time to time, which would have the effect of attaining the object he had in view, he would not press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. BIGGAR said, that before the Question was put, he should like to propose an Amendment in "Sub-section A." It was provided that—

> "Every constable of the Royal Irish Constabulary who became a member of the force on or after the *tenth day of August one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six*, or who shall become a member of the force after the passing of this Act, if he has completed not less than 25 years' service, shall be entitled, on the expiration of two months after he has given written notice to the Inspector General of his desire to retire, or of such less time after that notice as the Inspector General allows, to retire and receive a pension for life."

His (Mr. Biggar's) opinion was that all policemen, whether they had joined the Force after or before the passing of the Act, should come under the provisions of the Act. As a matter of fact, all the men of the Force would get the benefit of the Act, and therefore all of them should be bound to return to the Service in pursuance of Clause 6, to which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had just referred.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have put the Question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill, and therefore the hon. Gentleman is not in Order in moving another Amendment.

MR. CALLAN asked for information with reference to the meaning of Sub-section 6 of this clause, which provided that—

> "When any constable who became a member of the force on or after the tenth day of August one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, or who shall become a member of the force after the passing of this Act has completed a service of twenty-five years, the Inspector General may, if he thinks fit, require him to re-

tire upon the terms as to pension prescribed by this Act."

This sub-section had given rise to considerable doubt in the minds of some of the persons interested, because the Act said that in computing the pension a man's length of service should be taken at 30 years. It would relieve the unfavourable impression that existed if the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland would explain in what way that sub-section would act in computing the pensions of men required to retire.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he did not quite gather, from the remarks of the hon. Gentleman, what was the point of his objection. Did the hon. Gentleman object to the compulsory retirement provided for by the sub-section? This clause was introduced for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the Police Force; but in doing that it was necessary to preserve the vested rights of existing constables, one of which was that a man should not be retired before the age of 30 years against his own will, except on the ground of proved incapacity. The extra five years secured to the men was of very great importance to them in the computation of their pension. The Government thought it necessary to preserve to the men the full amount of pension, which would not have been paid unless this Act were passed; but it was not thought necessary to extend the principle to those who had not remained in the Service the full period.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Pension allowances and gratuities to widows and children) *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Reckoning of service in other police forces for pension) *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Proof of incapacity for duty and return toservice of pensioner on recovery from incapacity, and revision of pension) *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Forfeiture of pension or allowance).

Mr. BIGGAR said, he thought that after the prescribed period of service, 15, 20, or 25 years, as the case might be, a constable should be allowed to receive his pension, unless any substantial charge were preferred against him and proved, when, of course, it would be legitimate and proper that the pension should be taken away. But, as far as he could see, there was no provision in the Bill that any official inquiry should take place as to whether the complaints which might be preferred were justified by the facts of the case. Knowing, as they did, how the law was at present administered in Ireland, Irish Members had no confidence that it would be better administered in the future; and therefore it was felt, unless the present clause were amended, the unfortunate pensioners might be left in a very difficult position. He therefore begged leave to move the omission of Sub-section (*c*), which provided that—

"If the grantee refuses to give to the police all information and assistance in his power for the detection of crime, for the apprehension of criminals, and for the suppression of any disturbance of the public peace, his pension will be forfeited."

Amendment proposed, to leave out sub-section (c).—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. CALLAN said, he hoped that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland would consent to modify the sub-section, which was badly drawn and open to considerable objection. It was not desirable that such power should be taken, which would allow the Inspector General to ruin a man who had served faithfully for 30 years, and that, too, under circumstances for which pensions could not be withdrawn from a soldier serving Her Majesty in the Army. He asked why, if the Police were so loyal a body, if they had earned the approval of the whole country for the efficient manner in which they had discharged their duties, why should they be placed under a disadvantage which did not apply to a man in the Military Service? Was it to make the Police of Ireland slaves, not merely to the law which they had always obeyed, but slaves to every whipper-snapper Inspector of a district? He knew that the Proviso which it was proposed to enact had given great offence, and he thought, therefore, that it should at least undergo some modification. He should persist in his opposition to the sub-section unless the right hon. Gentleman agreed to its modification, because he regarded it as altogether unnecessary, unwarrantable, and gratuitously offensive, while, at the same time, no grounds had been alleged in its defence. He would suggest the postponement of the clause; but, if that were not agreed to, he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would consent to a modification of the sub-section in question.

MR. O'KELLY said, he thought the Government would see that the sub-section treated with great injustice a body of men who had served them faithfully and honourably for a great number of years. It seemed to him that when a policeman had done his duty and served his time in the Force, and received the pension he was entitled to as a reward for work done, he entered again into the position of a citizen. He regarded it as an offensive interference with the rights of these men that the Government should pursue them into the privacy of life, after they had quitted the service of the country, and make them practically the slaves of men who were still in the Public Service. He did not know that in any country in the world pensions to public servants were conferred under such onerous conditions as those proposed to be enacted by this Bill. The men had a right to those pensions as the result of work done—they had the same right to draw them as civilians had to draw the dividends on their money from a bank; and, in his opinion, nothing of the kind suggested by the clause could afford any justification for those pensions being forfeited. He thought the Government would be well advised if they consented to reconsider this portion of the clause.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, he hoped the Government would consent to drop the sub-section. He could not himself regard it as necessary, and it certainly had the appearance of being offensive to a deserving body of men.

MR. TOTTENHAM said, he hoped the Government would retain the sub-section. He could not conceive anything more objectionable than that a body of men should be in receipt of pensions from the State, and, at the same time, decline to give the Government all the assistance in their power.

MR. TREVELYAN said, that, under any analogous circumstances, he should not have had the slightest hesitation in considering that a pension of this sort was essential. The principle involved was one that was recognized both in the Military and Naval Service of the country. Inasmuch as it was the duty of a soldier or a sailor to fight against a foreign enemy when called upon, so it was the duty of a policeman to fight against internal crime; and, in his opinion, that duty only ceased when his physical and mental powers incapacitated him from continuing that warfare. The provision to which hon. Members opposite objected was embodied in the Act of 1866, and in the Act of 1874, and he hoped it would remain a part of the present measure. It was also introduced into the English Bill dealing with the same subject. The sub-section did not impose any duty upon retired constables which ought not to be the duty and privilege of citizens; it only formulated the Common Law duty of all persons, and imposed a penalty for disobedience in this case. For these reasons, with all respect to hon. Members, he must decline to modify the sub-section.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he had, on a former occasion, appealed to his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) to withdraw an Amendment to the Bill, because it seemed to him that he was interfering with the generous intentions of the Legislature with regard to the Constabulary Force. But now he thought his hon. Friend was quite justified in the course he had taken, inasmuch at he was clearly standing up for the rights and privileges of that Body. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that a certain Proviso was introduced into an English Act, and his argument was that it ought, therefore, to be introduced into an Irish Act. But the right hon. Gentleman forgot that there was a great difference between the conditions existing in Ireland, as to the government and the control of the Police Force, and the conditions which existed in this country. The differences in this respect between England and Ireland were as great as those which existed between England and Russia. Therefore, he said, that what might be admitted in such a Bill, as applied to England, could not to be tolerated with respect to Ireland. The pension of a constable might be taken away under this sub-section, although he might have been 30 years in the Service, and have done his duty to his country honestly and efficiently. The sub-section provided that—

> "If the grantee refuses to give to the police all information and assistance in his power for the detection of crime, for the apprehension of criminals, and for the suppression of any disturbance of the public peace, the pension may be forfeited."

But what were criminals in the eye of the Government? They were persons who spoke in any way against the policy of the Government of the day. His hon. Friend the Member for West Meath (Mr. Harrington) was a criminal in the eyes of the Government, because he gave advice to the people of Ireland which was distasteful to the authorities, but which, nevertheless, afterwards found its way into the columns of *The Times.* If such men were considered criminals at Common Law this clause might have been passed without any opposition whatever; but that was not the case, and what the present Government considered a criminal was any political opponent who had spoken unfavourably of their policy. Then with regard to the words "suppression of any disturbance of the public peace;" why, any public meeting would come under that category at which political opinions opposed to the policy of the Government might be expressed. It was for such offences as these that the sub-section, if it passed into law, would enable the pension of a constable to be taken from him. The terms of the sub-section were as vague, general, and wide as they could be made, and they would include anything like political action on the part of a person who had once been a constable in the Police Force. But what was the tribunal that would decide upon these offences? The pension of the constable might be withdrawn by the Inspector General—that was to say, the Head of the Force who at the moment happened to be a portion, and, without speaking it offensively, he might say, the instrument, of the Executive, had the power to deprive every retired constable of his pension on such vague and general charges as he had described. What was the meaning and intention of this sub-section, and why did not the Attorney General for Ireland get up and enlighten the Committee upon this point? Its object was to have a privileged class of spies spread over the country—in other words, it was that, having given to the police a pension to which they were entitled by 30 years of hard, perilous, and loyal service, the Government wanted further to keep them as a body of spies for the detection of what he called patriotism, but which they called a criminal offence. He did not know what were the feelings of the policemen themselves with regard to this sub-section; but so far as the Bill was intended for their relief and due reward, it had his hearty approval and co-operation. Up to the present time he had only given one vote against the Bill, and he felt a certain amount of regret at having done that. But he regarded this clause with entirely different feelings, inasmuch as it would introduce into Ireland the system of the *mouchard*, which had been universally condemned by the public Press of this country a short time ago.

Mr. T. C. THOMPSON said, he thought the opposition to the sub-section on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite was intended to show that on such occasions as were contemplated by the Bill a considerable amount of partiality might be shown. He would therefore suggest that the insertion of the words "with the approbation of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland" would obviate the difficulty, and be most agreeable to the great body of the people of this country.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he rose to point out that at the inquiry which had taken place no objection whatever was raised to this provision of the Bill. The hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) asked if any question was put to the men on this subject? No question was asked on the subject, nor was any question asked upon any subject in the manner suggested by the hon. Member. The form adopted was, "Is there any other matter you wish to refer to?" But he repeated, that out of the large number of constables who consulted with their fellows not one raised a single objection to this provision.

Mr. O'KELLY wished to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he thought it had ever presented itself to the minds of the constables that such a clause as this would have been introduced to the House and made into law? In his opinion, the absence of objection arose from the fact that the Police never conceived it possible that the Government would be so mean as to propose such a clause.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, from no policeman in his county had he received any complaint against the provision contained in this sub-section, and he did not believe that there were a dozen policemen in all Ireland who objected to it. For his own part, he considered it only fair that pensions should be given to constables, on condition that they assisted in the prevention and detection of crime; which meant nothing more than that they should give their services to the State as ordinary citizens.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER) said, the clause in question was, contrary to the misapprehension that seemed to prevail amongst some hon. Gentlemen, not a new one. It had been in force, without any objection being made to it, since 1866.

MR. CALLAN said, that the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson), being a faithful Member of the Government Party, and one of their servile followers——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to use that language to a Member of the House.

MR. CALLAN said, he withdrew the words, although he had heard them used on a former occasion without reproof. The hon. Member had stated that he sent a copy of the Bill to the members of the Constabulary in his county, and had not received a single objection to the clause. But he (Mr. Callan) held in his hand a number of letters from constables in various districts in Ireland who had addressed him on the subject. He did not intend to disclose the names of the writers, because the fact of any policeman making an objection to a Member of the House with regard to matters of discipline would certainly insure his dismissal from the Force. He only asked for a modification, not the withdrawal, of the sub-section. He would ask the Attorney General for Ireland, or the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, to inform the Committee how the Inspector General was to get the knowledge upon which to found his judgment. Was it to be by letter of complaint addressed to him, or would it be by Court of Inquiry, and, if by the latter means, how was that Court of Inquiry to be constituted? The man had a legal right to his pension, and he was, therefore, desirous of knowing how he was to be deprived of it—what tribunal was to be invested with the power of declaring that a man had forfeited his pension? Was the inquiry to be held in the district in which the constable resided; was the constable to be allowed to appear by his legal adviser; was there to be any safeguard at all of the rights of the men; or was the charge simply to rest upon one of those "reasonable suspicions" which so disgraced the late Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when he arrested thousands of innocent men, and allowed the Phœnix Park murderers to remain at liberty? The whole of the Special Rules relating to the Police were in a Code which was kept from the knowledge of the House. He observed the Chief Secretary consulting the Code, and he asked him whether he would place in the Library of the House a copy of that document, to enable hon. Members to see how the Police Force in Ireland was governed? In conclusion, he expressed his surprise that Members from the North of Ireland had made no attempt to safeguard the interests of persons whom they professed so much to admire.

MR. T. A. DICKSON said, he challenged the hon. Member for Louth to read from the letters which he had stated he had received one single objection to the sub-section.

MR. CALLAN: I have—["Order!"] If the observation means it is not in my power, I treat the insinuation with contempt.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he had received a great many letters about this Bill, and he might say he had the confidence of the police in the matter, and yet he had heard of no objection to the clause. The men were enlisted as fit to do their duty as loyal citizens; and was it to be supposed that after 25 or 30 years' service to Her Majesty they were going to discontinue to be loyal? In this matter the Committee seemed to him to be fighting the empty air.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, they were all aware what the hon. and gallant Gentleman meant by "loyal," and his statement must make the Government feel uncomfortable. The implication was that every man in Ireland was not loyal who did not believe that the landlord had still the right to evict, and starve, and murder. The hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson) said it was the duty of every loyal citizen to discover crime; but was the hon. Member so young and green that he did not know that what was understood by crime in England was one thing, and what the Government understood by crime in Ireland was another thing? If the Government meant by crime such things as were called crime in this country, and such things only, the clause would be unobjectionable. The hon. Member for Tyrone knew very well that what were considered political acts of a very good citizen for reforming the condition of the land in this country were denounced as crimes in Ireland. ["No!"] He heard some objection; but was not the reform of abuses in connection with the land the duty of every good citizen? Had not good citizens who had attempted to reform abuses in the Irish Land Law system, by speeches on platforms and judicious writing in the Press, been tried and convicted and punished as criminals? ["No, no!"] He heard exclamations of dissent from hon. Members opposite. They were not so familiar with Irish life as he (Mr. O'Connor), and he could give instances where the performance of legitimate duties in a perfectly legal manner had led to a man's being punished by the wretched, miserable pretence of Liberalism—by Gentlemen sitting on the Benches opposite and their mouthpieces on the Treasury Bench. The Treasury Bench could at that moment rejoice in the support of the county of Dublin. He congratulated them on the fact, and did not know whether they or the Party were more to be pitied for dragging themselves at the heels of this wretched and miserable clique of landlords in Ireland like a tin kettle at the tail of a mad dog. He wished to know from this Committee, assembled for the purpose of considering the condition of the policemen of Ireland, whether they had ever heard of any class of Her Majesty's servants being placed in such a position as these pensioners were to be placed in under the Bill? Was there a single class of Her Majesty's servants besides the Irish Police who had not some right of appeal when they believed they were unjustly treated? Here, however, they had the Police pensioners absolutely at the disposal of the Inspector General, without right of appeal or rehearing. Talk of the Star Chamber, was there ever a more monstrous system of Star Chamber inquiry, of Star Chamber punishment, than that which enabled the Inspector General for the time being—generally some wretched, docile, miserable tool of Her Majesty's Government—to deprive these poor men, after 30 years' hard service, of their pensions? This Bill, brought forward by the Government ostensibly for the purpose of giving boons to the police-constables, was really a Bill to cheat them out of all their rewards, unless they became the miserable spies of the Government in Ireland.

Mr. TOMLINSON wished to be informed what was the exact nature of the change made in the Act of 1874, under which the jurisdiction to decide this question was the Lord Lieutenant? The jurisdiction now, it seemed, was the Inspector General,

Mr. BIGGAR said, in reply to the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Tomlinson), he wished to say that it was a distinction without a difference, as the Inspector General was merely a tool of the Lord Lieutenant. It made no material difference with whom the power rested nominally, as, no doubt, the Lord Lieutenant would always say he acted under the recommendation of the Inspector General. The two now combined to perpetrate an injustice on the policeman. It seemed to him that the argument advanced by the Attorney General for Ireland was entitled to no weight whatever. Because the Act had been in operation for 17 years it was no reason they should not change it if they had an opportunity of doing so. This was the proper time for altering the law. He thought the law was one which required amendment; therefore he would make the Motion he had proposed.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the Attorney General for Ireland had made a great point of the fact that the Government were only following the precedents in the clause they had inserted; but the right hon. and learned Gentleman skilfully omitted that most important fact that in the Bill of 1866 it was the Lord Lieutenant who had the right of taking away a pension. Well, let them substitute the Lord Lieutenant, and that would be a slight improvement in the matter. He did not think it would be a great one; but, at any rate, it would be an improvement. The Lord Lieutenant might be a Member of the Cabinet—he was certainly a Member of either House of Parliament, and was a person, therefore, whose responsibility they could bring before Parliament; but this Head of the different Inspectors in the country was a person they could not reach by any means whatever. The Lord Lieutenant was not bound to approve of the conduct of the Inspector General. Suppose a constable were deprived of his pension, as it was believed unjustly, what would the Chief Secretary do if the matter were brought before the House? He would say—"What are we to do? This is not the action of the Chief Secretary, nor of the Lord Lieutenant." He (Mr. O'Connor) did not say they had done it intentionally; but they had so amended the Act that they had removed all responsibility from the person who took away the pension. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary might have been ingenuous enough to inform the Committee that this change had been made.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER) said, the subject of this Amendment was Sub-section (*c*), which was copied from former Acts. A question arose on a former Bill as to who was to be the authority, and the question was quite a different one from the state of things the hon. Member referred to. [Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: Not at all.] In Clauses 3 and 4 they had recognized the position that the Inspector General was the person who was to determine these matters, and that had been done without the slightest objection on Amendment.

MR. CALLAN said, the Attorney General for Ireland had made matters worse, because he had stated that the sub-section of the Bill was copied exactly from the Statute in force. Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman take the Act in his hand and compare it with the Bill which he asserted was copied from it, and repeat his assertion in the face or the Committee? The right hon. and learned Gentleman probably thought he was pleading before the Nisi Prius Court in Dublin to mislead the Judges. What was the fact? The Bill said—

> "On his refusing to give to the police all information and assistance in his power for the detection of crime, for the apprehension of criminals, and for the suppression of any disturbance of the public peace;"

whereas the Act contained the words "detection and apprehension of criminals." The passage in the Bill might be held to apply to persons attending a Land League meeting.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he hoped the Committee would go to a division on this Amendment. Whatever might be the feeling amongst the Police—and on that question he could not pretend to be an authority, like some hon. Members—in the interest of the Irish people the Irish Representatives were justified in protesting against this clause. The life of the Irish policeman was odious enough, and the duties which it was necessary for him to perform were odious enough, without branding him as a spy to the day of his death, as he would be branded if the clause passed in this form. If the Police were to be protected, so, too, were the people of Ireland—to be protected against these men being turned into the plastic tools and Sepoys of the Government.

DR. LYONS said, that, according to the strict letter of the law, they were proposing that which it was impossible to do. They could not withdraw a pension—no such power was vested in the Inspector General. The Inspector General might report to the proper authority that such and such a pension should be withdrawn; but he could not withdraw it himself. The Government said this officer could grant a pension; but he could do nothing of the kind. He might recommend one; but it was as impossible for him to grant a pension as it was for him to withdraw one. He (Dr. Lyons) rose simply with a view of getting the clause properly and carefully drafted, so as to bear all criticism. The clause should be withdrawn, and brought up again on Report.

COLONEL O'BEIRNE said, he saw this objection to the clause—that the Inspector who withdrew the pension might not be the same who granted it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 130; Noes 10: Majority 120.—(Div. List, No. 105.)

MR. CALLAN said, that in Sub-section (*d*) he found that if the grantee was guilty of any misconduct, or was, in the opinion of the Inspector General, disgraced, his pension was to be forfeited. Suppose a head constable took a public-house—as head constables, on entering into private life, very often did —if he lost his licence, or got it endorsed, would he be liable, under this Liberal cheese-paring arrangement of the Government, to have his pension withdrawn by the Inspector General? The Inspector General was to have power to forfeit the pension of the grantee if he were guilty of conduct which was, in his opinion, disgraceful. If the grantee, for instance, attended a Land League or Home Rule meeting, that would be "disgraceful," probably; or, in the words of that celebrated modern document, "if he spoke in disrespectful terms of people in superior station." On that—without any proof beyond "reasonable suspicion," the reasonable suspicion, perhaps, of some petty officer —the man's pension was to be forfeited. It would be only fair and respectful to the Committee for the Chief Secretary to give some declaration as to how this forfeiture of pension was to be guarded. Unless some explanation were given he should move the omission of Sub-section (*d*) from the clause.

Amendment proposed, in page 6, to leave out sub-section (d).—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the explanation of the introduction of the Inspector General into the clause was simply that power was here conferred upon him analogous to that given throughout the Bill. It was the Inspector General who had to decide whether or not a man was to be invalided, whether or not he was guilty of conduct or habits discreditable to him, and who, within certain limits, settled what amount the pension should be. It was he who, throughout the Bill, had to be responsible for the discipline of the Service. The ordinary safeguards which existed against the misconduct of any Executive officer existed against the misconduct of the Inspector General. The Inspector General was a person of exalted position in the Service—like the Commander-in-Chief in the Army—and everyone knew that there could be no very great injustice perpetrated in any Service so long as the conduct of the Executive could be called to account in Parliament. Every high officer knew perfectly well that when he was settling the question of the fortunes of his men, if he acted with injustice he was liable to have Questions put to the Minister who was in charge of his Department in the House of Commons, and to give an account of the manner in which he had behaved. It appeared to him to be absolutely necessary, in the case of the Police, to have a clause of this nature. This clause was not the production particularly of a Liberal and cheese-paring Administration. The Act of 1866 was passed after a Liberal Administration had been ejected; and the Act of 1874 was undoubtedly passed by a Conservative Administration. Liberals and Conservatives, happily, upon this point of the management of the great Service by which the business of the country was carried on, were very much in accord. An Act of this kind might be borrowed by a Liberal Administration without any fear of being called cheese-paring. In this matter, over all others, it was necessary to watch men after they retired from active service. It was scarcely possible to conceive any retired officer who could make a more objectionable use of the information he had obtained in the Force than a policeman. It was not necessary to say how he might use that information; but in England and France—to say nothing of Ireland—there were offices where private detectives of a more or less disreputable character might be found to do work which the Government did not intend to be done by any of their pensioned Police. In the Indian Civil Service the authorities looked most carefully after the condition of Civil servants who had retired, and who lived in India, and took care that they should not, when enjoying their pensions, use the information they had obtained while in the Service for purposes of which they could not approve. This clause had stood the test of 17 years at least, and it was one which the Government considered necessary as part of this Bill.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, it was personally disagreeable to him to have to say anything unpleasant of the Chief Secretary; but he was almost tempted to say that the right hon. Gentleman's present Office was having a debilitating effect on his otherwise vigorous mind. Otherwise, he would not have committed himself to these platitudes. He had said that both Parties were agreed as to the management of the Irish Force. That was quite a good thing; but he had said the Inspector General was just as much amenable to that House as any other high officer. That was a truism; because, under the present dexterous management of Offices, the Lord Lieutenant might commit any act, and then the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary would screen himself by saying he was not responsible for the Lord Lieutenant. It did not much matter whether there was an Inspector General or not. Again, he had to complain of a want of candour on the part of the Government in regard to this clause. In the Act of 1876 the words were—

> "If they enter into or continue to carry on any business or employment which shall be in the opinion of the Lord Lieutenant disgraceful or injurious to the public interest."

The right hon. Gentleman might have explained that the words "or injurious to the public interest" had been left out, but they gave a much more explicit meaning to the Act. The act of a constable must be "disgraceful or injurious to the public interest;" but under this Bill the act might simply be what appeared disgraceful to the Lord Lieutenant. If the hon. Member went to a division he would support him, in order to protest against the action of the Government upon this clause.

MR. CALLAN said, he was willing to withdraw if the Government would give an explanation of the mode of procedure by which the Inspector General would arrive at his decision; and whether, if he held an inquiry, the person concerned would be allowed to attend and hear the evidence, and have a legal adviser with him; or whether the Court of Inquiry would be a Star Chamber, in which the evidence would be taken behind his back, with no opportunity of being represented by counsel? Would he be permitted to meet his accuser face to face, or was it to be a mere arbitrary act on the part of the Inspector General? Would the right hon. Gentleman lay on the Table, or place in the Library, a copy of the Police Code, by which Members might see the mode in which these inquiries were to be carried on, and so be able to see how the Police were administered? If he did not receive a satisfactory explanation he must persist with his Amendment.

MR. GIBSON said, he hoped the hon. Member would reconsider the question of proceeding to a division. He had made his protest and stated his objections; but the previous division was practically taken on the same principle as was involved in this matter, although the hon. Member had stated his reasons slightly more in detail upon this clause. This clause was not new. It had been familiar in the Irish Police Code for many years, and had worked without any objection on the part of the Force. He had received a large number of letters from various members of the Irish Constabulary, and they had expressed no objection to this particular clause. The hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had just pointed out that the drafting of this clause showed the advantage of close verbal criticism. This clause was less oppressive than the existing clause, because it left out one of the conditions upon which the Inspector General would deprive a man of his pension. He could understand objection being taken to giving to a Sub-Inspector, or even a County Inspector, who was a very high official, this considerable power over a pensioner; but the Inspector General was the highest officer in the Force, and it was reasonable and fair to give this power to him, and to retain it in him. In these cases of high discretion someone must always be trusted, and nothing better could be done than to trust the highest officer that could be found. Anyone who took up this 7th section, would find that in the first three lines the whole power was given to the Inspector General. They had been already passed, and therefore in the last section, which the Committee were now upon, it would be illogical and unreasonable to take out what had been placed in the Act. As this clause was not new, he hoped the hon. Member would see his way to not dividing on the question.

MR. CALLAN said, the Chief Secretary had not condescended—probably, and as he believed, because he did not know—to inform the Committee what procedure the Inspector General would adopt. To save time he had asked that a copy of the Police Code should be placed on the Table, so that Members might see the powers now given to the Inspector General. He did not intend to take a division on this matter, but would yield to the appeal of the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gibson). At the same time, he must express his disappointment that, although he had met the Bill with a desire to facilitate its progress, no attempt to remove objectionable portions of the measure had been made.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. CALLAN asked whether the Chief Secretary would give any explanation?

Mr. TREVELYAN said, it was out of no disrespect to the hon. Member that he had not answered his questions. He hardly imagined that the hon. Gentleman required him to enter into the process adopted in a Departmental Inquiry into the conduct of men for whom the Department was responsible, Under the Civil Service Act of 1859, no Civil servant of the Crown could get a pension, unless he obtained a certificate from the Head of his Department that he was of due ability and high character; and he did not imagine that he was expected to inform the House of Commons of the way in which that officer satisfied himself of the man's ability and character. The process of inquiry was not judicial, and could not be laid down by Act of Parliament. If these inquiries could not be made privately, no administrative Service could be carried on. As to a copy of the Code, that had been asked for more than once, and the Chief Secretary had always found it necessary to decline to lay it on the Table.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Suspension of pension).

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he thought it would be unreasonable for the Government to ask the Committee to go on any further at that hour of the night, and he would move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the period of the Session was now late, and it was many months since the Police and Constabulary were informed that their complaints should be inquired into. Eighteen months had elapsed since then; and it was certain that if the Committee would not now take this opportunity of going on in the extremely business-like manner in which they had been engaged, an almost indefinite period must elapse before the matter could be fully dealt with. He could not say that he had ever seen a more business-like House than the present; and it would be only under absolute pressure from the majority that the Government would consent to the Motion.

Mr. CALLAN suggested that the Chief Secretary might facilitate matters by saying that he would not go beyond the 12th clause, which dealt with the Constabulary. The Committee could then proceed until they reached Clause 12; but if the right hon. Gentleman wished to run the whole Bill through, the Committee might as well at once see whether Progress was to be reported or not.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he thought the Chief Secretary was unreasonable, and that it would be better to go on to the 12th clause, and then report Progress.

Mr. GIBSON said, that all these matters were more or less relative, and it could not be said, he thought, that there had been anything like substantial opposition to this Bill. It had been before Parliament a considerable time, and there had been no Amendments except upon clauses, and those Amendments were all in the same direction, leaving out a line here and a line there. That was rather a destructive than a constructive line of Amendments. The hon. Member must see that the Amendments to the Metropolitan part of the Bill were exactly the same thing in principle as those he had put down on the Constabulary part. The hon. Member must see, with that sense of humour which everyone recognized, that when the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) made some of his ablest speeches he invariably differed from the hon. Member for Cavan. That was a matter not to be lost sight of. Tolerably substantial progress had been made, and if the Committee persevered for a little while longer they would find that they had got through the Bill in almost a miraculous way.

Colonel ALEXANDER said, that, as one who had supported the Government against hon. Members below him, he considered the proposal to report Progress perfectly reasonable; and he could not conceive anything more reasonable than asking the Government to state at what point they would stop. Hon. Members were told that, under the New Rules, they would be allowed to go home at reasonable hours. One of the Grand Committees must meet at 12 o'clock, and were hon. Members to go right round the clock without any sleep at all? He should support the Motion.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that if the principle of his Amendment was the same as the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gibson) had said, it would be easy to get through the Bill in a single night, for he did not intend to raise any factious opposition. He did not mean to divide over and over again on questions of the same kind, and he would attempt no Amendments which were not thoroughly justified by the facts of the case. He thought it was now a reasonable hour for adjourning the discussion, and in a single succeeding night they could easily get through the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he had been in the House all the evening, and had been as anxious to go to bed as the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Alexander); but there was business to be done, and this was important business. When they had once got possession of a subject it saved time to go right on with it, rather than to drop it and then take it up again. Therefore, as this Bill was an essential measure, and one not very complicated, he hoped the Committee would go on for some time longer.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, if the Government did not intend to keep Members there all night they might say when they would stop. That was a reasonable proposal; but the Government seemed to wish to go on until the Bill was finished.

Mr. CALLAN said, he would make another appeal to the Chief Secretary. He was most anxious that this Bill should pass; and he thought it would have been much better if, instead of coming and interfering with the discretion of the Chief Secretary, the Home Secretary had remained away, for the Bill would have gone on much more smoothly. He and his Friends numbered 12, and were ready to try conclusions. It would not be the first time.

The CHAIRMAN: A Motion for reporting Progress having been made, the hon. Member must confine himself to that Motion.

Mr. CALLAN asked whether the Chief Secretary would mention an hour at which he would stop? Besides the meeting of the Grand Committee, the Liberal Party had to meet at 11 o'clock, and for that reason it was desirable to report Progress now, in order that they might meet fresh at the Foreign Office to hear their Leader. If the right hon. Gentleman wished they could separate in half-an-hour, having settled the first part of the Bill. If not, the sooner they proceeded to war the better. He and his Friends were ready for the fray.

Mr. LEWIS said, he had not the least desire to delay the Bill; but he doubted whether the Government would accomplish their object by persisting. The right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gibson) had referred to the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) as the only Member having Amendments on the Paper; but he himself had a most important Amendment, and he should be exceedingly sorry if it could not be taken at a time of night when it could receive the serious attention of a sufficient number of Members. He was sure there had not been the smallest spirit evinced to give any unnecessary trouble to the Government, or to cause any undue delay; and he could not imagine that there would be any difficulty to going into Committee at 1 o'clock on Friday morning. If the right hon. Gentleman would agree to adjourn now there certainly would be nothing lost.

Mr. O'BRIEN said, he was very sorry the Chief Secretary had not seen his way to meet the very moderate proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan), and to meet the appeals which had been made to him from various quarters. The Government ought to be pretty well pleased, and even surprised, with the amount of progress they had already made with the Bill. It was thoroughly characteristic of the present Government that the only piece of Irish legislation this Session that they were so anxious about, and in regard to which they would not report Progress at 2 o'clock in the morning, was a Bill to keep their Police in good humour.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the appeals that had been made came from quarters where he hardly expected them, and they likewise came from some Gentlemen, specially from the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel Alexander), who could scarcely have studied the Bill. The appeal of the Government was that questions of principle had already been, for the most part, discussed, and that the great number of the Amendments which were put down by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) were principally Amendments which amounted to a desire, on his part, to bring the pay and allowances of the Police below the amount which the Government had named in the Bill, and below even the point they already enjoyed. The Government had come to the conclusion that it was not very likely that the Bill would pass, as a whole, that night, except after a sharp and sustained fight. That sharp, sustained fight, so far as he was personally concerned, he was pefectly ready to engage in. He would willingly sit up until 6 o'clock in the morning in order to let the Police in Ireland learn, in course of to-morrow morning, that this Bill had passed through Committee. There was one condition, and one condition only, on which, so far as he was individually concerned, he would consent to abstain from that conflict, and that was, that if they only passed Part I. of the Bill that night, there should be an honourable understanding that when the Bill was brought on on Thursday evening, even at a somewhat unusual time—not as early as it was brought in to-night—hon. Members would consent to sit up and see the Bill through. On that condition, providing he could induce hon. Members to take a friendly interest in the Bill, he should be willing to recommend the Committee to leave off after they had passed Part I.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that if they resumed the reconsideration of the Bill before 1 o'clock on Thursday night, there would be no difficulty in getting through the Bill that evening. Of course, it was impossible to make any pledge, because he did not know what other hon. Members would do. Certainly, there was no Member of his Party so much opposed to the Bill as himself; and, therefore, he did not suppose that any of his hon. Friends would raise a protracted opposition to the Bill.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. Trevelyan

Clause 9 (Punishment for obtaining pension, &c., by fraud) *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Provision as to pensions of men appointed before August 1866, 10 & 11 Vict. c. 100, s. 3).

Mr. LEWIS said, he had only one word to say. He desired to draw the attention of the Committee to the word "not" in line 33. The new clause of which he had given Notice seemed to him in a direction different to the one now under consideration, and he objected to the provisions of the clause on the ground that it was undefined whether the Irish Constabulary were or were not, as a matter of fairness or justice, entitled to that increase of pay. He did not understand why the Government did not, when asking for the proposed increase of pay, ask also that the men should have their pensions relatively increased. They all knew that for many years the Irish Constabulary were very much underpaid, and that it was doing but a tardy act of justice in increasing their pay. He thought it was doing it in an unfortunate way to say that they should not have relative increases of pensions. It was a cognate matter, and he did not think it would be an illiberal accompaniment to the increase of pay to provide that there should be a relative increase of pension.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he had an Amendment on Clause 9. He was aware it was now too late to move it; but he wished to point out that the object of his Amendment was to insist upon the provision that a policeman who had enlisted under the Act of 1866 should still have to undergo a medical examination before retiring on a pension.

Mr. CALLAN said, that Section 10 did an injustice to one particular class, and he thought that he only need mention the injustice to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to cause him to at once remedy it. The men who joined before 1866 were, in law and equity, entitled, after 30 years' service, to a pension equal to their full pay. Under Section 10, however, of this Bill, they were debarred from such pension; they were debarred now of the rights they had under the Act of 1866. A head constable who joined before 1866 had, for instance, a vested interest in a pension of £101 per annum, provided, of course, that he served long enough to entitle him to receive that pension. Now, if this Bill passed unamended, such a man would only get £91 per annum, so that this Act would entail an absolute loss upon a head constable who joined the Force before 1866 of £10 a-year. He was sure that such a loss should not be entailed by the Bill upon any man, and he was confident that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would agree with him that such an injustice should be remedied and guarded against.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, that the object of all legislative measures was to remedy particular grievances, and the particular grievance of the Police and Constabulary was, that all of them considered that their pay was not sufficient, and that the younger men considered that their pensions were not sufficient. He must own he had never heard that the men appointed prior to August, 1866, considered that the amount of their pension was a serious grievance, and it was what no Government could possibly for one moment admit.

Mr. CALLAN said, the men admitted that their pension was a good one; but they said that the present Bill would in certain cases reduce it by £10 a-year.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, that arrangements had been made in the Bill to the effect that a man would always be able to choose between either the new and the old scale, according as it would be most advantageous to him. The Bill had been so arranged that Constables and Inspectors in both the Metropolitan Police and the Constabulary would be pensioned on a somewhat more liberal scale than if classes in their respective ranks had been maintained. If the scale of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) were carried out, the Government would have to give a greater number of pensions than many men expected when they came into the Service. A man appointed in August, 1866, got sufficient pension now; and certainly the Government could not consent to the proposal of the hon. Member for the sake of bringing the scale in uniformity with the arrangement of 1874. They could not consent to make any alteration.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (The Constabulary Force Fund) *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Change of designations of certain ranks).

Mr. KENNY said, that the clause provided that important changes should be made in the names of the different ranks of the Police in Ireland. He found that in the first part of the Bill it was proposed to retain the name "Acting Constable;" but he could not understand what the object was in changing "Sub-Inspector" to "District Inspector," and what object there was in altering "Constables" to "Sergeants" or "Acting Sergeants." He considered that the Royal Irish Constabulary was sufficiently military in its character already without introducing still more military titles. He did not know what the opinion of the Constabulary was themselves; but he fancied the proposed change would be rather unpopular with the principal proportion of the people of Ireland, if not with the Force themselves.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, there was no desire to turn the Constabulary into a Military Force. The desire was that "Constable" should mean the same thing in Dublin and the country, and everywhere where the language was spoken. He was told the officers and the men themselves were desirous of the change of terms. The term "Sergeant" or "Acting Sergeant" was supposed to assimilate them to other Police Forces, and not to Military Forces; and he (Mr. Trevelyan) had been informed that the term "Sergeant" was in very common use among the people in Ireland. He considered the changes were reasonable, and he was sure that they were not only acceptable to, but desired by, the Force.

Mr. KENNY asked if he was to understand that "Sub-Inspector" had been changed to "District Inspector" on the suggestion of the men themselves?

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he was quite satisfied that the change would be acceptable to the men.

Mr. CALLAN said, that in changing the name "Sub-Inspector" they, unfortunately, did not get rid of the men. A more incompetent set of men than the "Sub-Inspectors" could not be imagined. They were, in fact, a disgrace to the Royal Irish Constabulary. If a mode were provided by which "District Inspectors" or simple Inspectors were appointed from the ranks, it would be one great step towards giving to the Force that promotion which it deserved. It was high time to break down the system of appointing the higher offices in the Constabulary to sons of broken down clergymen and officers.

Clause *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

LORD ALCESTER (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY).—RESOLUTION.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That it is expedient to authorise the grant of a sum of £25,000, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, to Frederick Beauchamp Paget, Lord Alcester, Admiral in Her Majesty's Navy, in lieu of the Annuity of Two thousand pounds per annum, which was proposed to be granted to him in answer to the Message from Her Majesty on the 13th day of April last."

Sir WILFRID LAWSON supposed that this was a matter of form, in order that the grant to Lord Alcester might be made in the form of a lump sum instead of an annuity. He had no wish to oppose any proceedings at this stage. He, however, intended to oppose a grant of any money at all; and he presumed the best time to do that would be when they were asked to go into Committee after this Resolution had been incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that that was quite the understanding.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

LORD WOLSELEY (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY).—RESOLUTION.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That it is expedient to authorise the grant of a sum of £30,000, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, to Garnet Joseph, Lord Wolseley, General in Her Majesty's Army, in lieu of the Annuity of Two thousand pounds per annum, which was proposed to be granted to him in answer to the Message from Her Majesty on the 13th day of April last."

Mr. R. N. FOWLER asked the hon. Gentleman the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, if he would explain why the grant to Lord Alcester was £25,000, while that for Lord Wolseley was £30,000? He supposed that Lord Wolseley was to receive a larger amount, because he was a younger man than Lord Alcester.

Mr. COURTNEY believed that that was so.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [24th May] *reported.*

Resolutions 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Resolution 3.

Mr. BIGGAR desired to say that his information with regard to the discipline of the Antrim Militia was very different to that supplied to the Government. He gained his information from a variety of persons in different regiments. The conduct of the officers, more especially the senior officers, who should show a good example, was said to be of an exceedingly lax nature. The War Office would do well to keep a more watchful eye upon the Antrim Militia, for the money expended upon that Militia had been entirely thrown away.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Remaining Resolution *agreed to.*

MOTION.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Lyons, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Registry of Deeds Office (Ireland), *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. Lyons, Mr. Maurice Brooks, and Mr. Findlater.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 202.]

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 29th May, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders * (64); Poor Law Conferences * (65).
Committee — Representative Peers (Scotland) (53-66).

Committee — Report — General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Broughty Ferry Paving) * (55).

Third Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) * (27), and *passed.*

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT—BILL FOR THE BETTER PROTECTION OF YOUNG GIRLS.

QUESTION.

In reply to Earl CAIRNS.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that on Thursday he would make a statement when a Bill by the Government for the better Protection of Young Girls would be introduced in their Lordships' House.

REPRESENTATIVE PEERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—(No. 53.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMITTEE (ON RE-COMMITMENT).

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do go into Committee on the Representative Peers (Scotland) Bill, on re-commitment."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he wished to ask the Chairman of Committees, Whether he was right in understanding that a Bill having been re-committed, there would be an opportunity of moving Amendments on Report? There had been no time to put down Amendments to the Amendments which the noble and learned Earl opposite (the Lord Chancellor) had put on the Paper.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES): Yes; certainly. Before taking the Chair, he wished to call the attention of their Lordships to the fact that the Bill, as re-cast, provided that the Committee of Privileges might submit a claim to the Peerage to the Court of Session for decision. He contended that it was absolutely the Privilege of the House of Lords to determine who were the proper persons to sit in it, quite apart from the Court of Session. The Lord Chancellor proposed, in order to secure a safe determination of any such proposal, to provide that no such Resolution should be passed, if the greater number of the Lords of Appeal present in the Committee dissent therefrom, although the majority of the Committee might decide otherwise. A most important principle was here involved—namely, that the minority was to override the majority. That was entirely contrary to Parliamentary Procedure, and he thought their Lordships ought on no account to agree to it.

LORD DENMAN said, he also wished to be allowed to protest against the new clause proposed by the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack, which provided that no Resolution should be passed by the Committee of Privileges if the greater number of the Lords of Appeal—mentioned in Section 5 of the Judicature Act, 1876—present for the time being should dissent therefrom. He (Lord Denman) had protested, in 1876, against the necessity for three Law Lords being needed to form a quorum. Lord Hatherley had said, or written, that three Law Lords would not, although a good Court, be the House of Lords, and had pointed out that, under it, Lord Kingsdown—who sat afterwards, as one of three, from 1859 to 1867—would have been unable to form one of a quorum; and on one occasion, at a winter sitting, suitors had to withdraw because only two Law Lords were present. He had predicted the possibility of this in 1856. He himself had recently asserted his right to sit on the Court of Appeal, and he had even ventured to give what had been called only an "opinion." He firmly hoped their Lordships would not admit this new clause, because, if they did, it would destroy the whole hereditary character of the House. The Act of Edward III. made the Archbishop of Canterbury the Head of the five Lords who formed the Court of Appeal and who reported to the House. The Scotch Peers were, very properly and very legitimately and naturally, tenacious of their rights; but he believed that, if the Bill passed in the shape it was now proposed to be amended, when it came to be understood, it would be regarded with disgust by the people of Scotland, because they looked up to this House as the House of Lords, and would not approve of any such delegation of their power. During the 29 years he had been in this House, he had striven for nothing more earnestly than the maintenance of its dignity, and, therefore, he hoped their Lordships would excuse him for protesting against a measure that was calculated to destroy its ancient character.

Motion *agreed to.*

House in Committee accordingly.

Clause 1 (Roll of Peerages and Peers of Scotland to be annually prepared).

On the Motion of The Duke of BUCCLEUCH, the following Amendment made:—In page 1, line 9, after ("Roll"), insert ("commonly called the Union Roll").

Amendment *moved,* in page 1, line 17, after ("January"), insert ("the name and titles of the Duke of Rothesay for the time being shall always stand first on the said Roll.")—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH said, he should like to know what the necessity was for the Amendment, as the Duke of Rothesay was always put first?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in reply, said, that, in the next clause, directions were given for the preparation of the Election Roll; and that it was to consist of those persons who had voted in the last 21 years, or had sat as Representative Peers, or had had their rights established by the House of Lords. He thought it his duty to inquire whether His Royal Highness the Duke of Rothesay had voted within that period, and was informed that he had not done so since 1807; and, as he did not come within any of the other categories, there would have been no provision for putting his name there at all.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he wished to know, whether, in the case of the Peer being a minor, his name would appear?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in reply, said, it would; but of course he would not be entitled to vote, but the name and all the titles would appear.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Form of Election Roll).

On the Motion of The Earl of GALLOWAY, the following Amendments made:—In page 1, line 19, leave out ("Union"), and after ("Roll") insert ("heretofore called at elections"); and in line 21, after ("the"), insert ("Election").

On the Motion of The LORD CHANCELLOR, the following Amendments made:—In page 1, line 20, after ("Scotland"), insert ("other than the Duke of Rothesay"); and in line 26, after ("vote"), insert ("by any Peer at the same time present and voting").

On the Motion of The Duke of BUCCLEUCH, the following Amendment made:—In page 1, line 32, after ("be"), insert—

("And the said Election Roll shall not contain any names of Peers other than those hereinbefore specified.")

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he wished to call attention to the way in which the Roll was proposed to be made up by the clause, which seemed to him to contain provisions partaking rather of a personal and individual character—that was, those provisions would exclude from the Roll some individuals who might think they were entitled to be on it. He, himself, did not come within any of the categories mentioned in the clause as it now stood. He had not sat before in the House of Lords; he had voted since 1862; and his Scotch Peerage had not been established by the House of Lords. He would thus be excluded from the new Election Roll. The Bill was intended to regulate the procedure at the election of Peers, and for "other purposes;" but if that was one of the other purposes, it was, as he had said—though, no doubt, not intended to be so — rather of a personal and invidious character. He was sorry that the first time he had risen to speak in their Lordships' House it should be to complain of a personal matter.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he could assure the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Wemyss) that the Bill was not intended to have any personal effect either for or against any Peer, and that the mysterious words which had been quoted from the title had no such sting in them as was apprehended.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Publication of Roll).

Amendment *moved,* in page 2, lines 12 and 13, leave out ("with the Deputy Clerk Register in the"); and in line 14, leave out ("Deputy"), and insert ("Lord.")—(*The Duke of Buccleuch.*)

LORD WATSON said, he heartily approved of the Amendment, it being similar to one which he (Lord Watson) himself had moved last year. Its intention was to make it perfectly clear that the Lord Clerk Register was intended by the Act of 1878 to remain the supreme authority in all matters connected with the Scottish Peerage, and that he should undoubtedly be supreme in this particular matter.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Names on Roll only to be called at elections).

On the Motion of The LORD CHANCELLOR, the following Amendments made:—In page 2, line 22, after ("only"), insert ("other than and except the Duke of Rothesay"); and in line 32, after ("except"), insert ("the title of the Duke of Rothesay, and").

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Proceedings by heirs of deceased persons).

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH, in moving, as an Amendment, the omission of the Proviso requiring the application of a Peer's heir, for insertion of his name on the Roll, to be accompanied by an extract decree of service of the applicant as heir, and of the evidence on which such service proceeded, said, that, generally speaking, there was no evidence, either documentary or oral.

Amendment *moved,* in page 2, line 43, to leave out from ("majority") to ("and") in page 3, line 5.—(*The Duke of Buccleuch.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he was sorry he could not meet the wishes of the noble Duke; but he had had some communication with the Lord Justice Clerk upon the subject, and he found that considerable importance was attached by him and others to the matter. He (the Lord Chancellor) quite agreed that if these services were to very remote ancestors, they would be of very little value. But, in ordinary cases, the succession would be proximate, as from father to son, and in such cases they would contain all the evidence which was required.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY moved an Amendment, with the view of giving power to the Lord Clerk Register, if satisfied with the claim of an heir, to insert his name on the Election Roll.

Amendment *moved,*

In pages 3, lines 6 to 15, leave out from ("thereupon") to ("he"), both inclusive, and insert ("after due advertisement of the application, if satisfied that the applicant possesses the character of heir entitling him to such title of honour, insert his name in the Election Roll, or otherwise, if not satisfied, may refuse to make the insertion until the applicant.")—(*The Earl of Galloway.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he could not believe that the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Galloway) could be serious in proposing this Amendment, seeing it would devolve upon the Lord Clerk Register, who might or might not be skilled in the law, a duty not contemplated by his Office, and which ought properly to be discharged by the House of Lords.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Clause verbally *amended,* and *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Amendments of Roll), *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Petitions as to rights of peerage and precedency, and to correct errors in the Roll).

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY, in moving an Amendment, to provide that when any such Petition was presented to Her Majesty, it should be lawful for Her Majesty, after obtaining the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown for Scotland, to refer the same to the House of Lords, said, his object was to apply the same procedure to Scottish Peerages as was applied to Peerages of the United Kingdom. It had been the custom to take the opinion of the Attorney General on questions relating to Peerages connected with England, and he asked that the same reference should be made to the Law Officers of the Crown for Scotland in the case of Scottish Peerages.

Amendment *moved,*

In page 3, line 35, after ("Majesty"), to insert ("after obtaining the opinion of the law officers of the Crown for Scotland.")—(*The Earl of Galloway.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, it was quite impossible to accept the Amendment. The Crown was under no obligation to take the opinion of the Law Officers, either in England, Ireland, or in Scotland, and nothing could be more improper than to introduce that principle. When these cases came before the House of Lords, it was usual for the Attorney General or Solicitor General in English cases, and for the Lord Advocate or the Solicitor General for Scotland in Scottish cases, to attend to assist the House; but there was no obligation on the Crown to ask for their opinion.

EARL CAIRNS said, he could corroborate what had been said by the noble and learned Earl opposite (the Lord Chancellor).

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY here cited instances, with the respective signatures of various Secretaries of State for the Home Department, showing that the references in English and Scottish cases were entirely different, the Crown referring English cases to the English Law Officers of the Crown before being brought before the Committee of Privileges, but in Scotch cases only after they had been brought before that Committee.

Amendment, (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he would next propose an Amendment requiring the Committee of Privileges to obtain the approval of the Crown prior to the rectification of the Roll.

Amendment *moved,*

In page 3, line 40, after ("may"), to insert ("after intimation of Her Majesty's approval.")—(*The Earl of Galloway.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in opposing the Amendment, said, that it was not the practice for the Crown to exercise a personal judgment, or to intimate approval or disapproval.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY contended that it had always been the practice to report to Her Majesty; and, as an instance, he would refer their Lordships to a case in which a Scottish Peer was placed on the Roll by command of the Crown, and not by the House of Lords at all. He would not, however, press his Amendment.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH said, that, objecting to the matter being referred wholesale to the Court of Session, without the issues of law and fact having been adequately separated, he would propose, as an Amendment, to omit the words "the same or." As the clause had been amended, the Petition itself might be amended.

Amendment *moved,* in page 4, line 3, to leave out ("the same, or.")—(*The Duke of Buccleuch.*)

LORD MONCREIFF said, the clause had been altered at his suggestion, and he, therefore, objected to the limitation proposed by the Amendment. To limit the reference to questions of fact or law, as proposed, would put the Committee of Privileges in a very awkward position, and impose upon it a duty for which it was not suited. It was often very difficult to separate questions of law from questions of fact; and, therefore, in complicated cases, he thought the Committee should have the power of refusing the Petition itself.

EARL CAIRNS said, he could not conceive a more conclusive reason for limiting the reference. The noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Moncreiff) said it was difficult at times to separate questions of law from questions of fact, and therefore the Committee of Privileges should have power to bundle them altogether, and send the whole thing off to another tribunal to make the best of it. That was what he (Earl Cairns) objected to. It was an improper delegation of the work of this House to a different Court. By all means let them send any point which it was thought could be better settled in Scotland for determination there; but be objected to the whole matter being referred.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the power of reference in the original Bill was limited in the manner proposed; but, as he had consented to its being widened, he would, of course, vote for the clause as it now stood.

After a considerable amount of inaudible conversation between THE LORD CHANCELLOR and EARL CAIRNS across the Table,

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY rose, and stated that, as he understood that the noble and learned Earl (the Lord Chancellor) had consented to accept the

Amendment of his noble and learned Friend (Earl Cairns), he (the Earl of Galloway) must interpose, and ask the Lord Chancellor to stand to his own clause, as amended, widening the reference to the Court of Session, and to divide the House upon the question.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR replied, that, upon this expression of opinion from the noble Earl (the Earl of Galloway), he was ready to stand by his own amended clause.

On Question (leave being given to the Lord MOSTYN to vote in the House)? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 71; Not-Contents 56: Majority 15.

CONTENTS.

Selborne, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Bedford, D.
Grafton, D.
Portland, D.
Sutherland, D.

Bristol, M.

Camperdown, E.
Clonmell, E.
Feversham, E.
Granville, E.
Haddington, E.
Innes, E. (*D. Roxburghe.*)
Kimberley, E.
Lovelace, E.
Manvers, E.
Morley, E.
Northbrook, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Strathmore and Kinghorn, E.
Sydney, E.

Eversley, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Powerscourt, V.
Sherbrooke, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.

Abercromby, L.
Ampthill, L.
Auckland, L.
Balinhard, L. (*E. Southesk.*)
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*) [*Teller.*]
Brabourne, L.
Carlingford, L.
Carrington, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Cottesloe, L.
Crofton, L.
Derwent, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Ellenborough, L.
Greville, L.
Hammond, L.
Hopetoun, L. (*E. Hopetoun.*)
Houghton, L.
Howth, L. (*E. Howth.*)
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare.*)
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kintore, E. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Moncreiff, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)
Reay, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Romilly, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Skene, L. (*E. Fife.*)
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*) [*Teller.*]
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*)
Sudeley, L.
Thurlow, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wigan, L. (*E. Crawford and Balcarres.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Northumberland, D.
Richmond, D.

Bath, M.
Hertford, M.
Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Bandon, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cairns, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Lathom, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Milltown, E.
Ravensworth, E.
Redesdale, E.
Rosse, E.
Selkirk, E.
Wilton, E.

Cranbrook, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V.
St. Vincent, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, L. Bp.

Ashford, L. (*V. Bury.*)
Blackburn, L.
Boston, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Denman, L.
de Ros, L.
Douglas, L. (*E. Home.*)
Elphinstone, L. [*Teller.*]
Forester, L.
Gerard, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Inchiquin, L. [*Teller.*]
Keane, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort.*)
Lamington, T.
Lyveden, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda.*)
Norton, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Poltimore, L.
Raglan, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saltoun, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Trevor, L.
Ventry, L.
Wimborne, L.
Winmarleigh, L.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he had no doubt the noble and learned Earl (the Lord Chancellor) would agree to his next Amendment—namely, in page 4, line 4, after ("to"), to insert ("either division of the Inner House of"). His object was to refer Petitions to either division of the Inner Court of Session.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Certainly not.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he had only moved this Amendment, that it might not be thought that Peerage cases were to be submitted to the Outer House, which would hardly be consistent with the dignity of the House of Lords.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Amendment *moved,*

In page 4, line 11, at end of clause, to add the words ("Provided also, that every petition presented to Her Majesty claiming a higher order of precedency upon the Roll than that which has been accorded the name of any Peer, shall be referred as heretofore to the Court of Session, whose judgment, subject to appeal to the House of Lords as the final Court of Appeal in the United Kingdom, shall be final and conclusive in law.")—(*The Earl of Galloway.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he could not accept the Amendment, for which there was no precedent since the Union. The most consistent and convenient and the least circuitous and expensive course was that proposed by the Bill.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Clause verbally *amended*, and *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Protests).

On the Motion of The LORD CHANCELLOR, the following Amendment made:—In page 4, line 15, leave out ("and received").

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he wished to propose an Amendment, as to the reception of a protest against a claim to vote, providing that it should be made only by any Peer present and voting at the election, and received by the Lord Clerk Register.

Amendment *moved*,

In page 4, line 16, after ("Parliament"), to insert ("by any peer present and voting at such election, and received by the Lord Clerk Register.")—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE EARL OF KINTORE said, he strongly objected to the proposed alteration. He should like to hear some reasons why there should be a departure from the ancient custom, under which protests had been made by Peers who had been unable to be present.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, it seemed to him to be only reasonable, if a Peer desired to come forward as an objector to the right of someone else to be on the Roll, in order that the question might be solemnly considered by the proper tribunal, that he should take the trouble to personally present his protest. Further, no protest should be allowed after the matter had once been adjudicated on by the House of Lords. The present arrangement had given rise to scandals and inconveniences, and his only reason for retaining protests at all was that there must be some means of correcting errors, and it was impossible otherwise to guard completely against errors creeping into the Roll.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that occasions might arise when, from illness or other causes, a Peer could not be present. Peers should be jealous of parting with a Privilege they had long enjoyed, and he trusted their Lordships would decide against the Amendment.

THE EARL OF STAIR appealed to the noble and learned Earl to accept this Amendment. Scotch Peers had, from time immemorial, had the privilege of protesting in writing; they were very tenacious of their ancient rights, and no good reason had as yet been given for this change. A Peer wishing to be present at an election might be prevented by illness or urgent business. He had often known snowstorms which prevented locomotion for days. He still trusted that the noble and learned Earl would accept the Amendment.

LORD BRABOURNE said, that, having served upon the Committee to which this subject was relegated, and having paid some attention to it, he wished to join in the opposition to the proposal to abolish written protests. He desired to point out the strangely illogical position taken by the noble and learned Earl (the Lord Chancellor). The noble and learned Earl said that he desired to limit protests, because there had been indecorous scenes at certain elections of Scotch Peers; and, in order to effect this, he proposed to abolish those protests sent by absent Peers, who could, by no possibility, have been guilty of the indecorum of which he complained. By all means, let all precautions be taken against disorderly scenes at these elections; but that might be done without forbidding the handing in of written protests from Peers, who might be ill, or, for other reasons, unable to attend. It might be desirable to know whether certain protests proceeded from the isolated action of individuals, or from a wider feeling among Scotch Peers; and there seemed no valid reasoning why this ancient Privilege should be swept away.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH said, he most heartily supported the Amendment of the noble and learned Earl (the Lord Chancellor). He (the Duke of Buccleuch) had been present at many elections, and could testify to the scandals, and inconvenience, and confusion which arose from the presentation of protests under the present system. Surely, any Peer wishing to protest, and unable to attend, could have no difficulty in finding a friend who would enter the necessary protest. Great inconvenience had arisen at Elections of Representative

Peers, from the practice of gentlemen unconnected with the Election, advocates in wig and gown for the most part, jumping up among the spectators, and lodging a protest on behalf of some individual Peer. The protestor might be within, or without the Kingdom; he might be ill in bed, or in perfect health; but the practice had given rise to a great deal of scandal and confusion at the Elections.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY asked, if it was permissible for a Scotch Peer to enter his protest by proxy?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in reply, said, that he had never heard so. A Scottish Peer might vote by proxy; and he could at present enter his protest, not by proxy, but by some person whom he deputed. He need not necessarily be a Peer.

LORD BRABOURNE said, that that was exactly the point he wished to urge. After the speech of the noble Duke (the Duke of Buccleuch), he (Lord Brabourne) should claim his vote against the abolition of written protests, since all he desired was that Peers present should be able to hand in protests from those Peers who might be unable to attend, but who ought not, on that account, to be deprived of their right to protest.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he thought there was ground for saying that there were objections to the practice of protests being delivered by some person not a Peer acting on behalf of a Scotch Peer. But was it necessary, in order to stop that practice, to go so far as to say that every protest should be delivered by the Peer himself? It was obvious that there might be cases where a Peer was prevented by illness or other causes from appearing; and, in such cases, when a friend incurred on his behalf all the liabilities and responsibilities, he considered that should be sufficient. Therefore, it was clearly desirable to modify the Amendment, so as to admit of the presentation of a protest by another Peer entitled to be present.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he did not at all object to the principle of the suggestion put forward by the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury); but he thought it better to give effect to it at a later stage of the Bill. His object would be attained if the protest were made, either on his own behalf, or that of another Peer, by some Peer actually present and entitled to vote. He would, on Report, propose words to give effect to the suggestion.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Amendment *moved,* in page 4, line 17, to insert after ("accustomed") the following Proviso:—

("Provided, that no such protest shall be made by or received from any person, other than a Peer present and voting at such election; nor shall any such protest be made or received against the vote or claim to vote of any Peer whose right shall have been established, either before or after the passing of this Act, by any Order or Resolution of the House of Lords upon any Petition referred to the House of Lords by Her Majesty.")—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE EARL OF KINTORE said, he objected to the latter part of the clause, inasmuch as it did not meet existing difficulties with regard to questions of precedence according to the Union Roll. One noble Friend near him had, in the aggregate, 47 protests against his vote, not because he had voted as a Peer in a Peerage given him by Resolution of the House, but because he had voted as the Representative of a much more ancient Peerage, his right to which the House itself had declared was by no means clear.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he most decidedly objected to the adoption of the clause as it stood.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he also protested against the clause, and would press upon the noble Earl (the Earl of Kintore) the necessity of dividing against it.

LORD MONCREIFF said, it was extremely doubtful whether the way proposed was the best to pursue in order to deal with this question; and he, therefore, should certainly have been glad if his noble and learned Friend (the Lord Chancellor) had seen his way to depart from this Amendment. It was a question whether the Act of 1847 should be interfered with in this respect at all; but, in any case, he doubted whether the clause proposed the right way of dealing with a judgment of the Committee of Privileges as regards any subsequent question raised upon the rights of any individual Peer. By its means an invidious distinction was drawn between Peers whose claims had been acknowledged and other Scottish Peers. The Act of 1847 had subsisted for nearly 40 years, and he suggested whether it would not be better to leave it as it was.

Lord **BRABOURNE** said, he must ask a clear answer from the noble and learned Earl (the Lord Chancellor) as to the effect of these words. Suppose a noble Lord, to whom the Committee of Privileges had adjudged a certain Peerage, answered to his name, and claimed to vote in an order and precedence higher than that particular Peerage, would, or would not, these words have the effect of preventing any protest or objection against such vote?

The **LORD CHANCELLOR**, in reply, said, that the Proviso had nothing to do with precedence, and would have no such effect. It was entirely limited to protests against the votes of Peers.

The Marquess of **SALISBURY** said, it appeared to him that the clause made a distinct change in the status of the Peers who were protested against, and it was undesirable. He admitted that the difference in question might be merely a technical one, and might not have any practical value; but, while acknowledging the fact that there appeared to be some inconveniences inherent in the present system, he did not think the practical advantage of passing the clause sufficient to justify the inconvenience of making an innovation and the invidious contrast to which several noble Lords from Scotland had very properly objected.

The **LORD CHANCELLOR** said, that noble Lords who objected to the clause seemed to lose sight of the real nature of the clause, the object of which was to put an end to constant disputes, which were certainly not desirable, and to settle the manner in which disputed questions in regard to Scotch Peerages might be determined. No Peer would think of protesting against a right to vote, which had never been in controversy. That protests should continue to be made against rights which, after controversy, had been conclusively established by the House, whose decision, by the express provision of this Bill, was to be final and conclusive in the future, and in the past was made equally so by the Act of 1847, would be, to say the least, indecorous.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 63; Not-Contents 36: Majority 27.

CONTENTS.

Selborne, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Bedford, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Grafton, D.
Portland, D.
Richmond, D.

Bath, M.
Hertford, M.

Amherst, E.
Bradford, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Milltown, E.
Morley, E.
Northbrook, E.
Ravensworth, E.
Redesdale, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Selkirk, E.
Sydney, E.

Cranbrook, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Melville, V.
Powerscourt, V.
Sherbrooke, V.
St. Vincent, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, L. Bp.

Ampthill, L.
Auckland, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*) [*Teller.*]
Carlingford, L.
Carrington, L.
Derwent, L.
Douglas, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Forester, L.
Gerard, L.
Hammond, L.
Howth, L. (*E. Howth*).
Inchiquin, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort*)
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare*)
Leigh, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Monson, L. [*Teller*]
Mostyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)
Ribblesdale, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Saltoun, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skene, L. (*E. Fife*).
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*)
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Sudeley, L.
Trevor, L.
Wimborne, L.
Wimmarleigh, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Beaufort, D.
Sutherland, D.

Bristol, M.

Camperdown, E.
Clonmell, E.
Feversham, E.
Haddington, E.
Innes, E. (*D. Roxburghe.*)
Manvers, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Strathmore and Kinghorn, E.
Wilton E.

Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.

Ashford, L. (*V. Bury.*)

Brabourne, L.
Calthorpe L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Crofton, L.
Denman, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Elphinstone, L. [*Teller.*]
Hopetoun, L. (*E. Hopetoun.*)
Houghton, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lamington, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyveden, L.
Moncreiff, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda.*)

Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Reay, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*) [*Teller.*]
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wigan, L. (*E. Crawford and Balcarres.*)

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he had put a new clause on the Paper, requiring the presence of a quorum of Lords of Appeal at meetings of the Committee of Privileges, at which references were made to the Court of Session; but the clause was now unnecessary, as the power of making these references had been withdrawn from the Committee and vested in the House itself; and, therefore, he was not disposed to press it.

Clause (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

House *resumed.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Friday* the 8*th of June* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 66.)

The Earl of GALLOWAY asked the noble and learned Earl (the Lord Chancellor) when it was proposed to take the Report? He would remind him that it was Ascot week.

The LORD CHANCELLOR in reply, said, it had been intended to take Report on Monday, and the third reading on Friday week; but, to suit the convenience of noble Lords, they would take Report on Friday week, and the third reading on the following Monday.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 29*th May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee Resolutions* [May 28] *reported.*

Public Bills — *Second Reading* — Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 3) * [169]; Agricultural Holdings (England) [186]; Lands Clauses (Umpire) [160].

Committee — Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment [183], *debate adjourned;* Friendly, &c. Societies (Nominations) [117]—r.p.

Considered as amended—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) * [149].

Third Reading—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders * [147], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND)—ST. JAMES'S WORKHOUSE.

Mr. DILLWYN asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of all Correspondence between the Guardians of the Westminster Union and the Local Government Board relative to the conduct of the master of the St. James's Workhouse, together with a Copy of the Evidence taken at the recent official inquiry into the conduct of the master, and such further Correspondence as relates thereto.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, the Board have now under their consideration the Evidence taken at the official inquiry into the conduct of the master of the workhouse; and they will have no objection, when their decision has been given, to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the depositions of the witnesses, and of the letter of the Board communicating their decision on the case, if moved for.

In reply to Mr. W. H. Smith,

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that, while the Board were considering it, he was going to allow the Guardians to see a copy of the Evidence.

INDIA—DUTY ON JEWELLERY.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, To state the rate of Duty charged on jewellery imported into India and amount of Duty collected in the last full year the Duty was in force on jewellery; whether, since the Duty was taken off, the imports of jewellery have largely increased; and, whether the Government of India has refunded to stock holders of jewellery, at the date the Duty was taken off, a drawback for the Duties previously paid, in order to put the holders on a fair position with the holders of free imported jewellery?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Sir, the rate of duty charged on jewellery imported into India in 1881-2—the last full year in which the duty was in force—was 5 per cent, and the gross amount of duty collected was £2,983. Precious stones and unset pearls were admitted free. The total value of duty-paying jewellery was, in 1880-1, £47,954; in 1881-2, £58,424; and in the first 11 months of 1882-3, £121,067. The value of precious stones imported in these three periods was £368,218, £242,363, and £168,865 respectively. The Government of India have never refunded drawbacks to holders of stocks of jewellery on account of alterations of the Tariff.

THE ARMY MEDICAL COMMISSION—SUPPLIES FOR THE ARMY IN EGYPT.

DR. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Lord Wolseley is correctly stated by the "Times" of May 19th to have given evidence before the Army Medical Commission, to the effect that "all the flour sent out from England for the purpose of making bread for the Egyptian Army was unfit to make bread with," "that the Commissariat never supplied any good bread during the whole campaign," and "that the bread supplied by the Commissariat to the hospital at Ismailia was unfit for human food;" and, whether the late Commissary General at head quarters is correct in his statement, in a letter in the "Times" of 23rd May, that his department had absolutely nothing to do with the purchase of the flour sent out, and was not consulted respecting it; and, if so, what official is responsible for the purchase of the flour in question?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The complete Report and Evidence has, I believe, been distributed to-day. The hon. Member will find this subject fully discussed in the Report; and when he has had the opportunity of comparing the statements quoted in the Question with those in explanation, he will be able to judge whether it is necessary to put further Questions upon it. At all events, I would prefer to postpone any full answer to the part of the Question referring to statements made in *The Times* until hon. Members have had an opportunity of considering the Report. With regard to the second part of the Question, the Commissary General at head-quarters is an officer charged with the *personnel* and discipline of the Commissariat Department. Supplies of provisions are made on the responsibility of the Director of Supplies, a full Memorandum by whom will be found in the Report.

EGYPTIAN EXPEDITION—COMPENSATION FOR BREAKING CONTRACTS.

DR. CAMERON asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office, What was the total amount paid by the Government to Mr. Taylor, of Constantinople, as compensation for breaking the contract entered into with him by Major Carré for the supply of Montenegrin muleteers for the Egyptian Expedition; and, what were the items of which it was made up?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: Sir, the total amount paid by the Government to Messrs. Gilchrist and Walker in the matter of the Montenegrin muleteers—for we know nothing of Mr. Taylor—was £835 10*s.*; and the items of it were made up as follows:—350 muleteers, each one month's pay at 1*s.* 6*d.* a-day, £787 10*s.*; 16 headmen at £3 per month, or 2*s.* per day, £48—total, £835 10*s.*

ARMY—ROMAN CATHOLIC SOLDIERS ON BOARD THE "EUPHRATES" TROOPSHIP.

MR. BELLINGHAM asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it be true, as alleged, that the Catholic soldiers on board Her Majesty's Troopship "Euphrates," which sailed from Bombay on 12th April, and arrived at Portsmouth on the 19th April, were forced by order of the commanding officer to attend Protestant service; whether the commanding officer in this instance acted entirely on his own responsibility, or under superior orders; and, whether, in any case, such an order is legal; and, if illegal, whether he cannot be called upon to furnish an explanation for acting contrary to the spirit of the regulations of the service?

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it be the fact that on board Her Majesty's Troopship "Euphrates" on her recent voyage home Roman Catholic Soldiers were forced on the second Sunday of the voyage to attend the Protestant service; whether this was required after objection made known to their officers; and, whether, when the service was about to commence, a few of the Roman Catholic Soldiers rose to ask permission to withdraw, and were at once made prisoners and kept in close confinement until the same hour next day; if so, who was responsible?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, the facts of the case would appear to be substantially as stated. The proceedings of the commanding officer were injudicious, and he has been so informed. There was, however, some justification for the course taken. On the previous Sunday the Roman Catholic soldiers were ordered to fall out; and as there was no Roman Catholic chaplain on board they avoided religious service altogether. The commanding officer considered that many more men fell out than were Roman Catholics, and a later investigation proved that this was the case. He was, however, unable to obtain access to the men's records before the Sunday referred to in the Question; and, therefore, to stop shirking, he injudiciously required all the troops to attend the Church of England Service.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND)—REPAYMENTS FOR PAUPER RELIEF.

Mr. E. STANHOPE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that questions have arisen as to the legality of agreements entered into by Boards of Guardians with the relatives of paupers for the repayment of weekly sums for the maintenance of such paupers; whether these agreements are not in common use, and are found to work exceedingly well in country districts; and, whether, in these circumstances, he will consider the desirability of removing, by legislation, any doubts as to their validity?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, Questions have arisen as to the legality of agreements entered into by the relatives of paupers for the repayment of relief granted by Boards of Guardians. The Board are aware that in some Unions it has been the practice to accept such agreements with the view of avoiding the necessity for obtaining orders of justices on the relatives of paupers; but the Board have no information as to the extent to which the arrangement has been adopted. When an opportunity for legislation on the subject offers, the Board will be prepared to consider the desirability of removing any doubts as to the legality of such agreements.

ARMY—ARMOURED RAILWAY TRAINS —LIEUTENANT COLONEL CAMPBELL WALKER.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA asked the Secretary of State for War, If Her Majesty's Government have any intention to recommend for some recognition, distinction, or honour, Lieutenant Colonel Campbell Walker, who first, and so far back as 1865, recommended and specified in detail a system of armoured Railway trains, such as have since been successfully used in the Egyptian Campaign of last year?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, there is no trace in the records of the War Department of any proposal of the description referred to having been made by Lieutenant Colonel Campbell Walker in 1865, or at any other period. If, however, the hon. Member can refer me to any statement which would throw light upon the matter, I will make further inquiries.

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—THE FRENCH AT PORTO NOVO.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he can give the House any information as to the reported proceedings of the French at Porto Novo; and, what action the British authorities on the Gold Coast have taken, or have been directed to take, in the matter?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, the French Government have notified, through their Representative in London, that they have re-established a French Protectorate over Porto Novo; and the Colonial authorities on the Gold Coast have reported that this step has been taken. This Protectorate, originally established in 1863, was withdrawn in the following year; and its withdrawal was officially notified by the French Admiral on the Coast to the Governor of Lagos. In 1878 the French took possession of a small district on the adjoining Coast named Cootenoo; but no French authorities, I believe, have been maintained there. It is impossible not to view with some concern this action in places so closely interwoven with our own Possessions; but the question is not of a nature to be dealt with by the local authorities, but will be treated in a friendly manner between the two Governments.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I wish to ask whether the action taken by the French Government has involved any interference with territories belonging to this country, or under the protection of this country?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: No, Sir.

ARMY (INDIA)—THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Colonel ALEXANDER asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether his attention has been drawn to a statement which appeared in the "Pioneer" newspaper of April 13th, 1883; and, if it be correct, whether he can say why a different rule has been applied to Officers of the Indian Staff Corps with regard to the command of Native Regiments, all these Officers having joined the late East India Company's service, and being as much protected by the Clause known as Henley's Clause as the Officers of the late Indian Artillery; whether he intends to remove the anomaly of Officers of the Staff Corps placed on general duty by the late order limiting tenure of command, drawing only R. 827 a month, whereas local Officers, similarly situated, draw R. 1032, and whether he proposes putting both on a similar footing; whether Henley's Clause did not guarantee to all Officers joining the Staff Corps "the advantages as to pay, pensions, allowances, privileges, promotions, and otherwise" enjoyed by them when in the late East India Company's service; and, whether, in that service, an Officer could not retain command of his regiment until he was promoted or attained his Colonel's allowances as long as he was efficient?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, the statement made in *The Pioneer* is inaccurate. The Secretary of State for India has expressly stated to the War Office that he can offer no objection to the removal of Lieutenant Colonels and Regimental Colonels of the Royal Artillery from their commands after they have held them for a term of five years. It is not proposed to raise the pay of the officers of the Staff Corps. The clause called Henley's Clause—namely, Clause 56 of the Act for the better government of India—secures the Forces of the East India Company—

> "The like pay, pensions, allowances, and privileges, and the like advantages, as regards promotion and otherwise, as if they had continued in the Service of the said Company."

It is unquestionable that the Company possessed the power of prescribing and altering the limit of tenure of appointments and commands; and there is no reason to doubt that had the Court of Directors continued in authority they would have exercised this power in respect of regimental commands.

THE BETTING ACT—ARRESTS AT NEWCASTLE.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to the action of the police in Newcastle on Tyne on the 23rd instant, in entering two public houses and there arresting sixty-nine persons, of whom sixty-four were shortly afterwards unconditionally released; and, whether he will take steps to discourage too stringent an application of the Betting Act?

Sir WILFRID LAWSON wished to ask this further Question—Whether the right hon. Gentleman would take steps to put down betting among the gentlemen who frequented Tattersall's?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, with the leave of the House he would answer the Question on the Paper. His hon. Friend (Mr. J. Morley) must know that he (Sir William Harcourt) had no control of the Newcastle-on-Tyne police, nor could he prescribe to the magistrates of Newcastle how they should perform their duty in the administration of the law. If he were to offer advice in a case where he had no power, it would be of no avail. With regard to the latter part of the Question, his hon. Friend was, no doubt, acquainted with the local authorities, and, having great influence, could enforce on them the views he entertained on the subject.

Subsequently,

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN wished to ask a Question of the Home Secretary with reference to his answer to his Colleague concerning the police raids on betting men at Newcastle. As he understood, the right hon. and learned Gentleman refused to interfere with this matter on the ground that he had no control over the police at Newcastle. Identical proceedings took place within half-a-mile of the Home Office every day, and he had control over the Metropolitan Police. He wished to know whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman's answer amounted to approval of the action of the Newcastle magistrates; and, if so, whether he meant to apply the same law to the betting establishments near the Home Office?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that he could answer for the action of the police over whom he had control; but he was unable to answer, either by way of approval or disapproval, for police over whom he had no control. If he were to express a judgment in this case upon the action of the Municipal authorities of Newcastle, he must consider the matter in an official way. He had not at present official information before him; and he could, therefore, express neither approbation nor condemnation of conduct he had not had an opportunity of considering.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON observed, that the Question put by the hon. Member for Newcastle had not been answered. The Question was, whether the Home Secretary would take the same action with reference to the betting establishments in London, which were under his control, as had been taken with regard to those of Newcastle, over which he had no control?

STATE OF IRELAND — PROCLAIMED DISTRICTS IN KING'S COUNTY—EXTRA POLICE.

Mr. MOLLOY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will obtain an investigation on oath upon the truthfulness of the reports upon which the townlands of Castlejordan and other districts in the King's County have been proclaimed, and whether it is the intention of the Irish Government to relieve these districts from a further continuance of the imposition of extra police?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I believe, Sir, that the Lord Lieutenant declined to order a sworn inquiry with regard to the Castlejordan Proclamation, and that His Excellency's decision was communicated to the hon. Member. I know no reason why an inquiry should be held in the other cases. There have been 14 Proclamations issued affecting parts of the King's County. Of these, nine have already been revoked, and the remaining five will be revoked as soon as His Excellency is satisfied that such a course can be adopted with safety to the peace of the districts concerned. None of them has been in force since an earlier period than January last.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—KING'S COUNTY.

Mr. MOLLOY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that, in the King's County, of the thirteen Deputy-Lieutenants only one is a Catholic, and of the ninety-two Justices of the Peace only six are Catholics; and, whether, since nearly ninety per cent of the inhabitants are Catholics, the Irish Government will appoint Catholics to future vacancies?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Government has no official knowledge of the religious persuasions of Deputy Lieutenants or Justices of the Peace. A Return is at present being prepared, in compliance with an Order of this House, which will give some information on the subject. I must remind the hon. Member that the selection of gentlemen for appointment as Deputy Lieutenants is not made by the Government. With regard to the magistrates, I will draw the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the fact of this Question having been asked.

EGYPT—THE DAIRA LANDS.

Mr. MOLLOY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in the event of a sale of any part of the Daira lands in Egypt, these lands will be offered direct to the Egyptian peasants, from whom they were originally taken, upon terms of payment extending over a period of years?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, as the hon. Member is aware, Lord Dufferin states, in his Report on Reorganization in Egypt (Egypt, No. VI., 1883, page 55), that the necessity for disposing of the Domain lands does not exist to the same extent in the case of the Daira. The question, therefore, does not call for immediate action; and I may remind the hon. Member that his Excellency points out that, as capital and skilled labour are required to work these lands, difficulties are placed in the way of their sale to private individuals.

MADAGASCAR—THE FRENCH INVASION.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have addressed a protest to the Government of the French Republic against the attack upon the territory of the Queen of Madagascar; and, whether he can give the House any further information regarding the French invasion?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, no protest has been addressed to the French Government. Her Majesty's Government have received no further information respecting the capture of Mayunga than is contained in the telegram from Colonel Miles which I read to the House on Thursday last.

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS—THE SUSPENDED BOROUGHS.

Mr. LEWIS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce, in the present Session, any Bill dealing with the boroughs of Oxford, Chester, and others now deprived of representation in this House?

Mr. O'BRIEN: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that Question, will he be kind enough to state whether there is any intention of filling up the gaps in the Irish representation in this House caused by the disfranchisement of Cashel and Sligo?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I do not think that the supplementary Question put by the hon. Member is at all analogous to the Question put by the hon. Member for Derry (Mr. Lewis). Of course, an answer could be given to that Question if the hon. Member desires; but I should wish a day or two to consider it. With regard to the Question of the hon. Member for Derry, the case stands thus—although we should have been glad, if it had been in our power, to deal with it at an earlier period, yet we believe it is well that the House should deal, in the first instance, with the general law of corrupt practices; and we shall not attempt to deal with those boroughs until the House has distinctly fixed its own views on the provisions of the Bill now before it. I think I could not reasonably anticipate that that Bill will pass the House in the present Session in time for us to introduce and carry a measure relating to those boroughs which have been specially reported upon.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Mr. CRAIG-SELLAR asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If the Government mean to take any steps, by proposing a Morning Sitting, or otherwise, with a view of enabling the House to proceed, on an early day, with the consideration of the important measure, mentioned in the Queen's Speech, dealing with the Universities of Scotland, and now awaiting a Second Reading?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I think it would be somewhat early for me to attempt to give any positive answer to this Question, at least in the shape of a reference to any particular form of arrangement; but we are, undoubtedly, very anxious to have this Bill relating to Scottish Universities passed, and we look upon it as one of the measures which ought to be carried, and might be carried, during the present Session.

SOUTH AFRICA—PROVISION FOR AFRICAN CHIEFS.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he is now able to state whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose a Vote in Supply for the purpose described in his Notice of Motion, of "making adequate provision for the interests of" any South African Chief "who may have just claims on them?" The right hon. Gentleman said that he asked a similar Question before Whitsuntide, and that he was then told that the Government would be better able to reply after the Recess.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I did certainly, Sir, refer to the arrival of Sir Hercules Robinson in this country as likely largely to increase our means of judgment upon various questions in South Africa. But with regard to the minuter point upon which this matter may turn, I am not sure that we have the necessary information. Therefore, it is not yet possible for us to say whether, or to what extent, pecuniary compensation will, in compliance with the declarations which have been made, be payable to the South African Chiefs in connection with the recent transactions in Bechuanaland.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When it is proposed to take the Second Reading of the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill, which was ordered to be printed on the 16th February?

MR. GLADSTONE: In reply, Sir, to the right hon. Gentleman, I have to say, with regard to the course of Business during the present week, that we propose to have—and I think we can have, with the general consent of the House—a discussion to-night on the Tenants' Compensation Bill. Whether that discussion will close this evening I am hardly in a position to say. If it does not, we shall, I think, do well to endeavour to close it with as little delay as possible. On Thursday, May 31, it will be necessary for us to ask the House for a further Vote on Account; and that will be put down as the first Order of the Day. If the debate on the second reading of the Tenants' Compensation Bill should not close to-night, we think we shall take it on Thursday, after the Vote on Account has been disposed of. But if we dispose of the second reading to-night, we shall take the second reading of the Corrupt Practices Bill on Thursday. If we do not dispose of the Compensation Bill to-night, the Corrupt Practices Bill will be taken on Monday next. Perhaps, Sir, at the time of the Session at which we have arrived I may refer to a matter which is not directly embraced in the Question of the right hon. Gentleman. We have thought it our duty to make a survey of the present condition of Business, with a view of relieving the House from all feeling of uncertainty with regard to our anticipations; and I wish now to say what, in our view, is the amount of legislative Business which we trust the House will be prepared to grapple with and to dispose of. We are obliged, Sir, to make an important deduction from the announcement made in the Queen's Speech; and I have to state that we do not propose to introduce, during the present Session a Bill, dealing with the Municipal Government of London. That is a matter of great regret to us; but it is an obvious necessity in the circumstances in which we stand. Having said that, I should also add that there may be measures of secondary importance with regard to which doubts may arise about our persevering with them. I do not, however, wish to refer to those Bills at the present time. But as regards measures of primary importance, to these we hope to adhere; and we also hope—intending ourselves not to spare any effort for the purpose of obtaining the judgment of the House upon them—we hope that the House may generously second us in that intention, and bestow whatever labour may be necessary for that purpose. I refer particularly to the Tenants' Compensation Bills, to the Corrupt Practices Bill, and to the Bills which may return from the Grand Committees, which are now engaged in considering them. Legislation of that kind appears to us to be within the powers and time of the House, If it be right for the Government to announce its own intention independently of the House, I should wish to say that it is our intention to spare no effort whatever to obtain the judgment of the House on these Bills. The House is, of course, supreme with regard to the course which it may take; but I am inclined to believe that the House likewise will enter into that view, and will spare no efforts to further the legislation to which I have alluded during the present Session of Parliament.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will give me facilities for the discussion of the Motion on the affairs of South Africa of which I have given Notice?

MR. GLADSTONE: I observe, Sir, that the right hon. Gentleman has put down his Notice for Tuesday next, but probably with a slight uncertainty as to whether he can then bring it on. Of course, in what I am going to say, he will understand that I do not in the least presume to interfere with his discretion as to the use he may make of the means at his command for raising a discussion. But our position in relation to the subject is this. We are already under a conditional pledge to find time for a discussion upon the Convention with the Transvaal Government. That condition has been virtually fulfilled, as I conceive, because the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) has announced that he is ready to move the discharge of the Order of the Day relating to the debate which has been adjourned, provided that an opportunity is found for discussing the Notice of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). I do not, of course, enter into any criticism upon that Notice, but the question before me is whether the Government can give any facilities for its discussion; but I hope he will understand and excuse me when I say that it is our business to consider the present state of our information and the present state of facts in South Africa, so that if we are to contribute time for a discussion a time may be chosen when the discussion shall be profitable, and when the House shall have definite issues before it. As far as regards the question of the Convention with the Transvaal, I expect that very shortly we shall be in a condition to give our views upon it; and, therefore, I do not anticipate any serious delay on that account before we shall be able to meet the wish of the right hon. Gentleman. But there is another subject of great practical importance, and of some complexity and difficulty, the progress of which does not depend upon us, and with respect to which I cannot expect that we shall be quite so soon ready for a discussion. I refer to the state of affairs in Basutoland. The right hon. Gentleman has, no doubt, heard of what has been going on at the Cape—of the great difficulties which the Cape Government has met with, and of its disposition, and the probable disposition of its Legislature, to make an alteration in the present legislative arrangements for the superintendence and regulation of the affairs of Basutoland. That is a question of great importance, and one upon which, undoubtedly, the House would wish to have some definite information before beginning the contemplated discussion. I will ascertain, as nearly as I can, in the next few days, when we may expect to know definitely the course likely to be taken by the Cape Government; and we shall then lose no time whatever in considering what duties that course may impose upon us. As soon as we can give any definite account to the House of these matters we shall be ready to make an arrangement with the right hon. Gentleman for the purpose of a discussion.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Considering the importance of this question, I think the right hon. Gentleman will agree with me that it ought to have adequate discussion.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Yes. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that no effort will be wanting on the part of Her Majesty's Government to secure adequate discussion.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: Will the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill follow the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill, or will it be taken after the second reading of the Corrupt Practices Bill?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I think it may wait till after the second reading of the Corrupt Practices Bill, in which the whole country is interested; but we will, undoubtedly, look for a very early opportunity for discussing it. I should not like to bind myself precisely, because it may be necessary to take the decision of the House—possibly in Committee—on some points which are common to both the English and the Scotch Bills before proceeding to the second reading of the Scotch Bill; but I hope it will follow the English Bill at a very short interval.

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY: The right hon. Gentleman has described as measures of primary importance those now before Grand Committees. Does he include Bills like the Criminal Code Procedure Bill and the Patents Bill, which have been referred to those Committees, but have not yet begun to be discussed by them?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I said all those measures which may come back from Grand Committees. I am under the impression that four Bills have been referred to the Grand Committees, and I must not anticipate their judgment on those Bills. My answer was intended to embrace those Bills which may come back from Grand Committees. I may state that on Friday next there stands on the Paper an important Motion on recruiting, with regard to which we do not think it right to allow anything to interfere. On Tuesday, also, there are several Questions down with which we should not wish to come into conflict; but, after that, it is our intention to ask the House to allow us to resume Morning Sittings.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that on

Tuesday week there is a very important Motion on the Paper with reference to the Purchase Clauses of the Land Act? It seems to me that this is quite as important as any Notice on the Paper for Tuesday or Friday next.

VISCOUNT EMLYN asked if it was intended to introduce and proceed this Session with the Bill relating to Intermediate Education in Wales. It had been promised for two successive Sessions in the Queen's Speech; but, from the statement of the Lord President of the Council, he understood that the details had not yet been decided upon?

MR. GLADSTONE: I did not make any specific reference to many important measures which are not among the primary Bills of the Session, and affecting the entire country. Unquestionably, a Bill relating to Intermediate Education in Wales is one which we think most important, and upon which we feel it our duty to ask the judgment of the House.

MR. ASHMEAD - BARTLETT inquired whether Morning Sittings were to be taken on Tuesdays only?

MR. GLADSTONE said, he proposed to ask for Morning Sittings both on Tuesdays and Fridays.

MR. MACARTNEY asked if the Grand Committees would sit on the same days on which Morning Sittings were taken?

MR. GLADSTONE said, that he had no authority to speak for the Grand Committees; but, so far as the Government could, if the House should be of opinion that their proposal was a wise one, they would communicate with the Members; and, if the House assented to Morning Sittings on Tuesdays and Fridays, he had no doubt that the Grand Committees would make arrangements to prevent the clashing of their Sittings with those of the House.

MOTION.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill have precedence this day of Notices of Motions and the other Orders of the Day."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL.—[BILL 186.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Solicitor General*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Dodson.*)

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he was certainly somewhat surprised that the ordinary course had been departed from, and that the Minister in charge of the Bill had not taken the opportunity, when moving the second reading, to thoroughly explain the principles of the measure. It was true, a statement of its provisions was made on the first introduction of the Bill; but it was also true that that statement was very brief, and was made at a time —about 1 o'clock, A.M.—when but few Members were present to hear it. That was not according to the old Constitutional practice of a Member of the Cabinet explaining clearly every part and every line of the Bill to a full House, and laying down clearly what were its main and vital points. They had especial right to complain on this occasion, because they knew what had been done in times gone by. In 1870, the Prime Minister introduced a Bill in a remarkable speech, in which he told the House that there were no germs of tenant right in it which could be afterwards construed as introducing fair rent, and free sale. Yet, in 1881, the right hon. Gentleman said that, although he thought at the time there was no tenant-right introduced into the Bill of 1870, he had since found that it had crept into it. They had, therefore, a right to ask from the Prime Minister an explicit declaration as to the vital principles of this Bill. They wanted to know what were the lines upon which the Bill was drawn, and whether it was intended to allow Amendments to be introduced in Committee contrary to what was now thought to be the principle of the Bill. This was a question they had a perfect right to ask, considering what had occurred during the last few years. He would at once admit that there had been great discussion with regard to this question of so-called unexhausted improvements since 1875, but more especially since 1879. As to the Act of 1875, that was introduced by those now sitting on the Front Opposition Bench. That Act had, undoubtedly, done a large amount of good—far more good than hon. Gentlemen opposite were inclined to admit—although some of them thought it a weak Act, because it did not contain compulsory powers, and left to tenant farmers that freedom of contract which hon. Members on his side of the House had always advocated. A large portion of that Act was, however, now embodied by the Government in their own Bill. There were several other Bills before the House, and the Government very wisely had considered them all, and taken such provisions from them as they thought were wise and prudent—notably from his hon. Friend the Member for Midhurst's Bill. His own name was also on the back of that Bill, which had dealt so well with the Law of Distress. But, besides these Bills, there was another Bill introduced by the Farmers' Alliance, but not before the House — a Bill which the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) talked a great deal about in the country; but that Bill was not palatable to that House or to the tenant farmers. It contained provisions for fixity of tenure, and for the establishment of Courts for the revision of rents, which he hoped would never become part of the law of this country. [Mr. GLADSTONE intimated assent.] He was glad to hear that the Prime Minister approved of that view. He believed there was to be a proposal that sitting tenants were to be taken into account. He would not enter into this question now further than to say that the sitting tenant at present had the matter in his own hand, for he was in possession and had all the benefit out of the land; but his best hope in time of adversity lay in that generosity on the part of his landlord which no Act of Parliament could enforce. A landlord dreaded nothing more, at the present time, than that his tenant should leave his holding, because a new tenant invariably required expenditure on the part of the landlord as a condition of his tenancy. There were large numbers of independent men who had weathered the storm of adversity, and believed that their best security lay in an honourable understanding with their landlords. But he was bound to say, also, that there were many tenant farmers who thought they ought to have more security than they possessed at the present moment; and that was a question which it was absolutely necessary to face. What they had to arrive at was this—that the tenant should, on leaving his farm, be repaid the sum he had laid out in improvements which would be for the benefit of the incoming tenant. That was the principle of this Bill. Upon this point there was a difference between the present Bill and the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875, for in the latter Act the question was one of money value; and, no doubt, the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) would have something to say on that point. The question was certainly worth discussing in Committee. There had been some curious writings on this point in the public Press recently, especially a letter in *The Times* newspaper of yesterday from the Hon. Auberon Herbert—a former Member of that House and an advanced Radical. That Gentleman, it appeared, was not in love with the present Bill. He thought the rights of property ought to be respected, and was not quite sure what would happen if this Bill passed. That letter he understood as expressing the views of the Radical Party. ["No!"] Mr. Herbert asked whether a lease did not offer fair inducements to a tenant farmer, and whether a lease for a term certain did not exclude the landlord and the tenant from the "unknown and unknowable" evils of this Bill. And he expressed a hope that the Bill would never grow into tenant right. That was what he was afraid of; and he further stated his belief that freedom of contract and common honesty should form the basis of all action. He would put it to the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) whether a Bill of this kind—to which he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) intended to give his support—would not, unless amended, keep only the large farms going; and he would also ask whether that was not the sole intention of the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard), who was naturally anxious that there should be a demand for large and expensive implements in country districts; whether the hon. Member did not wish to keep on the farms men who could pay for those implements, and whether he was not looking to that class of men rather than to the interest of the tenant farmers? With regard to the Law of Distress, he thought the question as to whether the period should be two years rather than one year was a question fairly open to discussion. He himself was in favour of two years, because the general practice in England was not to pay the first half-year's rent till three months or more after it was due; in fact, not, in many cases, until near the end of the first year. If the period were confined to one year only, landlords would have to be more stringent in demanding their rents than at present. There were many agricultural labourers whom they were anxious to place in small farms, who had brought up their families well, and who had a small amount of money, but who, when they went into the farms, though the landlords placed them in without any valuation, wanted a little money to buy that stock and those implements which were absolutely necessary for working the farms. If, then, there were a Law of Distress that would not be put in force, still there would be a security, and they could get the money from the landlord at a far cheaper rate than if they went to the bank to borrow it. Those men lived economically, and they would be able to pay the rent which, as it were, they borrowed from their landlord. Therefore, the Law of Distress should be looked at from both sides of the question, and not from the tradesman's point of view only. If the hon. Member for Ipswich would put aside his prejudices and crotchets in regard to land, he might do a good service to those honest and excellent men whom everyone would be glad to see in the occupation of a farm. The main principle of the Bill was comprised in the 1st clause, which provided that where a tenant had made in the holding any of the improvements included in the Schedules he should be entitled, on quitting the holding, to such compensation as was represented by the value of the improvement to the incoming tenant. So long as that principle was fairly maintained, and the Schedules worked in with that principle, there would be little to be said about the Bill. But, on looking a little further into it, they saw how much there might be of disputable matter when they came to deal with the different Schedules. Take the question of drainage. It was said there was to be 5 per cent on the outlay. He supposed that meant 5 per cent per annum, though that was not stated in the Bill. If they were to have compulsory drainage, as there might be by the Bill, that 5 per cent was not sufficient to pay the expenses. Some time ago he had charged 6 per cent on the drainage; his neighbour charged 5 per cent; and it was complained that he was charging 1 per cent more than his neighbour. He went into the question, and he found that his 6 per cent was less per acre for drainage than his neighbour's 5 per cent. And why? Because he only charged for the absolute cost to himself—for the money he actually laid out—whereas supervision and all other matters were brought into the other charge; so that, in reality, it was 6½ per cent, or considerably over his 6 per cent. Again, the life of a drain was about 20 years, after which time it required renewing; and when they put a compulsory clause into a Bill there ought to be some proper inspection as to drainage, so that the landlord might know, and the incoming tenant might feel assured, that it was properly done and efficient for all practical purposes. The last Schedule was a very important one. No doubt, the great majority of tenants would be honest, and would state exactly what they had placed on the land, and would buy the best articles they could; but there were a large number of tenants who dealt with men in their immediate neighbourhood, and it was known that the stuff sold to them was absolutely valueless, and that much of the feeding stuff sold to them was of little value. Those things might be charged for at such a price as could not possibly pay the incoming tenant. There should be some guarantee and regulation to secure that the person paying for them might know that the feeding stuff was good, and that the manures which had been used were of the best quality. There ought to be proper supervision, and proper samples should be given, that they might know that what they were paying for was really of value to the incoming tenant. In the counties of Surrey and Sussex, and he dared say in other counties, there were such things as dressings, half-dressings, and things which had been manufactured and made up to a large amount. Many landlords had purchased up those rights, so that the incoming tenant should go on without any of those dressings and half-dressings; and they ought to be secured by the Bill from having to pay over again for things many of which were manufactured from stuff that was not fit to be put into the land. They ought also to have some guarantee that they would have good and satisfactory valuers, men in whom both landlords and tenants had confidence. Many valuers were independent and honest enough; but it was necessary to have security that the incoming tenant should not have to pay for that which was really of no value. In giving, then, his assent to the second reading of the Bill, he wished it to be understood that he was not going to travel one inch beyond the principle to which he had referred; and if the measure was to be a final one—["Oh!"] That expression was exactly what he wanted to elicit. He saw in his place the Chairman of the Farmers' Alliance (Mr. Borlase), who made a speech the other day, following the example of the President of the Board of Trade. He did not use exactly the same words as the right hon. Gentleman about those who "toiled not, neither did they spin;" but he referred to the landlords as "the class whom an arbitrary appropriation had called into being, who reaped where they had not sown, and gathered where they had not strawed." If the hon. Gentleman knew anything of the landlords and of the agriculture of this country, he would know that what he had said was absolutely and entirely without foundation. He admired a man who had the courage of his opinions; but he did not admire the man who, for the sake of gaining a little applause from those around him, stated that which he must know, if he took a little trouble to inquire, was not true. What was it that, taking one acre with another, the landlords had put into the soil as compared with the capital of the tenant? Estimating the tenant's capital at £10, £12, or £15 per acre, the landlord's capital, then, consisting of farm-house, farm buildings, cottages, roads, fences, drains, and other matters, could not be less than £15 an acre, besides the value of the land. Nothing done in this country had improved the position of the working classes more than the improved dwellings erected for labourers on the large majority—he believed 90 per cent—of estates; certainly, large estates. [Mr. JESSE COLLINGS dissented.] The hon. Member for Ipswich shook his head. Let him look at his own town, and the suburbs of other towns, where the working men had to lodge as best they could in a miserable room without anything like a garden. Then, compare it with the comparative luxury of the man in the agricultural districts, who, in many instances, had his three good bedrooms, a good sitting-room, a good kitchen behind the house, a good larder and out-offices, and a good garden. He, for one, was willing, provided the Government did not proceed to alter the Bill, to accept it as a fair and an honest attempt to deal with the question. Goodness knew that in the agricultural districts they wanted encouragement; and he hoped something in the direction of this legislation might be of real service. But they might pass this Bill in the hope that it might help to insure a return of prosperity. But there was one far more important factor in the case, and that was fine weather, with which he hoped they might be blessed. He was confident that that would do more for them than anything that could be done in that House. He would conclude by saying that glad as he should be to see a good measure like this passed, he could not leave the subject without reminding the right hon. Gentleman that there was another matter which he had totally ignored; and that was the question of local taxation, pressing heavily, as it did, hour by hour and day by day, upon the agricultural population of this country. Now, having brought in this Bill, let him deal with that question. He knew the right hon. Gentleman did not like to spend more money; but, depend upon it, he would have to do it, and let him take heart and deal with that question. It was one of those questions to obtain legislation on which they would have to thunder at the door of the House; but he confidently believed that, if they thundered loud enough and long enough, they would yet get an acceptable measure.

MR. BORLASE:* Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, it would be painful to this House to keep it any longer in the state of fervid excitement in which the hon. and gallant Baronet opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) has, as is his wont, left it, I do not wonder he did not approve of my travelling back, when speaking at Hackney the other day, into the precedents of history, because he knows very well that those precedents tell against that class which he so ably represents in this House. I do not think it necessary, at present, to deal with the attack which he has made upon myself; but I will venture, Sir, to give you the reasons why I, for my own part, mean to vote for the second reading of this Bill. I do so, because I consider that it sanctions a principle, and carries with it admissions which are far too valuable to be lost, which may give scope for new departures in the direction of the reforms we seek, and which have been long and earnestly, though up to this point vainly, contended for by those Liberals who represent the agricultural interest in this House. By the principle it sanctions, I mean the just and, therefore, the ultimately indefeasible and inalienable right —however much that right may, unfortunately, have been restricted in this Bill—of the tenant to receive, in virtue of his holding, full and adequate compensation for the improvements which have been effected by him. By the admissions the Bill carries with it, I mean, first of all, that which was contained in the Bill of the hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Thomas Acland) —that is to say, that the measure of compensation is to be the value of the improvement to an incoming tenant; secondly, that no lapse of time shall suffice to exhaust the right to compensation in respect to that improvement while it is still in existence. But, having said thus much, I must not hesitate one moment longer to express, not only for myself, but on behalf of many whose views are made known to me, the great disappointment which this Bill has been to us—a Bill introduced by a Government from which so much was expected, and in whose name so much was promised by us in the Election of 1880, when we were led to suppose that an efficient and drastic measure of agricultural reform would have been put before us such as we cannot regard this Bill to be. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister, speaking at Leeds the year following that Election, said—

> "It is of capital and immediate importance for the farmers to see that effectual and not abortive measures are taken to secure the whole interest of the tenant—not a part of that interest, but the whole interest in his improvements; and his interest, as the law may define it—in his tenure."

Sir, I fail to see how I can find anything in common between the spirit that breathed life into that sentence, and hope into the hearts of those to whom these reforms are dear, and the words contained in the clauses which follow on and distort the first and Declaratory Clause of this Bill. Now, what are the characteristics of this Bill, and what does it do? That it is an honest attempt, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, to deal with this question upon certain existing lines, I do not for a moment deny; but honesty and poverty sometimes go together. I hold that it is an essentially poor measure, a half-hearted measure, little calculated to carry out its own principle of "payment by results," much less to produce enthusiasm, or to leave a brilliant impression on a future age. It begins with a general right of the tenant to compensation; it goes on to provide reservations, restrictions, limitations, call them what we will, of every conceivable kind, to prevent that principle from coming into practice. It is not original. It bears too much the stamp of its parent, the old Agricultural Holdings Act. It is inadequate; it is complicated; it is not plain and straightforward; it is not in any sense the ultimate solution—as the hon. and gallant Baronet would so much wish it to be—of this, the great and burning home question of the day. It is nothing more than the bare admission of a vital principle, for which we should record our vote, with such a measure of thanks to its authors as is their due, simply and solely because it will serve as a precedent, as a basis, as a vantage ground, and a leverage for further and more thorough reform. Now, I wish to ask the House to consider what are the sources from which this Bill is derived, and what is the past history of this just claim for compensation. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman himself who has introduced it (Mr. Dodson) will not claim for it the distinction of originality. I am sure he will admit that, in reducing it to its present shape, he has culled what he has thought to be the best from every Bill which has been before this

House. From the programme of the tenants he has borrowed the principle. From the programme of the landlords he has borrowed the means of evading it. It is eminently eclectic. It is a skilful compilation. It is a diplomatic compromise, which comes in most seasonably just now. It will prove successful; if the passage through this House of a measure so drafted as to meet the views of both sides can be regarded as a success. What, then, are the main influences, we recognize in it? Naturally enough the influence of one whose name should never be forgotten in connection with this question—of one who was the pioneer of agricultural reform in this House—I mean Mr. Pusey. All I can say is, that I wish that no other influences had been brought to bear, but that this were Mr. Pusey's Bill. Secondly, that of one whom I hope I may be allowed to call his lieutenant, who, together with Mr. Denison, had his name at the back of the original Bill—I mean the veteran land reformer, the hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Thomas Acland). I must say that for thoroughness and logical result I would have preferred his Drainage Clause to that which is in this Bill. The influence on this measure of the Bill of the hon. Baronet the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland) has been duly acknowledged; and we come, in the fourth and last place, to an influence which I would were absent. In that clause, which requires the consent of the landlord to some dozen necessary improvements—in that clause which we may call "the dog-in-the-manger" clause—where the landlord may say that he will neither effect the improvement himself, nor suffer it to be done by others, surely we cannot but recognize the influence of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin). Now, what is the past history of the desire for this reform? It is no mere cry raised up during bad seasons. It is not the offspring of the last unfruitful years. Its roots are deep down stretching in the English soil. Not to go back to the market-places of the Middle Ages, and the revolt against the feudal power, what is the past history of this desire for reform? I had in my hand, the other day, a little book written during the period of that noble uprising in favour of justice and truth which we know as the Commonwealth. It was dedicated to the Protector. Its author was one Walter Bligh, and it was entitled *The English Improver Improved, or the Survey of Husbandry Surveyed.* The first great hindrance to husbandry, Bligh says is—

> "That if a tenant be at never so great pains or cost for the improvement of his land, he doth thereby but occasion a greater rack upon himself, or else invest his landlord into his cost and labour gratis, or, at best, lies at his landlord's mercy for requital, which occasions a great neglect of all good husbandry, to his own, the land, the landlord, and the Commonwealth's suffering. Now this, I humbly conceive, may be removed, if there were a law enacted by which every landlord should be obliged, either to give him reasonable allowance for his clear improvements, or else suffer him or his to enjoy it so much longer, until he hath had a proportionable requital."

And then, after drawing a comparison with the rapid progress of agriculture in Flanders, he goes on—

> "Some tenants have advanced £20 to £40 per acre, and, depending upon the landlord's favour, have been wiped of all; and many farmers, by this uncertainty, have been impoverished and left under great disgrace, who might as well have been advanced."

The days in which those words were written were days too soon to pass away, when the bonds of class privilege had for the while been cast aside, and when the tongue of the suffering classes had been loosed and could freely speak out the truth. Yet it was not until more than 200 years had passed away, that this question, which had been seemingly sleeping so long, was recognized as one of primary importance. The farmer once more was gaining his power of speech and action. The Reform Bill and the Ballot Act had restored to him what two centuries of landlord government and class domination had taken away—freedom of speech and action. Coincidently with these reforms district customs appeared, due mainly to economic causes, involving tenants' claims and landlords' concessions. Amongst others, the Lincolnshire Custom arose in the early decades of this century. In 1841, Lord Portman, a Liberal Peer, introduced a Bill giving—

> "Power to the tenant to charge his landlord with the unexhausted value of any permanent improvements which he had executed, after having given notice of his intention to execute them with the consent of the landlord."

Arbitrators were to fix the amount. Six years later, Mr. Pusey brought in his

Bill for compulsory tenant right. Of that Bill my hon. Friend the Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) said—

> "I believe that no more honest measure ever was proposed to the British House of Commons. It held the balance fairly between landlord and tenant; it gave the landlord an indefeasible right to his improvements, whilst it secured the interests of the owner."

Mr. Pusey presented Petitions from farmers representing 200,000 acres; but the landlord influence was too strong, and he dropped his Bill almost with an apology. A Committee was, however, appointed, and the evidence before it was clearly in favour of compulsory legislation to secure the tenant's capital. The question grew. Farmers found they could see their way; they could feel their feet; they could hold their own. Their opinion was respected. They formed Clubs, Chambers of Agriculture, Associations, Alliances; and now, when rent-day came, they dined in the dining-room, and no longer in the servants' hall. In 1850, there was a Liberal Government, and Mr. Pusey's Bill passed this House by a Liberal majority. It went to "another place," where Tory briars spring up and choke the Liberal seed. The Landlord and Tenant Bill was, in 1873, introduced by the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. James Howard) and Mr. C. S. Read. I wish that Mr. Read were only here now. ["Hear, hear!"] If hon. Gentlemen opposite think so, why did not they support Mr. Read's Bill? Under that Bill compensation was compulsory, as it is under this; yet they opposed it. The cry of danger to freedom of contract was raised. Sir, once for all, what freedom of contract can there be, where, unless economic causes are present to prevent it, all the power to dictate terms is on the one side, and all the obligation to accept them is on the other; or, what freedom of contract should there be, where a bargain made between man and man is detrimental to the common weal;—where, as in this case for instance, it can set restrictions on the full and free produce of the home soil? I need not do more than remind the House of what followed. Hitherto, with one exception—Mr. Pusey's Bill—everything that had been done for the farmer had been done by Liberal statesmen. The Tories saw they must do something; so they passed that great measure of concession, the Agricultural Holdings Act, which was not only full of vexations and restrictions, and unfair assumptions, but was absolutely, from its permissive character, abortive. Well, how did hon. Gentlemen opposite act with regard to even so mild a measure as that was? Having opposed the principle of compulsory compensation then, I am anxious to see how they can support this stronger measure now. What did the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire say then—

> "The public feeling in favour of the Bill had been very much over-stated. There were, beyond doubt, many districts, and some counties, in England where nothing of the kind was required."—(3 *Hansard*, [225] 470.)

The hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) stated boldly that "compulsion would not do." The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) stated that "the merit of the Bill was that it was permissive." But the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex, as usual, surpassed them all in thoroughness and fervour. He sneered at Farmers' Associations, and denied the evidence of their grievances. He said—

> "They knew that through the length and breadth of the land Agricultural Chambers had risen up and demanded that there should be some legislation. But he was not absolutely clear, and no one had pointed out, that Agricultural Chambers represented the views and wishes of the tenant farmers of this country. What he wanted was, that the Bill . . . . should respect—as the measure of a Conservative Government ought to respect—the rights of private property."—(*Ibid.*, 508-11.)

In that wish, the hon. and gallant Baronet was not disappointed. The Bill did guard what he meant by private property—that was to say, the landlord's interest. In fact, it was a landlords' measure, passed by a Government of landlords, and in such a form, that while they could not be one penny the worse the tenant could scarcely be one penny the better. Such were the "farmers' friends." Since the passing of that Act, years of unexampled distress having set in, the demands of the agriculturists have again and again forced themselves on the attention of this House. What consolation have the Tories had to offer? The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire told the farmers, in 1879, that for the want of security "they had no one to thank but themselves." Their manner of living was made a subject of ridicule;—that their daughters played the piano, and that they drove their phætons. I do not say that they did not merit the charge of extravagance; but was the fault all on the one side? What were the landlords doing at the same time? Were they not building for themselves palaces all over the country? The whole business was, in fact, inflated. What wonder was it that the bubble burst? The Royal Commission on Agriculture has left out the raising of rent during the last 30 years as one of the main causes of depression. I have in my mind an instance of two estates, lying side by side in an Eastern county. They are only divided by a little stream. The one has passed from father to son, and has been held for generations; on that the rents have not been raised during the last 30 years. The other was purchased—I will not say as a speculation—some 25 years ago. During the good times the landlord raised his rent, and no objection was raised by the farmers. On the former of these estates, there is not, at the present moment, a single farm unoccupied. On the latter, there is scarcely one which is not on the landlord's hands. It is not that the landlord would not reduce his rent, even below that asked by his more fortunate neighbour; but what has happened is, that the land has been racked out in the meantime, so that no one can be found to take upon himself the responsibility of bringing it back to what it was once. We have seen what consolation the Tories had to offer. What remedies had they to suggest? The Bill of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire—a measure which was as dry a crumb of comfort for the farmer as are the dry bones in its Schedule, since it left him just in the position he was before, by making the landlord's consent precedent to any improvement at all. What has proceeded from the Liberal side of the House? I have mentioned several Bills. I will add to them that of the Farmers' Alliance, a Bill which has been much misrepresented. Hon. Members opposite would know, if they had studied that Bill, that it contained far stronger clauses to protect the landlord against deterioration than either the Government Bill or any other Bill introduced into this House. I recognize but little of the influence of that Bill in the present measure, except the principle of compulsory compensation. For that principle, let it be ever remembered, the farmers had to thank the Liberal Party. For that principle the Alliance has been contending from the very outset. Of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and its influence on this Bill I have not time to speak. Suffice it to say that, in common with this measure, the Report was disappointing, since the landlords' gloss had to be read between every line. Such, then, are the sources from whence this Bill has been derived, and, in brief, a sketch of the movement which has brought it into being. In the Declaratory Clause, which stands in the position of a Preamble, it represents, in principle, the consensus of opinion as expressed in this House by individual Members, who have introduced Bills on this subject, both before and since the Agricultural Holdings Act. In so far it is valuable. In practice, it will be found not to go as far as some of them; and that it will fall far short of what the vast majority of tenant farmers have expected at the hands of this Government I have no doubt. Now, what are the principal objections to this Bill? They are three:—First, that for the tenant who is continuing in his holding there is no protection given against his rent being raised on his own improvements. In fact, the Bill, as it stands, holds out a premium to the least deserving class of farmers—that is to say, the quitting tenants. As Sir James Caird well pointed out, these restless spirits are fortunately at present "the very small minority of British farmers." The other class—the vast majority—are the backbone of British agriculture. To deny to them the benefit of this Bill is discouraging to them, detrimental to the public weal, as gauged by this produce of the soil, and repugnant to our sense of right and justice. It is said—"How can you do this act of justice for them, without introducing the machinery of the Irish Act?" I think you can, and I shall move an Amendment in Committee with reference to this. But not only do I think you can, but I think, for reasons of the highest State policy, you ought. I have always been opposed to a Land Court in England; but we must remember that the Channel which separates us from Ireland is a narrow one, and that, although we fully recognize that the conditions under which the Irish Act was passed were different to our own here, yet, Sir, the penny paper has supplanted the history of conditions in the mind of the community at large; and the day may come when, if we do not take this opportunity of placing the sitting tenant in his proper position in this Bill, he will, if times continue bad, look across the Channel, and ask, with no little show of reason, why the security extended to his Irish brother has not been extended to him. To quote Sir James Caird once more, if the Bill is to be of any real advantage—

> "The change" it effects "must embrace not only the few thousands who are going out of business, but the hundreds of thousands who desire to continue in it.

The second objection is, that the consent of the landlord is required in the case of improvement other than drainage. I fail to see why irrigation is not as essential to dry land as drainage is to wet, or why pigstyes are not as essential to the rearing of pigs as drainage is to the raising of crops, or why the landlord has to be asked leave to make hop gardens, when the tenant in Kent, for instance, may, as I am told, do so already without it. The third objection is, that contracts are allowed to replace the compensation given by the landlord. This is the permissive principle which destroyed the Agricultural Holdings Act. There is a fourth objection, the retention in any form of the Law of Distress. This subject I naturally leave to my hon. Friend behind me, who has made it especially his own (Mr. Blennerhassett). Now, Sir, whether he be a member of Chambers of Agriculture, of Farmers' Clubs, or of the Farmers' Alliance, there is one thing which every farmer wants, and that is security. He wants to be treated like any other manufacturer. He does not want to have to invest his money on a good understanding. A good understanding may have done something for England; but how much more would have been done had the land been free? The farmer wants to be treated as a business man, engaged, as he is, in the first and most sacred industry of all. It is for the land we have to legislate—not for landlord, tenant, or labourer—in order that every artificial restriction may be removed which tends to prevent the community from gaining the full home produce of the soil, and to secure to each member in our tripartite system full remuneration for the labour and capital he expends upon it. There are two ways of dealing with a measure like the one before us. One is to adopt the plan, so well known to the Representatives from Ireland, of opposing all legislation, even when it would ameliorate their country, in the hope to gain the ultimate end desired. The other is, to act as the old Free Traders did in 1841, when they accepted the 8*s.* duty, and admit that reform must proceed step by step, not bound by bound. I cannot think we should be justified in throwing out a measure in which there is so much which may be beneficially altered in Committee, and which opens to us so wide a range for future reform. I shall, therefore, vote for the Bill.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, that, after the remarks that had fallen from the last speaker (Mr. Borlase), he wished to make a personal explanation. He just desired to call attention to the remarks that he did make in 1875. He had *Hansard's Debates* before him; and it seemed to him that Mr. Borlase had credited him with some of the remarks that he (Mr. Borlase) had himself now made, and he did not desire to rest under that imputation. All he had said was that—

> "They knew that through the length and breadth of the land Agricultural Chambers had risen up, and demanded that there should be some legislation. But he was not absolutely clear, and no one had pointed out that Agricultural Chambers represented the views and wishes of the tenant farmers of this country. He would like to know where the gross injustice had been where the evictions had occurred which led to the introduction of this Bill?"—(3 *Hansard*, [225] 508.)

That was all he had said, and yet the hon. Member had quoted considerably more than that as being his speech. In quoting speeches an hon. Gentleman should be very careful to be perfectly accurate, which the hon. Gentleman had certainly not been in the present instance.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the hon. and gallant Baronet who opened the debate commenced by making some severe observations upon his right hon. Friend for not having entered into any further explanation of the Bill. But as the hon. and gallant Baronet went on to say that the Bill was a fair and honest one, and that he would give it his support, he showed that he had read the

Bill to some advantage, and was not in need himself of any further explanation. The hon. and gallant Baronet then referred to the Act of 1875, which, he stated, had produced a great amount of good, notwithstanding that it did not contain the principle of compulsion which the Liberal Party desired to include in it. He could not agree with the hon. and gallant Baronet that the Act of 1875 had done a great amount of good. He had before him the Reports of the Sub-Commissioners of Agriculture; and he was surprised to find to what extent the farmers were still without protection, either by customs or by agreements with their landlords. He was under the impression, before he read their Reports, that a very large number of tenants in England and Wales were under protection either by customs or agreements with their landlords; but the general conclusion to which he had now come was that this was the case to a very much less extent than most people supposed. According to the Commissioners, there were only three districts where the customs of the country were satisfactory and sufficient—these were the counties of Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, and Glamorganshire. The Reports showed, it was true, that on the better managed of the larger properties there were agreements between landlord and tenant of a satisfactory character; and on some other properties landlords conceded compensation to the tenants notwithstanding the absence of special agreements. But no one who read the Reports could come to any other conclusion than this—that the great majority of tenant farmers would not obtain compensation for their improvements. That was the state of things which had led the Government to conclude that a compulsory measure, such as that now before the House, was necessary and expedient. With the exception of Mr. Auberon Herbert, who might be entitled the political hermit of the New Forest, no public man had pronounced in favour of freedom of contract as against compulsion. It was not the fault of the Liberal Party that compulsory powers were not given by the Act of 1875. Amendments in favour of compulsion were proposed by Members of that Party; but they were defeated. The late Mr. Ward Hunt, who had charge of the Bill, said that he could not suppose that landlords would rush to their lawyers immediately after the passing of the Act for the purpose of issuing notices excepting their property from the operation of it; but, notwithstanding that prediction, no sooner had the Act passed than landlords, as a body, did rush to their lawyers, and did issue such notices, the result being that the Act was of no avail, except in those cases where, through ignorance or negligence, landlords had failed to issue notices. ["Oh!"] Well, it certainly was the fact that the landlords had, to a very large extent, contracted themselves out of the Act. It now fell to the lot of the present Government to deal with the question; and he ventured to say that it was their intention to deal with it in such a way that it should be a reality and not a sham. The Act of 1875 specified three different classes of improvements for which compensation was to be given according to a scale based upon the theory that the improvements would be exhausted respectively in 20, seven, or two years. That scale of compensation was unsatisfactory and insufficient, for the great bulk of the improvements contained in the three lists were calculated to last more than the specified number of years. If, after 20 years, an improvement still existed, why, in the name of justice, should not the tenant be compensated for it? The durability of the improvements in the second class in question differed in different parts of the country, and no general rule could be laid down as applying to them all. It was, therefore, considered necessary to adopt a rule of a flexible character; and the only kind of rule which could be laid down was that which they had adopted in the Bill—namely, that of the value of the improvement to the incoming tenant. The next question to decide was, whether the rule should be applicable to every tenancy, and should exclude every kind of agreement or custom. In some parts of the country, as he had already pointed out, customs existed and agreements were made which gave satisfaction to landlords and tenants alike. That being so, it would not be wise to compel all landlords and tenants to come under the general rule in the Bill; and the Government, therefore, had reserved the right to make agreements, provided always that they were fair and reasonable. He could not agree with the view taken by the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Borlase) that the power of substituting an agreement for the rule laid down in the Bill rendered the measure inoperative. Substituted agreements, it should be borne in mind, must be fair and reasonable; and, of course, bogus agreements simply for the purpose of depriving the tenant of his compensation would not be held by a Court of Law to be fair and reasonable. The principle of compulsion was, therefore, contained in the Bill, for a landlord would have to give compensation either through the operation of the measure or by special agreement. One important point which the Government had had to consider was the question of the kind of improvements to which the Bill should apply. The Schedule of improvements contained in the Act of 1875 had been adopted by the framers of the present measure, and thus nearly all the various kinds of improvements would be affected by the Bill. If, however, there was any other class that might be included in the list, it would be open to the House to consider them in Committee. They thought that where any improvement was made or contemplated which really altered the character of the holding, it was only reasonable that the consent of the landlord should be obtained to such improvement before he was called upon to pay compensation. They had made an exception to this in the case of drainage, because they thought the drainage was so important that it could not be said to alter the character of the land or the tenancy, and for that reason they had put it into a Schedule itself. If the landlord was not himself prepared to drain the land when necessary, the tenant should be permitted to drain it without consent of the landlord. He did not think the tenants would drain their farms on a large scale; but he thought they might put the Act in operation to drain parts of their farms. He had no doubt that this provision would operate as a great stimulus to landlords to drain their property; and, in this way, it would have a most beneficial effect on the tenants. In respect to the second class of improvements, they thought that the notice to the landlord should be dispensed with, as they considered it an unnecessary condition. Some people doubted whether the Bill would give any protection to the sitting tenant. It was said that no compensation would be given to the sitting tennant, and that the landlord might so raise his rent as to exhaust the value of his improvements. He could not subscribe to that view. In his opinion, the Bill gave a very important encouragement to the tenant by materially altering his position when his landlord proposed to raise the rent. During the last few years there had been more cases of reductions of rent than raising of rent, and he believed this state of things would continue. There could not be a doubt, however, that the man who was under the protection of this Bill would be in an infinitely better position to resist any demand for an increase of rent on the part of the landlord than the man who had no protection whatever. The positions of landlord and tenant under this Bill would not be unequal, for if there were some tenants who would rather pay a higher rent than break up their homes and go, there were landlords, on the other hand, who would prefer receiving a lower rent from a tenant to running the risk and expense involved in a change. It was said that greater protection might be given to the sitting tenant by compelling the landlord, when raising the rent, to pay the tenant compensation for his improvements. That would be an impossible transaction. The landlord would raise the rent in proportion to the amount of compensation paid in order to recoup himself; and the position of the tenant would, therefore, be unsatisfactory. The only protection which could be given to a sitting tenant, besides that given by the Bill before the House, would be by a system of judicial rents. That really was the system preferred by the Farmers' Alliance. If the Bill were amended in accordance with the views of that body and of the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) and the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Borlase), it would cease to be a measure for the compensation of tenants, and would become a Land Tenure Bill in the true sense of the expression. It would introduce into England something closely approximating to the Irish system. The Farmers' Alliance wished to refer proposed augmentations of rent and questions of reduction to the Union Assessment Committee, which was always largely composed of farmers.

Mr. BORLASE said, that was not now on the programme of the Farmers' Alliance, and never was.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was simply interpreting what had been stated by the hon. Member for Bedfordshire. Whether he looked to the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Bedfordshire, or to those of the Farmers' Alliance, they practically had one end—namely, a judicial rent. That was what they must ultimately and logically come to, and nothing else. The next proposition was that the tenant should have power to make improvements either with or without the consent of the landlord; thirdly, it was proposed, there should be the right of assignment; and, fourthly, that there should be an indefeasible right to compensation for general improvements, no matter what might have been the condition of the farm when the tenant came in. It appeared to him that these propositions, hanging together and forming part of an harmonious whole, were really part of the Irish system, and flowed logically from the doctrine of judicial rent. It had always been argued, in the debates on the Irish Act, that one F involved the three F's. Judicial rent led logically to a term of years, and then followed naturally the right of assignment. The proposals of the hon. Members for Bedfordshire and East Cornwall (Mr. J. Howard and Mr. Borlase) constituted an approximation to the Irish system. The House would recollect that in the debates on the Irish Land Bill he was himself a warm supporter of that Bill, and he supported it on the ground of the exceptional condition of the Irish tenants as regarded their historic and economic connection with the soil; but, in doing so, he always took care to point out the great distinctions that lay between the case of the Irish tenants and that of the English tenants, and he frequently said it was both impossible and unjust to apply the system then proposed to England. Therefore, for his part, and on the part of the Government, there was no intention of applying the doctrine of judicial rent to England. None of the conditions existing in Ireland existed in England. The tenants in England had no hereditary connection with with the holdings as in Ireland, and they had not effected the permanent improvements that had been effected by the Irish tenants. It was purely a question of contract with the English tenant. That being the case, they were not entitled to consideration such as that which led to the Irish Act. In speaking as he had done, he did not wish it to be understood that he was afraid of land reform in England. He had often spoken on the subject of land reform; and he thought there were dangers in the existing system of England, owing to the paucity of landowners, dangers of a political, social, and economic character, that ought to be guarded against. In his opinion, Parliament and the Legislature would act wisely in doing all in their power to multiply ownerships. In this country people did not sufficiently appreciate the importance of a combination of ownership and occupation. He believed, however, that the highest forms of cultivation could not be carried out unless combined with ownership; but reform, whenever it did come in that direction, would not come in the direction of settling the tenant farmers as owners of the land, or constituting a joint ownership with the landlord. He did not think a proposition of this kind would find much sympathy with a large class in this country. The hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) was himself but a recent convert to the doctrine he now supported, for his Bill of 1873 contained no proposition of that kind. That Bill was a moderate and prudent one. Again, the hon. Member's Bill of last year fell very far short of that foreshadowed by the Farmers' Alliance. [Mr. James Howard: No.] The Bill contained no proposal for judicial rent, or for the protection of the sitting tenant. Since last year the hon. Member had become a convert to the doctrines now propounded. Lastly, he would say, with regard to judicial rent, that if his hon. Friend or the Farmers' Alliance had any prospect within a reasonable time of carrying that principle, or even of converting the Liberal Party to their views, he did not think that English landlords would be found prepared to give up their rights, or to sink into the position of mere rent-chargers, without a struggle. He believed that if such a measure were proposed by the Liberal Party the landlords would proceed to take the land into their own hands, which would certainly not be beneficial to the tenant farmers. With regard to the Law of Distress, the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Borlase) had but very slightly alluded to it. The Government had, in dealing with the subject, followed the recommendations of the very large majority of the Committee of last year. He was satisfied himself that a very large majority of the tenant farmers were in favour of a moderate Law of Distress, and were opposed to the total abolition of that law. That law was considered by many of them a protection to the small farmer — a protection against his creditors. The present moment was very inopportune for entering on a total abolition of that law, there having been so many years' depression, which had resulted in the tenants being heavily indebted to the landlords. The abolition of the law would, therefore, in his opinion, not be in the interest of the tenant; and he accordingly thought the House would consider the Government were right in their conclusions. Finally, he would say that the Government did not propose this measure as a remedy for agricultural depression; a few good seasons would do more for the tenant farmers than any amount of legislation. All that could be done was to put the farmers in a position of justice, so as to enable them to effect whatever improvements were possible, and take full advantage of the better seasons which he fervently hoped would come, and reap the reward of their industry, which had been so long postponed.

MR. CHAPLIN said, he had risen with the right hon. Gentleman who had spoken last, because, after the pointed attack which had been made upon him by the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Borlase), he was anxious to take up the challenge immediately. The hon. Member had favoured them with a prolix history of agricultural reform; but as they were all practically agreed on the necessity of some legislation of that kind, it was hardly necessary for the hon. Member to have inflicted on them his antediluvian researches. Moreover, if the hon. Member was not more accurate in the earlier part of his history than he was in its later portion, the House need scarcely pay much attention to it. The hon. Gentleman had cited a Bill which he (Mr. Chaplin) had introduced on that subject, and had told them it was as dry as dust in the mouth of the farmers. Well, he recollected that when that Bill was submitted to the Chambers of Agriculture it was received with almost unanimous approval. The hon. Member had also said that he was inconsistent in blaming the farmers themselves for all their troubles, which he had stated to be owing to their manner of living. There never was, in his judgment, a wilder charge made by one hon. Member against another, for there was not the slightest foundation for it. The hon. Member supported his statement by referring to a Motion which he (Mr. Chaplin) had made for the appointment of a Royal Commission on the State of Agriculture; and he actually cited his speech on that occasion in order to justify this unfounded allegation. Well, he had referred to that speech himself; and, so far from there being any justification for the charge of gross inconsistency now brought against him, this was what he found there, and this was what he said—

> "Better security . . . . . is essential for good cultivation . . . . . If it could be shown by experience that that security could not be obtained without some compulsory measure of legislation I would consent to it without hesitation."—(*Hansard*, [247] 1431.)

Well, he had learnt by experience that permissive legislation was not so satisfactory as might be desired; and, therefore, he was consistent in supporting other measures.

MR. BORLASE said, the words to which he referred were—

> "I declare I really do not know one single well-managed estate where good security is wanting. I suppose there are some, or this complaint would not be made; but, where it is the case, really the tenants must allow me to tell them there is no one to blame but themselves."—(*Ibid.*)

MR. CHAPLIN said, that if the hon. Member had not been in such a hurry to interrupt him, he was about to read that sentence himself, as well as the one that succeeded it, which was as follows:—

> "With farms lying vacant all over England, if a tenant cannot make satisfactory terms for himself . . . . nobody can. I can only say, from my own experience, that no tenant farmer in the county of Lincoln, which I represent, would ever dream for a moment of taking a farm upon terms by which he was deprived of either the benefits of the Agricultural Holdings Act, or the custom of the county, which is almost the same thing; and I do not understand why farmers in any other part of the country should do so."—(*Ibid.*)

Those were his (Mr. Chaplin's) words

on that occasion; and it was upon that language, in the speech which he cited as evidence himself, that the hon. Member charged upon him that he imputed to the farmers of this country that it was to their extravagant mode of living—to the keeping of pianos, and he knew not what besides—and to the neglecting of their business, that the blame for their present distress was owing. He repeated, that a more unfounded charge was never made by one Member against another, and he repudiated it altogether. It is a specimen, he supposed, of the fairness and accuracy of the President of the Farmers' Alliance; and if he was to be taken as a fair Representative of that body, he certainly was not surprised at the statements which he sometimes heard were made about them. Having tested the accuracy and fairness of the present Chairman of the Farmers' Alliance, he now came to the course pursued by the hon. Member's Predecessor in that office. On the first night of that discussion the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) announced to the House that, although nobody else did so, he would oppose that Bill; and that statement he made at a time when it was quite impossible for him to have known what the Bill really contained. A short time afterwards that hon. Member placed an Amendment on the Paper, and a few days later he withdrew it, and he put another Amendment on the Paper afterwards. Having placed that Amendment on the Paper and given Notice that he would move the rejection of the Bill, what was the line of conduct which he had adopted that night? The Bill was called on; the hon. Member for Bedfordshire was not in his place; it was to be supposed that he had thought better of it. The hon. Member's first Amendment was to the effect that the Bill was inadequate; that it would fail in securing its object—namely, the higher cultivation of the soil—because it contained no provision to guard the sitting tenant against an increase of rent on his own improvements. His second Amendment was to the effect that the Bill must fail if the compensation was permissive, and if the compensation was contingent on the tenant quitting his holding. Now, he differed entirely with the hon. Member on both those propositions. Was the hon. Member acquainted with any district in this country where any security at all analogous to that contained in this Bill had failed to increase or improve the cultivation of the soil. If he was, the hon. Member's experience certainly was totally opposed to his. In his own county—Lincolnshire—where they had had five or six bad harvests in succession, before that time of depression the cultivation of the soil would not have compared unfavourably with that of any other district, or, indeed, of any other country in the world. The system of security there prevailing had undoubtedly resulted in a considerable improvement in the character of the cultivation of that district. The system was one under which the outgoing tenant was compensated for his improvements; but it made no more provision for the interest of the sitting tenant than was made in the present Bill. How, then, could it be contended that because it contained no express provision for the sitting tenant, and because the compensation was made contingent on the tenant quitting his holding, therefore the Bill must fail in effecting its object—namely, the higher cultivation of the soil? The hon. Member's contention would not hold water for a moment. The sitting tenant and the grievance which he laboured under, in the first place, was really a creation, and nothing else but a creation, of the fertile brain of the hon. Member; because, when once they passed a measure of that nature, there could be no such person as a sitting tenant who suffered from injustice because his rent was raised upon his own improvements. And, secondly, he maintained that if there was, there was no way and no possibility of guarding him against a rise of rent upon his improvements, or on anything else, unless Parliament was prepared to adopt the principles of fixity of tenure and valuation of rents by the State; and he would tell the hon. Member why. He said that the "sitting tenant" of the hon. Member was a myth, because they could not raise the rent upon any sitting tenant except in one of these two ways—either by his own consent or by serving on him a notice to quit his farm. If the rent was raised with his own free will, his own consent, no human being could complain. If, on the other hand, a notice had been given he ceased at once to be the sitting and became immediately the outgoing tenant of the farm; and as such, of course, he could claim the compensation which was given by this Bill. He granted that he forfeited the opportunity of continuing to hold the farm and of making any further profit from the land; but if they recouped him his outlay, as they would do by this Bill, what right had he to complain more than the tenant, or, indeed, even half as much as the tenant, to whom, by declining to let him a farm in the first instance, they refused the opportunity of making any profit at all? In the one case, thanks to the landlord, he had had that advantage for some years; in the other, not at all; and yet, in the last case, was there anyone who would pretend for a moment that he was suffering from the slightest injustice at all? There were some who thought that the words "on quitting his holding" might be omitted from the Bill, and that the grievance might be met by making compensation obligatory upon any change whatever in the rent of any tenancy, even though the tenant still remained in the occupation. But, supposing they did this, it would not really alter their position. The landlord, it was true, would have to pay him compensation; but it would still be open to the landlord to raise the rent in proportion as much as he pleased, and the position of the tenant would still remain the same. They told them that the rent should not be raised in consequence of improvements or outlay by the tenant; and he would be the last man in the world to urge or to justify the practice. But who was to decide on what it was that the increased rent was demanded? There was no way of separating the rent arising from improvements, from the rent arising otherwise from the farm, unless you first made a valuation of the whole. If that were done, then, of course, you could say—"So much of this belongs to the tenant, and so much to the landlord." But then you would be landed at once in the principle of dual ownership, and of valuation of rents by the State. He passed, then, from the question of the sitting tenants, because, except on the hypothesis that they were prepared in some form or another to adopt the principles of fixity of tenure and rents fixed by the State—and even the hon. Member for Bedfordshire was not prepared, he understood, for so extreme a step at present—the sitting tenant did not, and, indeed, he could not, enter into their calculations at all. He took the principle of the Bill to be as follows—namely, to give security to tenants for the capital which they embarked in their occupations, and which they would be deprived of without that security in the event in any case of their leaving their farms. That was an object which had always commended itself to his views, and one which, in common with many Gentlemen sitting upon both sides of the House, he had long sought to secure more thoroughly by additional legislation. Indeed, the Bill which was then before them did not differ very widely from some of the other propositions on this question which had been already submitted to the House; and he was especially glad to find that, on one point in particular—namely, that, while it secured to the tenant the certainty of compensation for his improvement, it allowed the largest possible freedom of contract consistent with that end, it was entirely in accord with the measure which he had laid himself upon the Table. There were two or three criticisms, however, which he thought, perhaps, he ought to make at once. It would have been better, in his opinion, if the Bill had allowed the power of distress for rent for two years, instead of limiting the landlord's right to one year. There was a good deal to be said for the abolition of the Law of Distress in the interest of the general creditor; but he protested against its being advanced as a measure in the interest of the tenant farmer, who, in his opinion, would be injured, and not benefited, by a repeal of the law. It was a mistake, also, that no power was given to the landlord to make an original claim for waste or dilapidations against the tenants. The same omission occurred in the Act of 1875, and it should be remedied in Committee. Then he thought with regard to the improvements contained in the second and third schedules, other than the use of feeding stuffs and artificial manures, that some control should be given to the landlord over the making of improvements on which a large outlay was to be expended, when a tenancy was shortly to expire. In the case, for instance, of a lease which was drawing to a close, or in a yearly tenancy where a notice to quit had been either given or received. Then there was another point of more importance, but on which he did not feel clear—whether he placed the right interpretation upon the Bill or upon the intentions of its framers—and that was with regard to the measure of compensation to be given in the 1st clause of the Bill. In the first place, there was nothing in the Bill that he could see, if the arbitrators so decided, to prevent the compensation being very much greater than the outlay. Now, in his view, that was altogether wrong, and for this reason. Everything they gave to an outgoing tenant over and above his outlay, and the fair interest upon it, clearly represented the profit which he would continue to make if he still held the farm. But the right of making that profit was precisely what he paid rent for. Rent was the consideration for which he purchased the right to make that profit out of another man's land, as long as their agreement lasted; and as soon as he ceased to pay the consideration, surely the right to make a profit should cease with it. Otherwise, what would happen would probably be this—so, at least, it seemed to him. The incoming tenant who now paid the rent would make his profit on that outlay from the increased crops he found, and which he took to market and sold. But, according to his reading of the Bill, the outgoing man was to have the same thing, although he paid no rent at all, for he was to receive "such sum," entirely independent of his outlay, as represented the value of the improvement to the incoming tenant. What was that value, and how was it to be estimated? Might not the arbitrators decide that it was the whole value of the increased crops to the incoming tenant? And, if they did, then they would have two parties at the same time making a profit out of one outlay of capital, and one of them doing so entirely at the expense of the landlord. Against that they were told that, for unsuccessful improvements, nothing would be paid, and that as the tenant ran this risk on the one hand, so he ought not to be limited in compensation to his outlay on the other. But the risk which he was said to run was more imaginary than real. The first step in valuing was always to examine the bills of expenditure, and with this actual outlay before them, no valuers would ever dream of deciding that the tenant should get nothing. Payment by results was a very taking phrase. But it would be wholly inoperative as far as unsuccessful improvements were concerned, while it might open the door to what might prove to be, he feared, a ruinously heavy tenant right; and in these days, in particular, a too heavy tenant right would really be almost worse than no tenant right at all. For his part, he wished the compensation could have been more definite, and that the Government could have seen their way to introduce, as a voluntary alternative, something in the nature of the Schedules which were in two of the other Bills this Session. Those were points to which he felt bound to call attention. He was glad to find himself in a position to give, subject to the modifications which he had mentioned, a general, and, he hoped, not uncordial support to the Bill. And, although he agreed that no legislation could remove the cause of the recent agricultural depression, yet, now that there seemed to be more hopes that the worst had been passed, he trusted this Bill would do something to stimulate and encourage those who were engaged in the pursuit of that which, after all, was the chief and greatest industry in the country.

Mr. JAMES HOWARD* said, he had been frequently referred to in the course of the debate; and he hoped to show, before he concluded, that some of the views attributed to him were mis-stated or misrepresented. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had twitted him with having changed his views since the introduction of his Landlord and Tenant Bill, 1873. To that charge he replied, at that period they had not had an opportunity of seeing the working of the Irish Land Act, 1870; but, in his Bill of last year, it would be found that the sitting tenant was secured under Clause 19. He regretted that he had felt compelled to assume a hostile attitude towards the Bill now before the House; he had felt compelled to oppose it, because he believed it to be radically defective, and that it would utterly fail to accomplish its object. Before, however, he proceeded to point out its shortcomings, he would allude to the fact that, after the subject of tenant right had been discussed for 40 years, the late Government attempted to deal with the question by the Agricultural Holdings Bill of 1875;

and he had ventured to tell the late Prime Minister (the Earl of Beaconsfield), when that Bill was before the country, that it would assuredly fail. It had proved abortive; and he now ventured to tell the present Prime Minister that the Bill under consideration, if carried in its present form, would fail almost as utterly. Since the passing of the Act of 1875, these Islands had been visited with a series of disastrous seasons. British agriculture had passed through a period of depression unparalleled in history; and those farmers who had weathered the storm were looking forward to a brighter future. There prevailed also an idea—a deep impression—that the laws and customs relating to agriculture, which had sufficed for the past, did not suffice for the present, nor would they suffice for the future. The country was looking forward to something substantial in the way of legislation. A Royal Commission had sat for three or four years to inquire into the condition of agriculture and the changes necessary. Two of the foremost statesmen of the present generation had used language in reference to these changes which warranted the farmers of the country in expecting advantageous legislation. The late Earl of Beaconsfield, speaking upon the Duke of Rutland's Motion in March, 1880, said—

> "I shall be deeply disappointed if one result of the labours of that Commission is not to afford the farmer the most complete and absolute security for the capital which he has invested in the cultivation of the land which he occupies."—(3 *Hansard*, [251] 1254.)

The Earl of Beaconsfield has been removed from this sphere of labour; the other is still amongst us, and it is to be hoped he will be spared, and spared to this House for many years to come. Speaking at Leeds in October, 1881, the present Prime Minister stated—

> "I have said emphatically that, in my opinion, the Irish Land Act ought not to be an English or Scotch Land Act. I say as emphatically that it is an object of great importance for the farmer that effectual and not abortive measures are taken to secure the whole interest of the tenant—not a part only, but the whole of his interest—in his improvements."

He (Mr. James Howard) would ask, was it to be inferred from this language, or the language of the Earl of Beaconsfield, that only a fractional part of the interests of the tenant farmer was to be secured; and, further, was it language which would convey the idea that that fractional part of their interests was to be confined to a fractional part of the class—he would say an infinitesimal portion? He had been told by his hon. Friends around him that he was mistaken in opposing the Bill, that he ought to accept it as an instalment; the half-a-loaf doctrine had been dinned into his ears; but when he had asked his hon. Friends to point out where the half-loaf was to be found in the Bill, it had eluded their grasp as it had eluded his own. With reference to the charge brought against him by the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), that he (Mr. James Howard) had formed a hasty opinion of the Bill, he would say that he was convinced, from the opening statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Dodson), that the Bill was a milk-and-water affair. The 1st clause was simply the expression of good intentions, and was all very well so far as it went; but it was only declaratory, and simply asserted a general right to compensation. One of the first letters he had received upon the Bill was from a Norfolk farmer, who so accurately described its character, that, with the permission of the House, he would read them. Mr. Thomas Brown, of Marham Hall, one of the best known farmers in England, wrote thus—

> "I thank you for the copy of the Agricultural Holdings Bill. It contains a good principle, that an outgoing tenant shall be entitled to 'such sum as fairly represents the value of his improvements to an incoming tenant;' but, having enunciated that principle, the Government seems to have stood aghast at their own boldness, and to have exercised the utmost ingenuity to render that principle of as little value as possible."

Mr. Brown, the writer, was not one of the revolutionary band supposed to form the Farmers' Alliance, but a steady-going and staunch Conservative, whose opinions, nevertheless, upon agricultural topics he (Mr. James Howard) highly valued. The Bill dealt with the tenant farmers' interests under five heads—namely, notice to quit; the Law of Distress; and the three classes of improvements. What, he would ask, did the clause do for the farmer in respect of notice to quit? It changed the notice from six to 12 months; but, at the same time, it said in effect to the landowners of England—"We, the framers of the Bill, do not want to be unreasonable; if you object to 12 months, go on, as you are, with six months." When the Agricultural Holdings Act was introduced in 1875, a deputation of the Farmers' Club waited upon Mr. Disraeli. He (Mr. James Howard) was selected to place the views of the Club before the Prime Minister; and he informed him that, as practical men, they could not see the least use in troubling the Legislature to pass an Act to say to the landowners—"You may give compensation for improvements, and you may give 12 months' notice to quit instead of six." Mr. Disraeli was too astute to make his clause directly permissive; it was reserved for the Liberal Government to give a special invitation to the landowners to set the clause aside. Was it made permissive for fear that the Conservatives would oppose a compulsory clause for 12 months? He had no such fear, for the Conservative Party could not forget that the late Lord Beaconsfield's solution of the landlord and tenant difficulty was a two years' notice to quit. This he stated in his celebrated Newport-Pagnell speech; and, therefore, even out of respect for their late Chief's memory, they could not have opposed a one year's notice. He (Mr. James Howard) did not hesitate to say that a weaker—he would say a more childish clause was never submitted to the consideration of Parliament; at all events, it did nothing for the farmer, but left the question of notice to quit exactly where it was found. As to the Law of Distress, he would ask, what did the Bill do upon that question? He would not enter into an elaborate argument upon the justice or injustice of that law, for he believed that nothing new could be advanced either for or against. Those who had advocated its total abolition had done so upon the ground that, in the past, the tendency of the law had been to raise rents to an artificial standard, to impair the credit of the farmer, to repel capital from the land, to diminish production, and to confer an unfair class privilege to which there was no natural right. What, he would ask, was the Law of Distress, when stripped of its surroundings and the antiquity which attached to it? It was simply a State guarantee for the debts of the most opulent class of the community. He knew it was maintained that the law was in favour of the poor and the struggling tenant, and many had been led to believe in the doctrine; but that it was in favour of the richer class, he would point to the example of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), who had recently recovered a sum of no less than £2,600 upon one holding, and he had still more recently distrained upon another farm. He (Mr. James Howard) did not say the hon. Gentleman had done any wrong—he had acted within his legal rights, and he believed, from what he had told him, that he had acted leniently; but he maintained that the State had done a huge wrong in thus giving a preference to one creditor, who had recovered the whole of his debt, and had left the other creditors — who had claims of £5,000 against the tenant—without a shilling. No one had denounced the Law of Distress in stronger terms than the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill). He (Mr. James Howard) had quoted the words of the noble Lord in that House and upon many a platform; and he hoped that, when the Bill went into Committee, the noble Lord would render assistance in getting the obnoxious law abolished. He had said that no one had spoken in stronger terms of the Law of Distress than the noble Lord. He ought to have excepted the Prime Minister, who had used still weightier words. When receiving a deputation from the Farmers' Alliance, the Prime Minister used these words—

> "I quite agree that the Law of Distress is a law of severity that cannot be justified. The course which has been taken in Scotland may doubtless lead the English farmer to say and to think, with justice, that he is entitled to be treated on the same principles as those of which the Scotch farmer has obtained the application."

Yet this law, which could not be justified, was to be perpetuated. Further, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir William Harcourt) and the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), two Members of the Government, voted, in 1881, for the Motion of the hon. Member for Kerry (Mr. Blennerhassett), which was as follows:—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to abolish the power of levying Dis-

tress for rent on Agricultural Holdings in England, Wales, and Ireland."

He would ask, if it was desirable and expedient to abolish the law in 1880, why was it desirable to perpetuate it in the year 1883? He might be told that, since that period, the whole question had been referred to a Select Committee. He had served on that Committee, and had been amused at the tenacity with which the landowners clung to their privileges, especially the new men, those who had recently become landowners. As to the constitution of the Committee, he would ask the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) whether, upon the subject of Local Option, he would have been content to refer it to a Select Committee composed of the brewers and distillers in that House? Before the Committee, not one single witness ventured to assert that the Law of Distress was of any advantage to agriculture; and all the most experienced and intelligent witnesses bore testimony to its injurious effect in diminishing the productions of the land and the credit of the farmer. Notwithstanding these facts, the Liberal Government recognized as just a law which had been admitted to be indefensible, injurious to the public interests, and the severity of which, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, could not be justified, and to which no natural right could be claimed. He thought he had said enough to show that, whatever benefit the changes contemplated might be to others in the community, they were of no advantage to the farmers; and they had, therefore, nothing whatever to thank the Government for. On the contrary, he believed the change would be to their disadvantage, for it would diminish the credit of the farmer with his landlord, whilst, at the same time, it would not increase it with the general creditor, nor would it check the tendency of the law to raise rents. Turning to the question of compensation for improvements, he would ask — What will the farmer gain by the Bill in respect of permanent improvements? The answer must be, nothing. The Bill merely contained an exhortation to landlords to enter into private agreements with their tenants; but surely an Act of Parliament was not necessary for this purpose. If the clause was struck out altogether it would not weaken the Bill, nor would its retention strengthen it. Seventeen years ago the late Mr. J. Stuart Mill declared in that House that—

> "He failed to see of what earthly use to any landed proprietor was the right of preventing improvements."

He (Mr. James Howard) would go farther, and would say that he believed the power to be absolutely injurious to their interests. He had asked one of the largest landowners of England, who had objected to the Compensation Clauses in his (Mr. James Howard's) Landlord and Tenant Bill of 1873, how many tenants on his 50,000 acres quitted their farms in the course of a year? Another large landowner—the late Mr. Whitbread—had asked him, at the same period, when his revolutionary Bill was coming on? He replied that it might not come on at all; but if it were passed into law it would make no difference to him (Mr. Whitbread), as he neither changed his tenants nor raised their rents, and, therefore, no claim could be made upon him for compensation. Landlords would not suffer in any way from the freedom of tenants to make improvements, and the incentive to exertion on the part of tenants would be immense. The landlord would not have to pay compensation in one case out of 50; for it was not the improving tenant, as a rule, who quitted his holding, but the tenant of the opposite class, against whom should be given greater power to stop waste and dilapidations. One of the oldest and largest tenants in North Lincolnshire wrote to him, in 1873, as follows:—

> "I cannot for the life of me think why landlords are against your Bill, for with the provisions it contains they would, as a rule, get their land improved without any cost to themselves."

If called upon to pay greater compensation in one case in 20 than was just, a landowner would be abundantly compensated by the improvements effected on 19 other farms for which no compensation would ever be demanded. The main object of legislation, he maintained, should be to encourage, not to check, tenants in making improvements. To do so was against public policy—was against the interests of the owners themselves. He would point out that by the conditions imposed in Part II. the Government had recognized that the so-called rights of property might be overridden when the public interest demanded it—for instance, when recalcitrant or obstructive owners refused to carry out drainage, the tenant might carry out this essential improvement in spite of the owner; and he believed that this provision was the one redeeming feature of the Bill, for it did enact something; but the condition attached to it was worthless and injurious. It sent the tenant to the landlord armed with a legal revolver; whereas, if the right were conceded without the condition, the landlord or agent would, in most cases, approach the tenant, and an amicable arrangement would be arrived at. In his opinion, tenants would rather pay 5, 6, or even 7 per cent on their landlords' capital, than expend their own on drainage, subject to the uncertainty of recouping themselves for a portion of their outlay. He objected to the limitation in the clause, because it was unnecessary, and would delay the carrying out of such an essential improvement as draining, the want of which was a scandal. Evidence was given before the Royal Commission on Agriculture that 15,000,000 acres in this small Island required drainage. If only half that number of acres stood in need of it, it was a scandal and a disgrace to the landowners of England, and the small landowners were not the only ones to blame in the matter. A few months ago he had ridden over the estate of a noble Duke (a Member of the Royal Commission), in an adjoining county to his own, the drainage of which was in a disgraceful condition. The stipulation went beyond the limits required by the "Lincolnshire Custom," and the right to drain ought to be absolute and unconditional. If any limitation whatever were placed upon permanent improvements it ought to stop at buildings. He would now touch briefly on the fifth and last head—Improvements of the third class, probably the most important to the tenant of all, for it was upon these the farmer risked most of his capital upon the property of another. And what was proposed? The Bill stated that the tenant should be entitled to compensation; but it contained a direct invitation to the landlord to contract himself out of the Act, and to substitute for it a private arrangement. It was provided that such agreement should give "fair and reasonable compensation;" but there was no definition of "fair and reasonable," nor who was to decide the point. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had asserted that, if the agreement was illusory, it would not be upheld by a Court of Law; but why have to submit it to a Court of Law?—why not provide that the compensation should be equivalent? Mr. Pusey, in his Bill of 1847, had permitted agreements; but he had provided that any agreements entered into which, in the opinion of the arbitrators, were illusory or contrary to the spirit of the Act, should be invalid. It was highly objectionable to compel a tenant to resort to a Court of Law upon such a point. He (Mr. James Howard) believed there were 20 ways in which the proverbial coach-and-four might be driven through the clause. For instance, suppose a tenant applied for the offer of a farm, the rent of which was 30*s*. per acre, the landlord might say—"I do not want to be bothered about compensation; if you will forego your claim for improvements you shall have the land at 25*s*. an acre." If an agreement were entered into on this basis, would not that contract the landlord and tenant out of the Act? And if that could be done in one case it could be done in many others. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for West Staffordshire (Mr. Staveley Hill) had dealt with these private agreements in an effectual way. He had provided that they should be equivalent; and, to test whether they were *bonâ fide*, the tenant could claim under the Act, or under the agreement. A good deal had been said the other day by the Prime Minister about a certain clock being always behind time; but it seemed to him (Mr. James Howard) that, on this occasion, the Government clock was not only behind the clock of the Conservative Member for West Staffordshire, but 36 years behind the clock of Mr. Pusey's time. The truth was that the clause, in respect of the improvements of the third class, was practically permissive; and that was why the Tory Party were so ready to accept the Bill. Judging by the alacrity of the landowners to contract themselves out of the Act of 1875, he did not share the sanguine views expressed at Canterbury last Saturday by Lord Brabourne as to the provisions of the Bill being cheerfully acquiesced in by owners. The

Prime Minister had said to the Farmers' Alliance deputation—

> "With regard to the principle for which you contend, the principle that effective protection ought to be given to the improvement made by the farmer, upon that I cannot entertain the smallest doubt whatever."

He (Mr. James Howard) contended that the Bill did not give any effective protection, and that it would fail in its object. Having dealt with the five heads, he would turn to the omissions of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had pointed out that the measure did improve the position of the sitting tenant; but the question was—Did it place him in the position to which he was in common justice entitled? The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire said that, as the Lincolnshire Custom had sufficiently protected the sitting tenant against a rise of rent upon his own improvements, this Bill would be sufficient. Upon that point he (Mr. James Howard) would quote a letter he had received from a Lincolnshire farmer of the greatest experience, a man whom the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire would admit to be a man whose opinions were respected throughout the county—he alluded to Mr. Frank Sowerby, of Aylesby. Mr. Sowerby had written the day before the Bill was introduced, and could not, therefore, have known what it contained. He said—

> "I hope that amongst you you will get a thoroughly good Tenant Right Bill passed this Session; but I do not think any Bill could be called a good one which did not secure the sitting tenant against a rise of rent upon his own improvements, which, in many cases, have been sadly taken advantage of."

And Mr. Sowerby is an impartial authority, because he adds that, in his own case, he has not much reason to find fault on that score; and he would rather take the opinion of Mr. Sowerby upon so practical a question than that of the hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin). The Bill left the question of compensation contingent altogether upon the tenant quitting his farm. He (Mr. James Howard) would inquire—What were the arguments for the introduction of such a Bill? Was it justice between one class and another? He did not think the necessity for the Bill could be supported by such a claim, although he thought it could upon higher ground. No one was satisfied with the present condition of agriculture, nor with the amount of produce raised from the soil. Our herds and flocks were diminishing year by year; the price of meat was steadily advancing, until it had become a question of great national concern; and he believed it was mainly attributable to the want of security for the capital of the farmer, and the instability of his tenure. On what ground did the Duke of Richmond base the Agricultural Holdings Act? He had said that the object was to increase the food-producing power of the country —that unless the tenant had greater security for his capital it could not be expected that the resources of the soil could be increased to any great extent. That was a practical view of the subject, and it was the same as that taken by Mr. Pusey in 1847, the Preamble of whose Bill ran as follows:—

> "Whereas it is expedient for the better security of Farmers in the Improvement of Land, and for the consequent increase of Produce therefrom, as well as of Employment for Farm Labourers, to enlarge and extend the custom of Agricultural Tenant Right in accordance with the modern advancement of Husbandry."

Both were right. The only justification for invoking the aid of the Legislature in settling the relations of landlord and tenant was the public interest; and he believed that, if the landowners of Mr. Pusey's day had permitted his simple and just Bill to pass, the national wealth would have been increased by hundreds of millions, that the recent agricultural depression would have been far less, and that the House would not now have been sitting upon a Tenants' Compensation Bill. Surely, if the State were justified in legislating for the smaller class of outgoing tenants, it was justified in legislating for the larger and more useful class of sitting tenants. The country, he was sure, agreed with what Sir James Caird had written in *The Times* upon this subject. He said—

> "Unless the interests of the sitting tenants, who are the real backbone of British agriculture, are equally recognized and dealt with, it will fail to give that security which would promote good farming and justify legislative interference with the contracts of landlord and tenant."

Sir James Caird had the character of being a safe and sound man; at all events, he did not belong to the so-called revolutionary band, the Farmers' Alliance. The conviction he had expressed had taken a deep hold of the minds of the farmers, and it was growing stronger and stronger, which he (Mr. James Howard) had found at the numerous agricultural meetings which he had addressed. One of the main causes of the failure of the Irish Land Act of 1870 was that, although it secured compensation, it did not secure tenants against a rise of rent upon their own improvements. The true solution of the difficulty, in his opinion—and that opinion was shared by the majority of the members of the Farmers' Alliance—was, that the tenant who had improved his holding should have a power of appeal against his rent being raised upon his own improvements; and to show the necessity for such security he would read, with the permission of the House, one or two letters. The first was from Sussex, which was as follows:—

> "When I entered my present occupation, leases were not granted on the estate. In 1852, a circular was issued by my landlord's agent, in which the tenants were assured that they had no reason to anticipate a desire on the part of the landlord to originate frequent changes of rent. Thus assured, I expended several thousand pounds in under-draining and other improvements in 1857, and in 1867 I received notice to quit; and the best terms that I could obtain was an increase of 25 per cent on one farm, 28 per cent on another, and 150 per cent on the third."

That was on the estate of a Liberal Peer. Take another case, which was in the county of Kent. An uncle, who was getting into years, asked his nephew to succeed him in the tenancy of a farm. He assured him that he might do as he liked with the land; that neither the landlord nor the agent ever came near. He entered upon it, planted hops and fruit, constructed a hop-kiln and other farm buildings; the upshot was that he had to submit, within a few years, to two rises of rent amounting together to 80 per cent. The farm was subsequently sold, and he had to quit. He had no claim for the improvements he had effected; but the new owner put in a claim for dilapidations of the very buildings which he had put up at his own sole expense. He (Mr. James Howard) had had well-nigh a bushel of letters on this subject; but he would not weary the House with reading more than one other, and that was from a Scotch tenant farmer, who was a Member of the Royal Commission. Mr. John Clay wrote to him, on the 20th of April last, as follows:—

> "I see your letter in *The Daily News* of to-day. If the progress of agriculture is to be kept going, security to tenants must be given in full. Without that honest and just principle is carried out by law, both capital and tenant farmers will go and seek investment and reward for industry in some other land. I know there is a difficulty in getting the rent-raising process on tenants' improvements put an end to. I do not know a farm that has been improved for the past generation that the landlord has not pocketed hundreds, and in many cases thousands of pounds by increased rental, without his contributing one shilling to warrant that increased rent which he puts upon his old tenant. In Scotland the confiscation of tenants' capital has been worse than it ever was in Ireland, and that is bad enough. It is a crying injustice and must be remedied in some way or other."

Another Scotch farmer, of 40 years' experience, wrote thus—

> "There is an old Scotch proverb that looks untrue, but which I find, from my knowledge of farming for 40 years, is true in nine cases out of ten. It is—
>
> 'Let alone, and you sit;
> Improve, and you flit!'"

If they were going to legislate, they ought to do so in such a way as to render injustice to so important a class of the community as the tenant farmers impossible. The tenant farmers of the Kingdom were essential to its welfare, and no other country in the world could boast of such a class. Give the improving tenant a power of appeal, and it would act as a check upon a class containing some arbitrary members, the land agents, who would consider twice before doing many of the acts which they now did, if they knew that their conduct would be made public, and the fair fame of their employers jeopardized. One other great advantage of such a power of appeal would be, that it would lift the improving tenant to a higher platform than the slovenly and standstill; and, seeing that the improving tenants were lifted on to this higher platform, it would be an incentive to others to strive to gain it. He maintained that the property of the tenant, whether quitting or sitting, should be held as sacred as the possessory rights of the landlord himself. Lord Carlingford, in "another place," had proved, from Mr. Stuart Mill, that the right of the tenant in his improvements rested precisely upon the same basis as the possessory rights of the landlord, and it was a Conservative view to recognize those rights. There were men prepared with violent remedies for the settlement of what was popularly called the Land Question. He (Mr. James Howard) had never joined or given any countenance to these visionary or violent measures. He maintained that the most effectual and the safest plan was to make the best of our existing system. The English land system of landlord and tenant was the growth of centuries, and men of experience and observation knew that to change the conditions under which the agriculture of a country was carried on could only be brought about by slow, very slow, degrees. It was, therefore, far more statesmanlike to endeavour to make the best of the system which prevailed, than to seek to uproot it. He believed that the present Bill was not the best way. Lord Granville, in 1875, upon the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Act, in "another place," said—

> "I do not know whether your Lordships have ever observed in the streets little boys carrying bunches of small balloons. . . . . . . They are very fine to look at, and their lightness makes them float easily; but when you come to examine them closely, you will find they have absolutely nothing in them."—(3 *Hansard*, [223] 958.)

He then went on to describe the character of Bills introduced by the Government, remarking—

> "They deal with interesting subjects, they have very attractive titles; and when you examine them, either they have nothing at all in them, or they contain clauses by which no one need be bound."

He further added—

> "This description, I think, applies to the present Bill. . . . . . Without compulsion it is impossible for the Bill to have any effect."—(*Ibid.* 958-9.)

That description of Lord Granville's would be almost as appropriate if applied to the Bill of the Government of which he was a Member. He (Mr. James Howard) believed the measure would fail, and would not accomplish the object it had in view. It was upon that ground that he had assumed a hostile attitude towards it; but, acting upon the opinions of hon. Members around him, he had come to the determination not to move the Amendment which stood on the Paper in his name, but to wait and see what shape the Bill would take before it came to a third reading.

Mr. BIDDELL said, that, so far as he could ascertain, the general feeling with which tenants regarded this Bill was by no means unsatisfactory. Subject to amendment in details in Committee, it was as fair as they could expect. He believed that nearly every practical farmer had come to the conclusion that the ancient customs—some of them of feudal origin—by which farming was now regulated were not adapted to meet the requirements of modern farming. Therefore, on that ground, tenants were agreed that a Bill for revising the old customs was entitled to their cordial support. For his part, he should have been glad if the Government had consolidated the various Acts which affected agriculture into one Bill. Nothing was more confusing than to have to refer to two or three Acts to know what the law was. There would be in future Pusey's Landlord and Tenant Act, the late Agricultural Holdings Act, and the present Bill. With regard to the matter of buildings, the Bill appeared to be very harmless for landlords who were liable to pay for little or nothing but what they had consented to. At the same time the Bill would have its effect in showing what ought to be done. As respected incoming tenants, who were affected more than landlords, he had great doubt whether the action of the Bill would ultimately be so beneficial as seemed to be supposed. Landlords, as a rule, were not now exacting to outgoing tenants, generally acting on the principle of "depart in peace." But if stricter rules were applied to them, they would probably act more on commercial principles than at present.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. BIDDELL, resuming, said, that the Bill was somewhat inconsistent on some points, for it was retrospective in small matters and not in large. He trusted that that anomaly would disappear. The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplain) had expressed the opinion that when an outgoing tenant had been adequately recouped for his outlay he should have no further demand. He agreed that they ought not to go too far in that direction. As regarded drainage, he was inclined to agree with the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) that a tenant ought to have an opportunity of draining his land. There was good security in the

Bill against tenants doing unnecessary drainage. He could not agree with the 5th clause of the Bill, by which, if a landlord agreed with a tenant as to the value of his improvements, and if that agreement was not fair and reasonable, it should not be acted upon, but the tenant should be at liberty to fall back upon the Act. In his opinion, tenants, in such a case, could be trusted perfectly well to look after themselves and to protect their own interests in future agreements. With regard to notice to quit, he thought it ought to be extended 12 months in leases as well as in agreements. The question of increased rents from tenants' improvements was one of great difficulty. It must be remembered that the landlord had as great an interest against dropping the rent as the tenant against raising it. Therefore, if the one was to be secured against alteration of rent, so must the other. Then, in many cases a tenant took a farm that was thoroughly out of condition. He should like to see some arrangement by which the landlord could not take advantage of the improved condition of the farm unless the tenant had been compensated by a previous low hire. A tenant ought to be able to build whether the landlord consented or not, and to remove the buildings at the end of the tenancy if the landlord would not take them. If the Government did not meet this point, he would move Amendments for the purpose. As to the whole Bill, as its faults of omission and commission were not of great magnitude, he did not see why the House should not go into Committee upon it. He hoped they would do so, and not make the Bill a Party question. The interests of both classes, landlords and tenants, should be considered, and not the interests of one class only. With regard to the Law of Distress, he thought two years' notice would be beneficial both to landlord and tenant, though he did not think it would be equitable to the general public. He hoped, however, that the House would not be induced to do away with the one year. He concluded by saying that the Bill would receive his hearty support.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he hoped that he might be excused, as one not representing an agricultural community, for taking part in this debate on the ground that this was a subject in which he had always taken a considerable interest, and also because the interests of agriculture were not confined to a class but to the whole nation. The House entertained this Bill not solely as a question between landlord and tenant, but because the interests of the people were deeply concerned in giving to every tenant every reasonable guarantee in order to secure the utmost prosperity. He was one who had always entertained a strong hope that by simplicity in the mode of transfer and tenure of land agriculture would be placed in a better position. It appeared to him, in spite of all that had been said by the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard), that no law could be devised by this or any other Parliament that could make the tenant absolutely secure in his holding. Everything showed that the only way to absolute security was by ownership, and he found nothing in the antecedents of English tenants to induce the House to give the tenant any of the attributes of ownership. He would not be a party to any attempt to stereotype the existing distribution of land between landlord and tenant. He had always opposed forcing any particular system of land ownership or occupancy on this or any other country, as he desired as much freedom for the land as we could have. But as between landlord and tenant, it was necessary that we should have a just law for compensation for tenants' improvements. They should be careful not to import into that anything that would impede the transfer of proprietorship in regard to agricultural land. The sitting tenant was the primary subject of regard; but it must be admitted that he might make an outlay upon his farm which they could not secure to him, and which ought not to be secured. Tenant farmers might engage in experiments in regard to agriculture, and if they did not result in useful improvement it would not be just that the expense should be charged on the landlord. He agreed very much with what had been said in regard to drainage, and thought that when the Bill was considered in Committee it would be found desirable that tenants should have large power given to them as to the execution of drainage works. If hon. Members would take the trouble to read the Preambles of the several Bills introduced for the promotion of land drainage, they would be of opinion that it was the duty of the House to encourage that much-neglected work. But, at the same time, the landlord ought to be protected against having to pay for improvements which in no way added to the letting value of the farm. With regard to the erection of buildings, there was nothing in the Bill to prevent a tenant erecting as many as he liked without the consent of his landlord, subject to the condition that he might not be able to claim compensation for them, and that such buildings were removable without damage to the freehold. If the Bill was passed on the lines on which it was drawn, one of its probable results would be to promote the acceptance of agricultural leases by tenant farmers. Under present circumstances tenant farmers fought shy of such leases, because they looked at the period at which they would expire as the period at which their rents would be raised. But if the tenant farmer approached that time with the certainty that he would receive compensation for his unexhausted improvements, he would much more frequently than at present desire to have a lease granted him. The Bill should be amended so that the sitting tenant might feel that upon the determination of a tenancy he was in a position to obtain compensation, although he might not quit the holding. He did not argue that that would make very material difference, or that the tenant would frequently make a claim on his landlord for that compensation. The compensation would be discharged ultimately by an allowance of rent in most cases; but he believed it would strengthen the position of the sitting tenant, and would be agreeable to the tenants throughout the country; and the Government would find the Amendment to their interest and advantage to adopt. He certainly could not agree with Sir James Caird or anyone else who said there was nothing in the Bill of advantage to the sitting tenants. It would be a very great advantage to them to be able to claim compensation for their unexhausted improvements. More than that, it was plain that if a tenant accepted a lease, and the terms of it were such that they did not give him fair and reasonable compensation for his unexhausted improvements under the 3rd part of the Schedule, it would to that extent be void. To revert for a moment to the granting of leases, it should be remembered that two great authorities had spoken in favour of them. Adam Smith had said that it was against all reason and probability to suppose that a yearly tenant would improve the soil. And the late Mr. George Hope, writing in the interest of the Scotch farmers to *The Times*, said that what he desired to see was that the Lincolnshire custom should be adopted in Scotland, together with the Scottish system of leases. Mr. Hope believed the effect would be to add a third to all the crops of the Kingdom. The Bill went, in fact, very far towards the realization of that desire on the part of Mr. Hope, and it would therefore turn out probably to be one of the most useful measures which had ever been passed, certainly in the life of this Parliament. It was to be regretted that it did not make a more bold attempt to consolidate the law as to agricultural improvements. It would have been a great advantage certainly to the lay element if the Bill had incorporated in one Statute all the Acts of Parliament which were extant upon this important subject. He could see no advantage in the retention of the 2nd clause. There were thousands of farmers throughout the country who had executed improvements before the passing of the Act, and who might be put in a worse position by the clause. He should certainly advocate the omission of this clause which prohibited compensation for improvements carried out before the passing of the Act, partly because the other clauses appeared to give quite sufficient security to the landlord. It was plain that the object of the House in promoting a measure of this sort was to promote a better cultivation of the soil. They should keep clear of everything like joint ownership, and he did not wish anything put into the Bill which would carry the country one step nearer that position, as he felt sure its effect would not be to increase the economic production of the soil. Being in favour of a reform in the laws of the ownership and transfer of land, he was not anxious to change the position of the tenant. There could be no doubt that the capital employed in the improvement of the soil had mainly come from landlords, and it was to the interest of the country to encourage the landowner to spend his money by giving him reasonable security. As regarded distress for rent, he should prefer to see it totally abolished; and as to the clause dealing with notices to quit, he believed it would prove quite illusory. It was because he believed that the Bill was an honest and useful effort to deal with this subject, which was one of very great importance, and because he believed, further, that it was a measure which, so far as it required amendment, could and would be amended, that he supported it, and that he rejoiced that there was no disposition to divide against the second reading.

Mr. PELL, who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the measure was one that commended itself to the good opinion of the House, with some rare exceptions below the Ministerial Gangway. The opinions of those hon. Members had been dealt with severely from the Conservative Benches, and very severely from the Government Benches. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had said nothing more in his admirable speech than the merits of the case had deserved. He was glad that Her Majesty's Government had not adopted any of the views put forward in the Bill drafted by the Farmers' Alliance. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading had made a statement that the Act of 1875 had not been generally adopted; but that was impossible to prove. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether or no, since he had had the direction of the affairs of the Crown lands, he had continued to contract tenants out of that Act? That would be a little practical illustration of how the right hon. Gentleman viewed the application of that Act. The very Bill of 31 clauses they were now discussing had boiled down the whole of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 60 clauses, with the exception of 12, and the preliminary clauses. Strike out these, and they had the whole of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. He thought it was a direct compliment to the Conservative Government that time should have proved how extremely well that Act had worked. With the object of concluding the debate that night, he thought if there were any improvements to be made in the Bill they should be made in Committee. He deprecated wasting any time over the crotchets which had been ventilated respecting what were called sitting tenants, whose case was a mere chimera. If the sitting tenant wanted a new arrangement, he had only to give notice to his landlord.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, he believed that this Bill was a genuine and sincere development of the Act passed in 1875. That measure gave a promise to the ear, but broke it to the hope. He thought that the evidence as to how far the Act of 1875 assisted or developed the agricultural interest was to be judged from two facts, The first was that the anger and dissatisfaction of the Farmers' Alliance had been especially developed since the passing of the Act; and the second was that there had, since the passing of the Act, been an exhibition of agricultural distress, to which it was easy, as far the causes went, to find parallels in agricultural history, though the results were more serious and lasting than any he had read of before, which seemed to him to imply that the Act had not done any good, but that by developing hopes which had not been satisfied it had done a great deal of farm. At the beginning of the debate his hon. and gallant Friend opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) spoke about the purposes of the Government, and wished to extract from the Prime Minister a pledge that no future developments would be made of the principle embodied in this Bill; but in the nature of things it was impossible to give a pledge as to what popular opinion would be in the future. The question that would come before the public of this country hereafter would be how to discover some permanent *modus vivendi* under which landlords and tenants would have the whole stimulus of development and the whole sense of property. Mr. Auberon Herbert had been spoken of as a Revolutionary Radical. In point of fact, that gentleman was a revolving politician, for at one time he was a Radical and at another time a Tory. Consequently his opinions did not bear very much upon this subject. He reminded him of one of those stars which revolved about once in seven years; in his perigee he was a Liberal, in his apogee a Reactionary. One of the earliest writers on agriculture stated the feeling which prevailed in regard to occupiers in his time, and which, indeed, likewise prevailed now. He was referring to a writer of the Reign of Henry VIII. [*Laughter.*] He was aware that historical allusions were received with great impatience in that House; but we were what we now were by what we had been. Fitzherbert, one of the most eminent writers and jurists of that age, said the tenants were doubtful of their landlords, because they feared that if they made their holdings much better they would either be put out or else have to pay a great fine. If his opinion as an economist were asked, he confessed he could see no reason why we should interfere with the relations between landlord and tenant any more than we did with the relations between producer and consumer. But both sides of the House agreed that a change in the direction of this Bill was necessary, in order to give a chance to good husbandry in the future. Further, he denied that the Law of Distress was beneficial to tenants. It injured their credit, and thereby induced their creditors to bring undue pressure to bear upon them, and sometimes insured their ruin. This was illustrated by the fact, of which he was assured by a banker, lately a Member of this House, that the cause of agricultural distress was mainly to be found in the action of the country bankers, who secured themselves, when they found that tenant farmers were greatly indebted to their landlords, by calling in the advances they had made them. Besides, the farmers were ignorant, servile, and timid, and needed the protection with which other classes could dispense. They did not like a lease, because they did not understand the legal jargon of a lease, and were afraid they would be compromised by it. [*Dissent.*] Hon. Members dissented from his statements; but he would illustrate what he said from an anecdote for which he could vouch. He remembered some time ago hearing of a very distinguished younger member of the aristocracy who was a candidate for a seat in Parliament for a Midland town. He was the victim of the last phrase, and a mischievous phrase, of the late Mr. Mill—namely, the "unearned increment"—which had got into the heads of people at that time, and talked so continuously of the necessity of securing the "unearned increment," that, at last, a large body of people determined to vote for him. On being asked their reasons, they said they would vote for the man who was going to give them "free manures." However, both Parties in the House had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to take action; and, on the whole, the Bill was an honest and thorough attempt to carry a questionable theoretical principle to a practical result. At the same time, he hoped that the important question of silos would receive favourable consideration from the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who was also the new Minister of Agriculture.

MR. E. W. HARCOURT*: Sir, I quite approve of the principle of this Bill—namely, that the measure of compensation should be the value of the improvements to the incoming tenant. Justice, however, requires that the compensation should not exceed the money actually expended; what goes beyond that is the value for which rent is paid, That principle was laid down by the Committee of your House last year, of which I had the honour of being a Member, and of which the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) was the Chairman. Sir, I agree in the necessity for classification; but I cannot help thinking the 2nd Schedule somewhat fanciful. I hold that, where drainage is required, the drainage should be done by the landlord; I do not think that which requires drainage is fit to be left without it. That is a very different matter, however, from giving the tenant power to compel the landlord to drain all lands, whether they require it or not. The landlord must be the judge of this, with an appeal, if he should think right, to the Land Commissioners. I shall, therefore, propose to add some words at the end of Clause 4, to carry out those views. Well, next we come to the question of sets-off to benefits to tenants, and here we enter upon a very difficult matter—namely, compensation for manures. Sir, the real fact is, that, in light lands, the treading in of green crops is of more value than any compensation that could be given for taking them away. Besides these circumstances, I should like a provision inserted in the Bill that these crops may not be sold off the land, after notice to quit has been given on either side, without leave from the landlord. Then, Sir, at the end of Clause 6, I cannot for the life of me understand why, in a 21 years' tenancy, we will say, waste or breach is to be permitted for 17 years. And now, as to the Law of Distraint, that I consider to be more of a tenant's question than a landlord's. It is rarely used by landlords, excepting in the direction of giving credit to small tenants. It is the small tenants who will be losers by it, a circumstance I cannot help regretting. Sir, I am willing to accept this Bill, as offering a fair arrangement between landlord and tenant. I will go further, I will thank the Government for it. But, Sir, my thanks must be limited to the proportion of backbone which the Government shows in Committee, in respect to retaining the principles of the Bill as it is now presented to us, and to the resistance which it offers to Amendments of an extreme nature. Sir, there is amongst us, in this House, a class of Philosophers, such as in old times would have been called Epicureans. Now, of that school the celebrated Cyril Jackson used to say, that if their premises had been correct, their conclusions would have been magnificent. Sir, here, I am afraid, the magnificence is entirely wanting; I think it is the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Collings) who has a Motion down on the Paper, the object of which is to increase the productiveness of land. Well, to increase the productiveness of land, of course, capital is required. And what is the method proposed by the hon. Member? Why, to make the land over to agricultural labourers and to tenant farmers. In respect to the agricultural labourers, the experiment has been tried over and over again. I think, Sir, you have tried it yourself. In my neighbouring county (Buckinghamshire) the experiment was tried by Fergus O'Connor. The result has always been the same. In good seasons, the occupier manages to scrape on, in independent indigence; in bad seasons, he is ruined; and he ruins the land, for he has nothing to put into it. He manages to fight with starvation for a longer or a shorter time; but, in the end, he is forced to part with the land to those who can afford the luxury. With all my very heart I wish that the agricultural labourer should occupy as much land as is compatible with due attention to his regular work, and then, with a certainty of maintenance from his hired labour, he would possess the luxury of being able to grow his own potatoes, his vegetables, his pigs; and I should like to add, common rights for a cow. Then, as to the tenant farmer, I should be glad to see him the possessor of land, if it only suits his book—but how does the matter stand? A tenant farmer requires all his capital to work the land he occupies, if it is to make him any return for the labour he expends upon it. If he uses up that capital in buying land, or in paying for the imaginary advantages of tenant right, then there will be an inadequate capital left to him for working his land. On the other hand, if there is someone at his back, to supply the capital required for buildings, for repairs, for drainage, to let him the farm at a fair rent, and to meet him generously in bad times, then he will be free to cultivate the land to the greatest advantage, and to leave the land, if it does not answer his purpose. The tenant should most certainly be assured in respect to anything he may leave in the soil for the benefit of his successor. Whilst he is a sitting tenant, he reaps the benefit of it himself. No landlord in his senses would wish to disturb a sitting tenant, if he is a good one, either by an unjust rise of rent, or in any other way. Sir, I am convinced that the majority of tenants prefer this sort of tenure to being tied up to land which they have not capital to work. I have known instances of tenants, who after they had inherited land, went to their landlords and asked them to buy the land, and to to give them a lease of it. As a matter of fact, the English landlord, as a rule, deals very fairly with his tenant. If protection is required by a general measure against exceptional cases of unfairness, I would give such a measure my hearty support. For this reason, I am prepared to support this Bill. Sir, incalculable mischief is often done by our Epicurean Philosophers with their insufficient knowledge. It is through them that well-meaning reformers defeat their own objects; and it is through them that reasonable progress is frequently thrown back for an indefinite period. I do hope the Government is not going to give way to these clap-trap Philosophers. I hope they are going to set themselves to pass a possible, a practicable, and a useful measure. And now, Sir, before I sit down, and whilst I am on agricultural affairs, I must remind the Prime Minister, that there are other things nearer to the farmer's heart even than the Agricultural Holdings Bill—I allude to the matter of Local Taxation; and under this head I should like to include the maintenance of main roads, of indoor poor, of lunatics, the matter of Education, and I must not omit the very important point of the protection of our flocks and herds from the import amongst them of foreign disease. We have received some little kindness from the Government, in the matter of highway maintenance; but I am sorry to see a falling off this Session even in that matter. But, Sir, there is a great deal behind that. I dare say the Prime Minister may consider it the mark of a feeble intellect to care about such trivial matters as these; but to us, Sir, these trivial matters are of the highest importance, and I must try to remind the right hon. Gentleman that we have the majority of the nation on our side, and it is for that majority that he will have to legislate.

MR. HENEAGE said, he must congratulate the Government on the introduction of the Bill, the principles of which he approved. He believed the measure was an honest attempt to deal with a complicated question in a thoroughly practical manner. With respect to some of the observations that had been made in the course of the debate, he would remark that he did not at all believe in the existence of the sitting tenant in the sense it had been used. Either a tenant was an existing tenant, in which case his rent could not be raised without his consent; or his tenancy had been determined, in which case he would obtain all the advantages of the Bill. The words "sitting tenant," as advocated by the Alliance, simply meant judicial rents and fixity of tenure. There was no greater fallacy on this question than the statement that improvements had been made, on the whole, by the tenants. The great majority had been made by the landlords, and whatever Bill passed the great majority would continue to be made by the landlords, because it was far better that the tenant should devote what money he had to the cultivation of the land. It was certainly not an advantage to a tenant to borrow money from a bank, and he thought that banks had been the cause of a great deal of the failures of the last few years. It was still worse that the landlord should borrow money from his tenant to make improvements; and he hoped the tenants would be protected by the Bill from incapable landlords, while no encouragement would be given to landlords to leave the tenants to make necessary improvements, because, if there was any clause in the Bill which would tend to throw the making of improvements on tenants, it would drive away from agriculture itself that capital which the landlords ought to supply. The hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. James Howard) spoke strongly with reference to the abolition of the Law of Distress, and said the Select Committee which sat last year was a Committee of landlords.

MR. JAMES HOWARD said, he did not allude to the Committee.

MR. HENEAGE said, the hon. Member asked how any tenant would like to be judged by a Committee of landlords —[MR. JAMES HOWARD: No, no.]—and he understood him in saying this to refer to the Committee. That Committee, however, went thoroughly into the question, and he knew many of the Members who went on it in favour of the abolition of the Law of Distress, and who, after hearing the evidence, changed their opinions. The hon. Member for Bedfordshire said that all the witnesses of intelligence gave evidence in favour of the abolition of the Law——

MR. JAMES HOWARD: Surely the hon. Member could not have heard what I said. I did not say what he states; but I said that all the witnesses of intelligence stated that the Law of Distress operated in raising rent.

MR. HENEAGE said, he could not see what object the hon. Member had in making the observation he did if it was not to show that the witnesses were in favour of the abolition of the law. But such was not the case, and the hon. Member referred to the evidence of several of the witnesses to prove this statement. He did not believe this was a landlords' question at all. As a landlord he would give up the Law of Distress to-morrow, but it was the tenant farmers who wished to maintain it. In proof of that he would adduce the discussion recently at the Farmers' Club, where an amendment in favour of the abolition of the law obtained only 10 votes out of 100 persons present; whilst at a meeting of the Chambers of Agriculture on the following day no motion in favour of the total abolition of the Law of Distress was even suggested, but an amendment was moved and carried by a small majority of the farmers themselves, to substitute two years for the limitation of one year proposed by the Government Bill. With regard to the landlords, he believed himself that they would be far better off without the Law of Distress, for then there would be no credit system. In respect to the Bill itself, it was drawn on the only principle on which any such Bill could be drawn—in the interest of both incoming and outgoing tenants. Some persons were too much inclined to think that there was only one tenant—the outgoing tenant; but he ventured to say that the incoming tenant was as much to be considered as the outgoing tenant, and the farmers themselves were of this opinion. He believed the Bill would be taken by the farmers of England as a fair measure, and as one calculated to be of equal benefit to the two classes of tenants he had just mentioned.

Mr. BRODRICK said, he thought that the commendation which had been bestowed upon this Bill was due to a desire generally entertained that a good tenant should not, when he left his holding, be placed at the mercy of a bad landlord. But he was inclined to think that the Government, in aiming at the conclusions they had in view, had drawn the Bill in such a manner as to leave the good landlords at the mercy of the bad tenants. While there were ample provisions for compensation for improvements made by the tenant, there was not a sufficient set-off for the deterioration of farms, which would be to the detriment of the landlord. He therefore suggested to the Government the necessity of introducing some provision which would enable the landlord during the continuance of a tenancy to call on the tenant to make an assessment of damages which might have been done to the holding, so that the landlord might not find himself left out in the cold. The hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard) contended that the tenant should not only have the alternative of receiving his capital back again if he went out, but should be allowed to remain on his farm without having his rent raised. This seemed to come very near fixing a fair rent. Then, with regard to the Law of Distress, which the hon. Member proposed to abolish, he wished to call the attention of the House to the reason given by the hon. Member for that view, as it appeared in the evidence he gave before the Royal Commission. He there stated that it was of no use to limit the distress to one year without abolishing it altogether, as that did not do away with the injustice to the commercial classes. It was not, then, the tenant, but the commercial classes, the agricultural implement makers, and so on, whom it was desired to benefit. It appeared to him that such a proposal simply took money from one class in order to pay it to another, and was nothing more than robbing Peter to pay Paul. With regard to the question of set-off, he wished the Government definitely to say whether such an arrangement as had been suggested, whereby the landlord accepted a lower rent in lieu of the tenants' right to compensation, would be permitted under the Bill; because, if it was not, he did not see any chance of improvements being undertaken in cases where neither landlord nor tenant had much money. He also wished to know whether it was proposed to limit the compensation to the outlay; and he hoped the landlord would be permitted to assess the deterioration, when necessary, before the end of the time. The questions of unexhausted manure and of drainage also required careful attention; and it was obvious that if the landlord was not permitted to drain his land by means of borrowed capital, except under stringent restrictions, the tenant who undertook to drain his landlord's land, whether he wished it or not, ought not to be allowed to do so except under the same restrictions. The Bill came before the House as a just settlement of the tenant's claims, and, no doubt, the right hon. Gentleman who introduced it regarded it as a *juste milieu* between the claims of both parties. He trusted that the Bill was to be regarded as final, and not merely as an instalment and incentive to fresh agitation, and that the Government would view with the greatest suspicion any Amendments which might be proposed with the object of enlarging its scope. The extent to which they had gone in this Bill was the full extent to which they were justified in going by the present agricultural condition of the country and the desire expressed by the farmers; and by stopping there it might be possible to legislate in such a way as to secure compensation to the tenant for his improvements without deteriorating the property of the landlord. But if the Bill was simply to operate, as the hon. Member for Cornwall (Mr. Borlase) hinted, as an instalment, and as a vantage ground for fresh agitation, the House would incur serious responsibility in passing it. He (Mr. Brodrick) was not at all sanguine that the Bill would greatly relieve the tenant farmers from the difficulties from which they suffered. What the farmers required was a degree of capital which could not be given to them by any legislation.

COLONEL KINGSCOTE said, his feeling was that freedom of contract between landlord and tenant was by far the best system. But it had been shown before the Royal Commission that there were black sheep among both landlords and tenants, and that there was a demand for a measure of this sort. He had looked carefully at all the Bills that had been produced on this subject, and he had no hesitation in pronouncing this to be by far the most equitable and most workable. There were some things in it that might be improved; but these could be better discussed in Committee. If the members of the Farmers' Alliance knew what they were about they would accept this Bill; and he believed that 99 per cent of the farmers of England would refuse to join in the opposition to it. He had the opportunity of hearing what farmers did say, and in the main it was—"Let us hear a little more about relief from local taxation, and never mind about tenancies." He trusted they would get the measure out of the way before the end of the Session, and that they would pass it not as an instalment, but as a final settlement of the question. If independent valuers were appointed under the Inclosure Commission, they would do their work far better than it was done at present by the valuers representing respectively the landlords and the farmers. A good deal was said about unexhausted improvements; but the word "improvements" was a misnomer, for a man worked a farm in order to get out of it the most that he could; and why should he expect to obtain more than the value of what he had put in during the last one or two years? It was, therefore, quite right that the Bill did not go further back. He could not admit that the Schedules were open to the objection that they were not minute enough. [Mr. CHAPLIN said, he had suggested a voluntary alternative, which might be taken, or might be left.] He did not quite like the term "voluntary alternative." With the allowances that had to be made for differences in localities and of seasons, it was impossible to lay down hard-and-fast lines. As to joint ownership, those who had read the Report of Mr. Jenkins, the Assistant Commissioner, on joint ownership in Denmark and Holland, would know that it was a failure in both those countries. It was said that the sitting tenant ought to be recompenced for the improvements he had made; but the sitting tenant had been master of the situation for some time, and he was quite able to take care of himself—indeed, the continuance of farms in the same family, and the readiness with which banks lent money, were two of the main reasons why farmers did not prosper. The farms passed to eldest sons, and the money made was given to younger children. The eldest son was left with nothing but the stock on the farm. As long as seasons were good he was all right; but when a bad season came there was no money to fall back upon, and it had to be borrowed from the bank. He would not detain the House further, but would only express his satisfaction with the Bill, and his confident hope that it would benefit both landlord and tenant alike.

MR. DONALDSON-HUDSON said, he was not by any means a friend to the Bill, because he did not believe it would confer any benefit whatever on the agricultural interest. But he did not view it with disfavour, because he thought it would commit no injury on any of the classes engaged in agriculture. He was convinced it was only a step to something further. There had been an assurance from the Treasury Bench that this was to be a final Bill on the subject; but, to show how opinions changed in a very few years, it was only necessary to call the attention of the House to the opinions expressed by hon. Members who sat opposite at the time when the Agricultural Holdings Bill of 1875 was introduced by Lord Beaconsfield. In the debates it was proposed by some hon. Members opposite that the provisions should be made compulsory. This was opposed by Lord Brabourne, and Lord Sherbrooke said the result would be to raise rents, and the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) said that so long as rent was left an open question any legislation in that direction must fail. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), in his speech at that time, said—

> "I should have very great objection to see the provisions of this Bill become compulsory, or the provisions of any other Bill on the subject made compulsory, because I believe this or any other Bill, if made compulsory, would limit in a most injurious manner the arrangements which ought to be made between landlord and tenant."—(3 *Hansard*, [225] 521.)

Well, it could be seen how the opinion of the noble Marquess had changed in the interval, for it was to be presumed he was a supporter of the present Bill; and was it not reasonable to suppose, although the Government had given an assurance that this was not a step to something further, that pressure would be applied at a future time which would compel them to adopt some measure which would be of the nature of fixity of tenure, because, if there was any truth in the statement that to make such a measure compulsory would have a tendency to raise rents, it stood to reason that such an agitation would be set on foot and as great a pressure would be brought to bear on the then Government as had been brought to bear against the Government of the present time? But he wished to briefly allude to a few of the provisions of the Bill, some of which decidedly needed improvement. It seemed to be of very great importance that when notice was given by the landlord to the tenant—notice requiring the tenant to supply an account of what he had expended—the tenant should at stated periods supply to him thorough accounts showing what he had spent on these improvements, and producing vouchers for the money he had expended in artificial manures or in feeding stuffs; for it seemed to him very unreasonable that the landlord should be called upon —as he must be in certain cases—to actually give the tenant on leaving his holding a larger sum than the tenant had expended in these improvements. There was another point which seemed to him a great blot in the Bill, and that was with regard to drainage. He would very much prefer to see the 2nd part of the Schedule, that which dealt with drainage, included in the 1st, in order that the consent of the landlord should be necessary to these very important works. But, failing that, if it should be decided that the tenant should have the power to execute the drainage works himself, provided the landlord did not execute them, it seemed to be a very unreasonable thing that the landlord should be called upon to do this drainage at a sum not exceeding 5 per cent, and for this reason—hon. Members knew that drainage did not last for ever, but for a period of from 20 to 30 years. Even the Drainage Companies limited the years over which they spread the drainage to something like 30 years; and he had known it to fail under 20 years. But, taking the period at 30 years, and allowing for the sinking fund to supply the capital to enable the parties to reconstruct the drainage when carried out, the sum of 5 per cent would only return an interest of something like 2½ per cent. It seemed quite unreasonable to expect a landlord to invest money in improvements on which he would only get 2½ per cent supposing they lasted 30 years, and under that if they only lasted 20 years. It was utterly unreasonable to compel him to expend his money upon such terms. The idea of many hon. Members opposite was that landlords, as a rule, were bad, that they dealt with their tenants in a very unjustifiable manner; but he thought it would be found on inquiry that landlords in far more instances than was supposed actually gave as good provisions to the tenants as were given to them under this Bill, with the exception of allowing them to drain. But even when these compensations were given, he did not find on these estates that there was such a perceptible improvement. He knew an estate of 20,000 acres, which, as soon as the Act of 1875 was passed, was put under the provisions of that Act, and yet he did not find that this estate was more a Garden of Eden than other estates in the neighbourhood. He therefore wished that hon. Members would dispossess themselves of the idea that as soon as this Bill came into operation the whole country would smile and become prosperous again. The Bill in itself was innocuous. He only hoped that care would be taken in Committee to prevent injustice to either of the classes whose interests ought to be consulted, the one quite as much as the other.

MR. DUCKHAM said, he had heard with great satisfaction the speeches from both sides approving this measure as a whole. The people had a right to expect that the best should be made of the soil; but he felt that until security for capital requisite to be invested in the cultivation of the soil was obtained, they could never hope to see the land made to yield its full increase. The Bill now before the House was a fair and good one, and was a great improvement upon the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. He thought that the several clauses of the Act to which it referred should be incorporated into it, and that we should have one good and comprehensive Act which farmers could understand, and not an Act referring to the provisions of another. He also thought that the Act should be made the one Act under which all agricultural holdings were regulated, instead of part being held under the Act, part under custom of the country, and part under private contract; and that those changes should be carried out at the termination of the present tenancies. Customs, where they existed, were very varied. They had been told that they were almost exclusively confined to Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, and Glamorganshire; but even in those counties they did not extend over the whole area. In the county of Glamorgan, he believed, they were limited to the Vale. The hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) had said that no tenants were raised upon their own improvements, that when rents were raised it was usually by their own consent and their own free will. He (Mr. Duckham) did not believe that any tenant ever put his head into the collar willingly to increase his burden. When the hon. Member made that remark, there was in the Gallery a son of an old friend of his who occupied an estate in the West of England, considerably over 1,000 acres. In good faith he drained the land, collected the water near the homestead to supply a water wheel for the use of his machinery to thrash his corn, &c. After incurring a heavy expenditure the estate changed hands, and he had to pay a greatly increased rental upon the improvements he had, in good faith, made. But that was not a solitary case. They had been told that in these times no landlord would be so absolutely mad as to turn a tenant out; but only recently he had heard of one being turned out because his dog caught a hare in the month of March of last year. The adoption of the Schedules in this Bill he considered an error, as they could not be rendered applicable to all counties, neither did they embrace all the improvements for which a tenant should be compensated. He considered that no practical man could have aided in drafting the Schedules in the Act of 1875. In illustration of his meaning he would mention the compensation for planting fences and orchards; the tenant was considered to be recouped the cost in 20 years, sinking 1-20th every year, so that if, at the expiration of 10 years, he had to leave the farm he would sacrifice one-half the cost, notwithstanding that he had incurred a continual expense during that period in protecting what he had planted, and without any corresponding benefit. He hoped that the permissive element would be removed from this Bill. The effect of permissive legislation was clearly shown in the working of the Act of 1875. He would not go so far as some did, and say that that Act had done no good, as he felt it had done great good, although generally its provisions were barred. It had educated the public mind; it had brought both landlord and tenant to consider what should be done, and what was requisite for the country. That something was requisite was manifest to all when they beheld the very miserable state in which large areas of the land in this thickly-populated nation were at the present time, and when they referred to the Agricultural Returns and saw that there were some 320,000 less cattle, 6,000,000 less sheep, and 600,000 acres less corn grown in Great Britain in the year 1882 than in 1874, to meet the wants of a greatly increased population; also that there was now about 1,750,000 acres more permanent pasture than there was at that time. It certainly behoved the Government to consider by what means this state of things could be rectified. But whilst legislating for the security of tenants' capital, deterioration of landlords' property should be guarded against. He felt that Clause 16 of the Bill was not sufficiently clear upon that point, that it followed too closely in the lines of the Act of 1875 that precluded a claim for depreciation being made unless the tenant first claimed compensation. The valuations, he considered, should be made by two men conversant with the locality, and, in the event of their disagreeing, application should be made to the Land Commissioners to appoint a competent person, who should take the evidence of the valuers and others, and whose award should be final, binding, and conclusive. When the Bill was introduced, they were told that the part relating to the Law of Distress was that of the Bill of the hon. Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland); but one important part of that Bill was omitted by the exception from distraint of an animal on the premises for breeding purposes. Agricultural machinery was proposed to be exempt, and surely the other should be. It had also proposed the Court of Summary Jurisdiction to adjudicate in cases of dispute. He thought the County Court should be substituted. The County Court was the Court for dealing with other matters connected with the Bill; it was the Court for replevin, and he felt it would be wrong to introduce another. Again, he had to complain that a clause he last year caused to be added to the Report of the Select Committee of the House which sat on the Law of Distress, empowering the tenant to deduct any claim for compensation he might have against his landlord from rent due, had not been introduced into the Bill. He felt that such a clause should be added. He had produced evidence before that Committee of two cases of extreme hardship. Neither of the tenants was insolvent. In one, the valuation made between landlord and tenant exceeded the balance of rent due. The tenant quitted the holding, expecting to be paid at an early date; but, instead of that, he was applied to for the rent. He unavailingly claimed exemption; his offgoing wheat crop was seized under distress for rent. His neighbours were so disgusted with the case that they raised a subscription; an action was brought against the landlord at the Hereford Assizes, the venue was removed to London, and the tenant had a considerable amount to receive. He thought the possibility of such a state of things should not be allowed to exist, and he hoped that some clause would be introduced into the Bill that would for the future prevent it. He should support the Bill.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I think, Sir, it is a matter of congratulation, not merely to Her Majesty's Government, but also to all hon. Members—and they are many on both sides of the House—who are convinced of the necessity of further legislation on this question, that the principle of this Bill has been so generally approved. There were, no doubt, two great exceptions to the approval with which it has been met, and they were the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. James Howard) and his follower and successor the hon. Member for East Cornwall (Mr. Borlase). Nothing could exceed the violence of the language with which those hon. Members denounced this measure. They talked of it as essentially a poor Bill; as a milk-and-water measure; as not straightforward, and not likely to create any enthusiasm in the country; and, perhaps, in that respect they may be right. I am glad this is a Bill which is not likely to create enthusiasm in the country. We should be extremely sorry if the Government had been so ill-advised, in attempting to settle a question which hitherto has not been approached as a Party question, as to bring in a Bill which would be acceptable to the hon. Member for Bedfordshire (Mr. J. Howard). But, after those violent denunciations, I was hardly surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the First Commission of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) commenced his very able exposition of the Bill by a depreciation of the Act of 1875. Now, I do not want to follow him in that matter. I agree with the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Duckham) that the Act of 1875 did very great good, not only in educating the country, as he expressed it, but also, where it was not itself adopted, in inducing landlords and tenants to come to an agreement on questions of compensation. But, Sir, Her Majesty's Government are themselves the best witnesses to the value of the Act of 1875. It is not too much to say that the Act of 1875 is the parent of this measure. My hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) has pointed out that there is nothing in this Bill not to be found in that Act, except that it makes compensation compulsory. The clauses of the Act of 1875 are, one after another, incorporated in this Bill, or else referred to in the measure; and I should wish, on that point, to join my appeal to that already made by my hon.

and gallant Friend the Member for West Gloucestershire (Colonel Kingscote), and by more than one other speaker in the course of this debate, that Her Majesty's Government would take heart in this matter, that they would repeal *in toto* the Act of 1875, that they would insert in this Bill all the provisions of that Act they desire to maintain, and that they would pass a Statute which, above all others, ought to be self-contained. There were two things in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works of which I was very glad to take note. The first was as distinct a repudiation as could well be of what I may call the germ principle, which the hon. Member for East Cornwall referred to as his justification for voting for this measure. Nothing could exceed the clearness and frankness with which the First Commissioner of Works laid down his total dissent from the principles of the Farmers' Alliance, and the determination of Her Majesty's Government that they would not introduce judicial rents, fixity of tenure, or the Irish system into the relations between English landlords and tenants. Well, Sir, I have no doubt that, after that clear and definite declaration, we shall not have to complain of Her Majesty's Government, as some hon. Members behind me seem to anticipate, assenting to any propositions, from whosoever they may come, which would be contrary to the principles laid down by the First Commissioner of Works. But there was another part of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman which I also heard with satisfaction. He gave no support whatever to what has been a very favourite contention of the many who have taken an active part in this question, and which, to my great astonishment, was repeated in the speech of the hon. Member for East Cornwall—namely, that, in the present state of agriculture, landlords can dictate their terms and tenants had only to accept them. A more ridiculous assertion was never made in this House. Anybody who knows anything of the condition of agriculture at the present time, in the South of England, at any rate, knows this—that if a tenant wishes his landlord to give him security, he can get it for the asking for it; that not only can he protect himself against an increase of rent, but if he wants a reasonable reduction of rent, in 99 cases out of 100, his landlord will be ready to give it him; that, so far from the tenant being in any danger of notice to quit, the landlord is the person who fears that notice to leave may be sent to him; that, in fact, the tenant, at the present time, is master of the situation, and would be the first to repudiate the proposition of the hon. Member for Bedfordshire, that a long notice to quit should be made compulsory on landlord and tenant. I only know this, that within the last three or four years instances have come under my own observation where tenants possessing the right to that notice which, in the absence of agreement to the contrary, the law now applies to all parties—namely, 12 months—have come to their landlord, and said—"The prospects of agriculture are so serious that we should be very glad if you would reduce the 12 months notice to six." It may be asked, "If this is the case, why should we legislate at all?" I answer that, in my opinion, there is nothing in the principle of this Bill which is inconsistent with justice, and that, although it may not be necessary at the present moment to provide by law security to a tenant for compensation for his unexhausted improvements, yet, for that reason, I am prepared to support the Bill. I take the principle of the Bill to be this—that, in some shape or other, either by this Act or by agreement, fair and reasonable compensation for unexhausted improvements shall be given. Well, now, that seems to me to be a principle which it is quite unnecessary to support by argument, after the reception which the second reading of this Bill has met with to night. I fully accept it; but what I should like to direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Dodson) to for a few moments, is the mode in which the Bill provides that compensation should be given. I confess it does appear to me that there is something entirely too vague and indefinite in the provisions of the Bill on this head, and that its result, if it is passed in its present shape, might be to cause that which everybody, whether landlord or tenant, would be only too desirous to avoid—namely, a very large amount of litigation, simply because neither party will be able to be quite certain of his position towards the other. Let me compare, on this matter, the provisions of this Bill with the provisions of the Act of 1875. The House will remember that, with regard to the three classes of improvements under the Act of 1875, a certain term of years was laid down in each case, after which the improvements were held to be exhausted. For the first class of improvements, there was a term of 20 years laid down; for the second class, a term of seven years; and for the third class, a term of two years. With respect to the first class, it was provided that the amount of the tenant's compensation should be the sum laid out by the tenant on the improvements, with a proportionate reduction for each year, while the tenancy endured. With regard to the second class, it was provided that the amount should be the sum properly laid out—and I wish to direct attention to the word properly—with a proportionate reduction for each year that the tenancy endured. With regard to the third class, it was provided that the compensation paid should fairly represent the value of the improvements to the incoming tenant. There were other safeguards as to improvements of the third class; their duration was not only limited to two years, but there was a proviso, that where an exhausting crop had been taken after the improvement had been effected, no compensation could be given. I do not wish to dwell upon the provisions of this measure so far as the first class, or permanent improvements, are concerned. The necessity of first obtaining the landlord's consent will practically govern the whole of that matter; but, I must say, I fully agree in the expression of regret which has fallen from more than one speaker in this debate, that Her Majesty's Government have thought fit to remove drainage from the class of permanent improvements, and permit it to be done by the tenant without the consent of the landlord. There seems to be an idea, on the part of some hon. Members, that all land in the country ought to be drained. Yet I have no doubt many hon. Members of the House, including the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dodson) himself, are acquainted with tracts of land in the chalk formation, where there are thousands and thousands of acres on which a drain would be a simply ridiculous thing. You find the same state of things on the light stone formation in other districts of the country. Ought a tenant, who may be under notice to quit, who may be desirous in every way of harassing and encumbering his landlord — ought a tenant to have power, in such a position as that, to make his landlord pay for a drain which would be absolutely useless? I find nothing in this Bill which would protect the landlord against such action on the part of his tenant. Why should drainage not be considered a permanent improvement? The matter was discussed by a Select Committee last year. I think the hon. Member for Herefordshire (Mr. Duckham) proposed that the tenant might be allowed to drain without his landlord's consent. The proposition was negatived by a large majority of that Committee, and the hon. Member for East Cornwall has very properly said this evening that irrigation and some kinds of buildings are often improvements on precisely the same footing, so far as regards permanence, as drainage, and that, therefore, if the landlord's consent be required in the one case, there can be no reason why it should not be required in the other. I trust the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster will either give us some reason we have not yet heard, why drainage should be separated from other permanent improvements, or consent to reconsider the matter, and put drainage where it was before; or, at least, that he will put in his Bill some provision to secure that drainage, where effected by the tenant without the landlord's consent, shall be properly executed, and that it shall not be effected by the tenant without the landlord's consent after notice to quit has been given. With regard to improvements of the second and third classes, now to be entirely comprised in the third class, I am bound to say that it seems to me that, in removing the necessity for notice to the landlord on such matters as were formerly classed as durable improvements, Her Majesty's Government have taken a course which will very materially add to the difficulties of the valuers or umpires or referees of the Court by whom the provisions of this Bill will have to be carried out. If it were required that notice should be given to the landlord, before these improvements were effected, the obvious result would be that a landlord would take care to have evidence to produce at the proper time, as to the manner in which they had been made, and the amount of compensation which should properly be awarded. Now, such evidence will probably be wanting, and therefore I think the right hon. Gentleman has made an alteration, which will scarcely tend to a just settlement, based on insufficient evidence. Sir, I must add that I do not think this class of improvements should be permitted, after notice to quit has been received or given by the tenant. Improvements of the third class are, practically the most important of all, because they are improvements which people all over the country have been in the habit of making. Yet, under this Bill, there is no guide whatever to the landlord, or tenant, or referee, or umpire, or County Court, as to the mode in which compensation for improvements of the third class shall be assessed, except that the compensation given is to represent the value thereof to the incoming tenant. No doubt there is great force in the argument, that the limit of 20 years, or seven years, possibly even of two years in the third class, as required by the Act of 1875, was sometimes too little. I can quite understand that proposition; but I do not understand why it should have been thought necessary by Her Majesty's Government, when dealing with that matter, to abolish the limit of time altogether, instead of extending it. It is obvious, surely, that the effect of improvements of the third class must be very limited in duration; that after five years, at any rate, such improvements must, in all cases, be exhausted, and that where an exhausting crop has been taken after the improvement was effected, the tenant should be debarred from compensation as is provided by the Act of 1875. I now come to the alternative which her Majesty's Government propose to this Bill. If the provisions of this Bill will be found vague and indefinite by those who have to interpret them, how much more is that true of the agreement securing the fair and reasonable compensation which is proposed as the alternative? I should very much like the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to inform us what he means by fair and reasonable compensation? Would he hold, for instance, that compensation under the provisions of the Act of 1875 would be fair and reasonable compensation? Supposing a landlord and tenant, at the commencement of the tenancy, agree together on certain terms, which to both of them appear to be fair and reasonable compensation for unexhausted improvements, whatever shape that compensation may take—suppose that, after many years, the tenancy comes to an end, and the tenant's representatives desire to repudiate the agreement. They bring the matter before the referees, and the umpire, and the Court, and the agreement which to both parties, when made, appeared fair and reasonable, may then be actually ruled to be nothing of the kind. It seems to me that such a result as that would be worse than absurd, because it would be a setting aside of an agreement entered into by both parties as a *bonâ fide* agreement. I will venture to make a suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman, which I think might very much facilitate the working of the Bill, and diminish the dangers of litigation, and it is this. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Gloucestershire (Colonel Kingscote) suggested that the valuers might be certified as efficient by the Inclosure Commissioners. I would suggest that the Inclosure Commissioners should be directed to draw up certain forms of agreement, providing compensation for unexhausted improvements, and that this Bill should refer to the forms of agreement so drawn up, as satisfying the provisions for fair and reasonable compensation. I believe it would be perfectly easy for gentlemen, with the experience of the Inclosure Commissioners, to deal with the question in that way. A landlord and tenant desirous, at the commencement of a tenancy, to come to an agreement which would be binding on both parties, and which would *bonâ fide* carry out the object aimed at by the Bill, would be then able to do so without any fear that the agreement would be repudiated at any future time. There have been some observations made in the course of the debate upon the Law of Distress. Well, I see no particular objection to the proposals contained in this Bill on the matter; but, I confess, I see no particular reasons why these proposals should have been inserted in the measure. I suspect there is a growing change of feeling in the agricultural mind upon this subject. I very much doubt if the abolition, or even an alteration, of the Law of Distress would be popular, at the present time, amongst as English farmers as it might have been five years ago. I have heard some remarks as to the effect which this Bill may have upon the fortunes of agriculture. The hon. Member for Herefordshire (Mr. Duckham) seemed to anticipate wonderful results from its working; and I think that, to the absence of such a measure, he attributed the diminution in our stock of cattle and sheep, and many other evils that have affected us. I am afraid, if we look into these matters very slightly, a good many of us may be of opinion that the losses of agriculturists on that head, at any rate, are far more due to a neglect of sufficient precautions against the introduction of disease from abroad, than to a want of security for compensation for unexhausted improvements. Again, I do not believe, as my hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Harcourt) has already said, that anything which is contained in this Bill is likely to prove as welcome to those who are engaged in agriculture as some relief from the burdens of local taxation. I doubt if the measure will very much relieve existing tenants. I am afraid that many of us know, to our cost, that during the last few years, the losses of existing tenants have been so heavy that, so far from having been able to expend capital in permanent or durable improvements, they have barely been able, if they have been able, to maintain their farms in a proper state of cultivation. I do not, in the least, believe there is any desire on the part of the tenantry of England to alter the existing system under which, very much to their benefit and their pecuniary gain, permanent improvements are effected by their landlords. On the other hand, I am not very confident as to the success of this measure in inducing capitalists to embark money in the pursuit of agriculture. I suspect there is something which far more deters capital from agriculture than any absence of legal security for improvements, and that is the unfortunate fact that, for some years past, agriculture has not been a paying pursuit. But, Sir, as a measure dealing solely with the question of compensation for improvements, as a measure dealing with it in its main principles, consistently, I believe, with the laws which up to the present time have regulated the relations between landlord and tenant in England, I am ready to give my hearty support to the second reading, and I shall certainly do my best to give what assistance I can to Her Majesty's Government in conducting the Bill through Committee.

MR. DODSON: It would be very ungrateful, Sir, on my part, after the favourable reception the Bill has met with from all quarters of the House, if I were now to detain the House by an unnecessarily long speech in support of, or in vindication of, the measure. I will, however, make one or two observations in answer to the speech, which was no exception certainly to the friendly character of the speeches this evening, which has just been made by the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). The right hon. Gentleman has pointed out that we are, in a great measure, indebted for the foundation of this Bill to the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. But we hope there will be this material difference between this Bill and the Act of 1875—that whereas the Act of 1875 has remained almost, if not entirely, inoperative, this measure will prove operative and practical. The right hon. Gentleman expressed the hope that Her Majesty's Government will adhere to the principle of the Bill, as laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), in the able speech which he delivered in the earlier part of the evening, and that we should not introduce the principles of the Irish Land Act into the land tenure in England. In further confirmation of what fell from my right hon. Friend, I would remind the right hon. Gentleman opposite and the House, that English-managed estates in Ireland are exempted from the provisions of the Irish Land Act; and, therefore, I do not think he need be under any apprehension that we shall apply the principles of the Irish Land Act to England. I should just like to say one word with regard to what has been said by some hon. Gentlemen who spoke early in the debate. It has been said that the Bill affords no protection to the sitting tenant. I maintain that, economically, the Bill does protect the sitting tenant. If a landlord proposes to raise the rent, and the tenant objects, on the ground that a part of the rise of rent is due to his improvements, what happens? The landlord must give the tenant notice to quit; and, if so, he must either provide a lump sum to pay the compensation for the improvements, or he must find a tenant to come in who will do it. If the landlord has other funds besides his land, and can provide a lump sum himself, he must sacrifice as much in interest upon the money as he will gain by the rise of rent. On the other hand, if he finds an incoming tenant to pay the money, that incoming tenant will say—"I can afford to pay so much less rent." Now, let me put another example. Let us suppose that you frame some clauses that are to protect the sitting tenant against a rise of rent for his improvements. If you put a sitting tenant in the position that he is the only man in England from whom a landlord cannot obtain an increase of rent, you make it directly the landlord's interest to get rid of the tenant, and you do not improve the position of the tenant by that. If the state of the market for farms was such that a landlord could obtain a given increase of rent; but you provide that in the case of the sitting tenant that increase shall be reduced by a certain amount, the landlord will either cut the knot by giving notice to that tenant, or he will pitch his demand for an increased rent at such a figure as to discount the amount which he knows will be taken off for the tenant's improvements. The fact is, that when you come to argue the matter out, you will find this—that the actual and only practical protection any proposal that has been made gives to the tenant against an increase of rent is the compensation which is provided by the Bill, or that, if you are to do it otherwise, you cannot stop short of fixity of tenure and judicial rents. ["No, no!"] Some hon. Gentlemen say "No, no;" but all I can say is, that I have not seen any effectual proposal intermediate between the two. The right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), in criticizing our proposal that the measure of compensation should be the value of the improvements to the incoming tenant, said it was too vague. We had purposely made it general, and we think that is the merit of it. We think that you cannot properly lay down a definite rule, applicable to all parts of the country, and to different soils, and to different conditions of agriculture. We wish to lay down a broad principle and an elastic rule, which will be generally applicable; and we think this rule of value to the incoming tenant is the most elastic, most equitable, and most sound that we can take. As I stated the other night, if a tenant lays out money wisely and successfully, he is entitled to compensation; on the other hand, if he lays out money unwisely and unsuccessfully I do not think he is entitled to compensation, and we do not provide he shall receive it. We think it undesirable to introduce, as the principle of our rule, the limit of outlay, or the limit of period. The right hon. Baronet adverted particularly to the question of drainage; and he asked me, if I did not know a good deal of land which did not require drainage? Of course, I know there is a good deal of land which it would be as absurd to drain as to plough the sea-shore and sow it with salt; but then comes in the virtue of our principle. If a tenant were foolish enough to lay out his money in draining the South Downs, for instance, either before or after notice to quit had been served, there would be no value, he would have wasted his money, and he would receive no compensation. The right hon. Baronet also spoke of the alternatives, and said they were vague. First of all, as to the principle of the Bill, in allowing compensation under agreement to be substituted for compensation under the Act. We think that the permitting such alternative arrangement does not detract materially from the efficiency of the Bill; because the compensation which is substituted is to be substantial and *bonâ fide* compensation. But we think that to allow such other compensation to be substituted as may be for the convenience of the parties will make the Bill much more acceptable and juster to both, and, at the same time, encourage the application of capital to the soil, and not discourage it, as some hon. Gentlemen seem to think. It remains to me to say one word on the subject of the Law of Distraint. A Committee of this House recommended the limitation of distress to one year; we have followed that recommendation. The Royal Commission which inquired into this subject also reported against its abolition; but in favour of the period being reduced to two years. We have, therefore, two bodies of great weight, who have inquired into the matter, reporting against the abolition of distraint. One word upon this from the landlord's point of view. As long as we are to have a classification of debts with regard to mortgages and other matters, I think the landlord may fairly claim to have some place in that classification on account of rent, because it must be remembered that he cannot recover the possession of his property all at once; he can only recover it twice in the year, while his debt is one that accrues from day to day. I do not, however, look upon this matter of abolition or non-abolition of distraint as mainly a landlords' question. Should it be abolished, the landlord will have it in his power to protect himself by taking caution money, or advances, or otherwise, for the payment of his rent. But it is really a question more particularly between large tenants and small tenants. The existing law is an advantage, to a certain extent, to the smaller tenant, because he can, as it were, obtain by means of it a loan from his landlord for a certain period of time without interest. It has been said that the existing law is very unfair to other creditors. Well, I think there is some force in that argument, when one considers that the limitation, under the present law, stands at six years; but if we reduce it, as the Bill proposes, to one year, I think that, without altogether depriving the poorer tenant of advantage, we take away the objection in regard to the creditors almost entirely, because any creditor dealing with the tenant will know the maximum of preference there can be over his claim—he will know there can only be one year's rent. In conclusion, I can only thank the House for the favourable reception that has been accorded to the Bill, stating, at the same time, that although I shall not fix the Committee stage at too early a date, it will be taken soon enough to allow the details of the measure to be fully dealt with.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* 11th June.

UNION OF BENEFICES ACT (1860) AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 183.]

(*Mr. George Russell, Mr. Edward Stanhope.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. George Russell.*)

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he thought that this Bill, which proposed so many material alterations of the Act now in force, and other fresh matter, should not be taken at that late hour of the night. He also entered his protest against proceeding with the Bill then, because the second reading, on Tuesday last, had been obtained by what he might call a snatch process. Several hon. Members who intended to oppose, and had given Notice of opposition to the Bill, having left the House, in the belief that the second reading of the Bill would not be taken. Further, the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. George Russell) having, as a new Member, not a great experience in these matters had given the House no explanation of the object and provisions of the Bill. Under these circumstances, he felt it his duty to move the Adjournment of the Debate.

MR. WARTON said, he rose for the purpose of seconding the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate. The question dealt with in the Bill was of very great importance; and he would only say, with reference to the second reading, that it was taken by an extraordinary accident. Under the peculiar circumstances of the case, he thought they should not then go into Committee on the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL said, it had been erroneously stated that he had agreed to postpone the Bill; but, as a matter of fact, he said that if the Bill did not come forward on Tuesday evening he should proceed with it this day. So far as he was concerned, there was certainly no breach of faith in proceeding with it last Tuesday, although he himself was not personally a party to the proceeding. As he would not be in Order now in endeavouring to remedy the defect which the right hon. and learned Gentleman who moved the Adjournment of the Debate had referred to, he would venture to submit that his present object was to advance the Bill a stage, without proceeding to any final issue with regard to the details of the measure; and he would respectfully point out that, if the House would consent to the Motion for going into Committee, no harm could possibly be done, while the promoters of the Bill would be much gratified.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, he hoped his right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) would not press his Motion. His right hon. and learned Friend had called the Bill hard names; but he (Mr. W. H. Smith) believed that, on the whole, it was one of the best of its kind that had been introduced into the House; and, therefore, he trusted that Mr. Speaker would be allowed to leave the Chair, on the assurance given by the hon. Member for Aylesbury (Mr. George Russell) that no progress would be made that night in Committee, and on the understanding that, on a future occasion, there would be ample opportunity for discussion.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said, the House was aware that the second reading stage of the Bill was passed without any explanation being given by the hon. Member in charge of the measure. The Bill was by no means a simple one, and a casual examination of it showed that it took up a very obnoxious position. He could not then go into the principles of the Bill; but he contended that an opportunity should be given for that purpose, seeing that the last stage had been taken without any discussion at all. So far as the leading features of the measure were concerned; he believed that it would be found to be objectionable from almost every point of view. Amongst other things, it presented the extraordinary proposal that tests should be applied. He should never have expected that his hon. Friend the Member for Aylesbury (Mr. George Russell) would have committed himself to any measure that subjected candidates in this country to new religious tests. Hon. Members would agree with him that a measure of that character ought to undergo a searching investigation in the House. As a matter of fact, the second reading had not been passed at all; the whole subject was in obscurity; and as long as that continued he should not shrink from what he regarded as his duty in opposing the progress of the Bill. Besides these grounds of objection, there was the strongest reason for opposing the Motion to advance a Bill of that character at such an untimely hour.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, he was somewhat amused to notice that hon. Gentlemen who complained in one breath that they had not had any explanation of the Bill with the next took the very course to prevent any explanation being given.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he rose to point out that this was a very important Bill in the interest of the Church. No explanation had been given of its provisions on the second reading; and he understood that the hon. Member for Aylesbury (Mr. George Russell) had now moved that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair without tendering any explanation. The course which had been followed was most unusual, especially in the case of Bills of this character. Doubtless, the Bill was a good one; but that was no reason why they should depart from the ordinary practice of the House, to evade which so many attempts had been made of late.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, they could not expect that the House would agree to go into Committee on the Bill without receiving an explanation, either on the second reading or on this stage. He understood, however, that the hon. Member for Aylesbury (Mr. George Russell) would now be prepared to shortly state the objects of the Bill, if he were allowed to do so; therefore, it would not be unreasonable to withdraw the Motion for Adjournment. After hearing the hon. Gentleman's statement, the House would be in a better position to say whether the discussion should be taken to-night or not.

Question put.

The House *divided;*—Ayes 33; Noes 44: Majority 11.—(Div. List, No. 107.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. ONSLOW said, he begged now to move the Adjournment of the House. He could honestly tell his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. George Russell) that he knew very little indeed about the Bill; but he was adopting a course consistent to the practice he had always taken in the House—namely, of opposing Bills containing such clauses as the 7th clause in this Bill, when they were brought on without explanation. If he went through the Bill he might approve of it; but, whether it was a good measure or not, it was a monstrous thing, and utterly futile, to pass it without a single word of explanation. He was in the House when, amidst the cheers of its supporters, it was read a second time, without a word having been previously said in explanation of it. If the House was to pass Bills of this kind, they ought, at least, to have them discussed.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he was very grieved to hear the remarks of his hon. Friend (Mr. George Russell) on this subject. It was unusual to proceed with a Bill when there was so large a minority against its being proceeded with. It was unwise to force the Committee stage of a measure of this kind on the House without discussion. He begged to second the Motion for the Adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Onslow.*)

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL said, he had gathered the sense of hon. Gentlemen sitting around him; and from that, and what he understood to be the feeling of hon. Members on the other side of the House, it would seem that it was no use proceeding with the measure. He wished to repudiate the charge, which some hon. Members persisted in urging against him, that he had treated the House with disrespect. ["No, no!"] He was glad to hear that denial; but, no doubt, a great deal had been said about the manner in which the Bill had been pushed on. If he had been in the House when it was read a second time he should have explained its provisions. As he now saw a determination on the other side to prevent their going on any further with the Bill, he must reluctantly submit to a postponement. He should have been glad to have taken the Committee stage even formally; but as hon. Members would not consent to that, he would agree, if the Motion for the Adjournment of the House were withdrawn, to move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. George Russell,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Tuesday* next.

LANDS CLAUSES (UMPIRE) BILL.

(*Mr. Dodds, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Coddington.*)

[BILL 160.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. WHITLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was one requiring very few words in explanation, as it was not, so far as he was aware, opposed. The object of the measure was to extend the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, so that the same rule should apply to lands taken by Corporations and local bodies as now applied to Railways — namely, where arbitrators differed, to allow the Board of Trade to appoint an umpire, instead of two Justices, as at present. The measure had the approval of all Municipal Corporations, and of the Board of Trade.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Whitley,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

FRIENDLY, &c. SOCIETIES (NOMINATIONS) BILL.

(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Burt, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Northcote.*)

[BILL 117.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY, in moving, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," said, he believed there was no opposition to the Motion. If the Motion were carried, he would at once agree to Progress being reported.

Motion made, and Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Stuart Wortley,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

LORD ALCESTER (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY).

Resolution [May 28] *reported,* and *agreed to.*

Instruction to the Committee on Lord Alcester's Annuity Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.

LORD WOLSELEY (GRANT IN LIEU OF ANNUITY).

Resolution [May 28] *reported,* and *agreed to.*

Instruction to the Committee on Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 30*th May,* 1883.

Their Lordships met for the despatch of Judicial Business only.

House adjourned at a quarter before Four o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 30*th May,* 1883.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Commons [No. 186]; *Second Report*—Public Accounts [No. 187].

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Commons and Inclosure Acts Amendment (No. 2) *.

Ordered—First Reading — Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) * [203]; Statute of Frauds Amendment * [204].

First Reading—Medical Act (1858) Amendment* [205].

Second Reading—Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham) [21]; Labourers (Ireland) [29]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Yorkshire) [56], *debate adjourned.*

Committee—Report—Lands Clauses (Umpire) * [160].

Report—Local Government (Gas) Provisional Order * [164]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) * [170]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) * [176].

Third Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) * [149], and *passed.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (DURHAM) BILL.—[BILL 24.]

(*Mr. Theodore Fry, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Lambton, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Thomas Richardson, Mr. Gourley, Mr. T. C. Thompson.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. THEODORE FRY: I rise, Sir, to move the second reading of the Bill for the closing of public houses on Sundays in the county of Durham; and I hope that, in doing so, I shall not have to trespass at any great length on the kind indulgence of the House. I ought to say, in the first place, that no one regrets more than I do—and this is the case, I believe, with all the promoters of this measure—that it has been found needful to introduce a Bill dealing with one county only. We should very much have preferred that the debate had taken place upon the Bill of my hon Friend the Member for South Shields (Mr. Stevenson), which seeks to confer the blessing of Sunday Closing upon the whole of England; but he has not hitherto been successful in obtaining a day for its second reading. I will admit, at the outset, as fully as any hon. Member can wish, that, in most cases, sectional legislation is not desirable, because it would lead to great difficulty if one law existed in one county and another in another; but the principle of sectional legislation has been affirmed over and over again, so far as the whole Kingdom is concerned, even on questions of far greater magnitude than Sunday Closing. For the three divisions of the Empire we have constantly Bills introduced affecting one or two only; and where differences already exist, as in the case of our Marriage Laws, with such far-reaching consequences, little or no attempt has been made at assimilation. The same applies to our Bankruptcy Laws, the franchise, and many other points. As regards the question before us, this House has affirmed the desirability, in many cases, of sectional legislation; and I trust that some of the Members from Scotland and Ireland will, in the course of the debate, bring forward their testimony with regard to the benefits which Sunday Closing has conferred on their respective countries. Thirty years ago the well known Forbes-Mackenzie Act was passed for Scotland. In 1878 the Irish Sunday Closing Bill received the sanction of the Legislature; two years ago the same boon was granted to the Municipality of Wales; only last year a Bill for the same object in the county of Cornwall passed the second reading, with the sanction of Her Majesty's Government; and this year the five large cities and towns of Ireland, which had been previously excluded, are to be included by the Government in the Irish Act. If we need any further corroboration of this point we have only to consider the action of this House in reference to the Resolution which has been introduced by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), and which has passed with increasing majorities on each of the three occasions that it has been before this Parliament. I trust that this House will express the same opinion with regard to this measure now before it, for the closing of public-houses on Sundays in counties is simply giving effect to that Resolution on a small scale for one day in the week. We know that a great many of our Colonies have also adopted Sunday Closing within the limits of their jurisdiction. It has been so in Tasmania, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, and, perhaps, in other places; and I scarcely think that these Colonies, unless they saw benefit arising, would be inclined to retain it. The result of the Scotch law is so well known that I need not give figures, which are always unwelcome; but I will ask the House to allow me to repeat the result of three years in which Sunday Closing in Ireland has been a fact. Whether all I am about to point out is to be attributed to that I cannot say; but probably a great deal is, and I think no better testimony could be given of the value of the Act than the fact that the Government are now intending to apply it to the five large towns and cities. In 1877 the drink consumed in Ireland was of the value of £12,196,915; whereas, in 1882, it was only of the value of £11,042,520, showing a decrease of £1,154,395. Of course, as I have said, I do not attribute the whole of this decrease to Sunday Closing, as there are other agencies at work in Ireland, just as there are in England, which tend to decrease the consumption of intoxicating liquor; but, no doubt, a large amount of the decrease may be put down to Sunday Closing. We must bear in mind that in the largest towns Sunday Closing was not in operation, or only partially, the public-houses remaining open two hours less than formerly. Now, let us take the cases of conviction for drunkenness in Ireland during the three and a-half years before Sunday Closing, and three and a-half years after it. We find that there has been a reduction of 57 per cent, the number of cases having been respectively 15,942 and 6,788, showing a decrease of 9,154. In the five cities not included in the Sunday Closing Act the cases of drunkenness during the first period were 9,870, and during the second 6,573, showing a reduction of 3,297, or 33 per cent. With regard to the result in Wales, I will say only one sentence, for the reason that, as yet, we have no statistics to guide us. I have, however, been favoured with a telegram from one of the delegates present at a large public meeting which was held last night in Swansea, where numerous testimonies were given to the success of Sunday Closing, and the benefits it was bestowing upon the country. Public opinion is ripening on this question, and it is evident it is one which the Government must very soon take up and carry to a successful issue; but, in the meantime, I wish to show that in the county of Durham it is as ripe as it was in other parts of the Kingdom when Sunday Closing was granted them. It is, indeed, so overwhelmingly strong that we have fair claim to come before this House and ask for this special legislation on our own behalf. I hope, therefore, that the House will not any longer withhold from us the possession of the same advantages which it has already accorded to our fellow-countrymen in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. We are as ready in the county of Durham for the adoption of the Sunday Closing Act as they were in Ireland and Wales when it was granted to them. The public opinion of the county, I imagine, is best shown by the fact that, out of its 13 Representatives in this House, 12 are pledged to support the measure; and the 13th, who has not given in his adhesion, is now wavering, and will, I trust, feel justified in joining the rest at the close of the debate. The measure is not one which we have pressed upon our constituents. We have not specially advocated it, or even suggested it; but it has been pressed upon us by the force of public opinion—by those who have sent us here, as I hope to show. The population of Durham, according to the last Census, was 867,586. Of these, the boroughs of Gateshead, Sunderland, Durham, Hartlepool, Jarrow, Stockton, and Darlington absorb 343,551. How is public opinion better shown than by the fact that, with the exception of that of the City of Durham—and I believe in that case there has been an oversight —the Town Councils of every borough have petitioned in favour of the Bill? Every Board of Guardians in the county has either this year, or in some previous year, signed a Petition to this House in favour of this Bill, or the Sunday Closing Bill for England. There are in the county 170 parishes; and of these 133, with, in most cases, the clergymen at its head, have taken up the matter exceedingly warmly. I am told that of the parishes only one has altogether declined to support the Sunday Closing Bill. Some have not identified themselves with the Petitioners, as they do not think the Bill goes far enough; some object to the *bonâ fide* traveller's clause; and others have held themselves aloof from other causes. We have got with us not only clergymen of the Church of England, but ministers of all denominations. The Bishop of the Diocese is President of the Society promoting the Bill, and with him is associated the Dean and Archdeacon, and other very well known personages in the district. We have the manufacturers and employers of labour with us, and are able to state that the working people of the county are themselves the people who have asked for the measure. Neither the Members of Parliament, the magistrates, nor the clergy have originated this Bill. It has originated from the people themselves, who desire not to live under this temptation on the Sunday, and that this reproach shall be removed from them. There have been about 100 Petitions from public meetings, and the signatures attached have been 1,617 in number, in very many cases the signatures having only been those of chairmen on behalf of the meetings. I had the honour to present a Petition yesterday containing 140,000 signatures all but 15; and that number would have been enormously increased had it not been for similar agencies at work in the county at the same time. A number of signatures from the county of Durham were attached to the Petitions presented by the hon. Member for South Shields, numbers to the Wesleyan Petition, the Presbyterian Petition, and the British Women's Temperance Petition. Altogether, it may be fairly estimated that 200,000 of the people of Durham have petitioned in favour of legislation on the subject of Sunday Closing, either for the county, or the whole of England; and this must, in itself, be a sufficient refutation to those gentlemen who maintain that we have not the working classes with us. With regard to the house-to-house canvass, we have obtained no fewer than 60,000 ayes and 2,440 noes, 2,124 being neutral, which gives only 4 per cent of noes, or 7 per cent no and neutral, and 96 per cent in favour of Sunday Closing, taking only the ayes and noes, or 93 per cent, taking the ayes, noes, and neutrals. The result of a canvass in one pit village showed that 1,657 persons were in favour of Sunday Closing, 59 were against, and 32 were neutral, which gives 3 per cent of noes, and 5 per cent of noes and neutrals. Let me give a few statistics of the results of an impartial house canvass. In 1882, in Barnard Castle, which is an agricultural town, it was found that there were 592, including 6 publicans, ayes; 39, including 4 publicans, noes; and 47, including 5 publicans, neutrals. In 1868 the result of a canvass in Darlington was 2,682 ayes, 171 noes, and 113 neutrals. In 1878, in Stockton, there were 3,590 ayes, 308 noes, and 267 neutrals. In Jarrow, in 1880, there were 2,683 ayes, 210 noes, and 164 neutrals. In 25 places the numbers were, ayes 16,892, noes 1,317, and neutrals 966. In the large borough of Gateshead, the second largest in the county, a Return was made to the effect that only three publicans were opposed to Sunday Closing. Objection will probably be taken to this Bill on the ground of its sectional character; but similar feeling to that exhibited in Durham has been shown in Yorkshire and Northumberland, two contiguous counties, from both of which similar proposals have emanated. The population of the three counties amounts to 4,187,917, or one-sixth of the whole English population, so that we cannot be said to be asking for very small or sectional legislation. We are asking for a measure in the interest of a population three or four times as large as that of the Principality of Wales; and if our request is listened to, and it is found to work well—as I am sure it would be—the Secretary of State for the Home Department would have something to go upon in proposing the extension of the Act to the whole of the country. The passing of this measure would be exceedingly helpful to the right hon. and learned Gentleman when the Bill of the hon. Member for South Shields comes before the House. Hon. Gentlemen have asked whether there is any opposition? There is some opposition; but I believe it is of the smallest character. A few Petitions have been presented against the Bill—an exceedingly small number; I cannot tell how many, as I have not been able to trace them; but exceedingly few have come from the county itself. The testimony we have received on the other side has been overwhelming. One gentleman writes—

> "After 36 years' experience of working men, by far the larger majority of the best men are in favour of the Bill."

Another—

> "The universal wish is for the passing of the Bill."

I have several other quotations here; but I will not trouble the House with all of them. A gentleman was asking me what evidence we had that the working men are in favour of this Bill. Mr. Crawford, Secretary to the Miner's Union, writes—

> "I am quite sure that, if balloted, an overwhelming majority of working men would vote for Sunday Closing."

Mr. Jenkins, the able manager of very extensive works in the county, employing 6,000 hands, and representing a population of about 25,000 persons, says—

> "A very considerable majority of the householders in this district are in favour of the measure. There are about 50,000 to 60,000 persons dependent on the coal and iron in the country; and, having spent a lifetime with working men, I am firmly of opinion that public-houses should be closed on Sundays."

Mr. Theodore Fry

There is one aspect of the question which is not a pleasant one to dwell upon, but it has an important bearing on the argument; and that is, the drunkenness found to pervade the country. I am sorry to say that amongst the rural population drunkenness exists in Durham to a greater extent than in any other county. It is at the top of the tree in regard to convictions for drunkenness. According to a recent Return, we find that in 1881 the convictions in Durham were 9,124, or 15 per 1,000, In Lancashire they were 11 per 1,000, whilst in Essex and Cambridge they were only 1 per 1,000. Sunday cases in Durham were 1,015, whilst in Cambridge they were only nine, with one-fifth of the population, or, speaking proportionately, about 40 to 1. Perhaps we should not wonder at the disproportion of these figures when we remember the different character of the population and the many who have only Sunday and a portion of another day above ground. But, Sir, I fear I have already trespassed too long on the indulgence of the House. It is needless to speak of the terrible evils of intemperance. They are admitted on all sides. Our Judges, our magistrates, our ministers, and the whole army of Christian workers throughout the country bear united testimony to the fact. We cannot spend £130,000,000 a-year in drink—of which a large portion is admitted by all to be unnecessary so far as either health or rational use are concerned — without thousands of people being annually consigned to the drunkard's grave. The question is—Can legislation assist to withstand this demon of drunkenness—"a demon worse than war, pestilence, and famine?" We believe we can do much; and we ask the House, to-day, to enable us to make the experiment, in one important county, of trying whether the prohibition of the sale of drink on Sunday may not be one means of attaining an end desired by all. This is a measure which the inhabitants of the county are practically unanimous in asking. It is only a question of time; it is a fight of light against darkness, of good against evil, of that which is of good report against that which is evil; and we ask the House no longer to hesitate when such tremendous issues are at stake. I thank the House for the patience with which they have listened to my speech, and beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Theodore Fry.*)

MR. WARTON, who had a Notice on the Paper to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, said, that, notwithstanding the eloquent peroration of the hon. Member in charge of the Bill (Mr. Theodore Fry), he must call the attention of the House to a few dry, and, he hoped he might say, sober facts. He quite understood, and did not in any degree wonder at, the adroitness with which the hon. Member glided over the question of statistics, and had only dealt with them cursorily. It was much easier to go to certain picked villages in Durham, than to deal with an entire country where a Sunday Closing Act had been in operation for upwards of three years. That was a curious argument, by which the hon. Member attempted to prove the necessity for this piecemeal legislation, by the fact that the Ministry had brought forward a Bill that Session to render the Irish Sunday Closing Bill permanent, and to extend its provisions to certain towns and cities previously exempted from its operation. What the Ministry did was no criterion on a question of statistics, and amounted to very little as an indication of what was right or proper. Further than that, as to statistics, everybody knew that they could not be relied upon, as they could generally be made to tell in any required direction. But the whole question of Sunday Closing had been tested in Ireland; and, having regard to the area, as well as the time the Act had been in operation in that country, he was not at all surprised the hon. Gentleman had not ventured to quote pertinent statistics, but had confined himself to those which had nothing to do with the question—namely, the falling-off in the consumption of liquor by a decreasing population. In Ireland, in the exempted cities and towns, there had been a positive decrease of 13 per cent in the arrests for drunkenness, while there had been an increase of 21 per cent in the non-exempted places. The Irish Judges' Charges to Grand Juries, at the recent Assizes, indicated that, in the Sunday closed districts, the increase of drunkenness still proceeded; while, in the exempted cities, an exactly opposite result formed the subject of congratulation from the Judicial Bench. The Police Reports upon which these Charges were based included the first quarter of the present year; and they showed that 1883 was not unlikely to reach the highest figures of intemperance ever before reached in rural Ireland. Lord Justice Fitzgibbon and Judge O'Brien in Munster, Baron Dowse in Leinster, and Judge Harrison in Ulster, had all the same story to tell —a great increase of drunkenness in the counties. The case was summed up by Lord Justice Fitzgibbon at Cork, at the close of the Munster Assizes. His Lordship, after congratulating the City Grand Jury on the decline of intemperance, said—

> "It is not for me to speculate on the causes of this change—a change, however, by no means peculiar to your City; for it is a remarkable fact that, throughout this Munster Circuit, in every rural county there has been an increase, in some instances extremely large, in the number of convictions for intoxication, while in the City of Limerick and the City of Cork there has been a most remarkable diminution."

He (Mr. Warton) agreed with the hon. Member for Darlington that a great deal of nonsense was talked about Petitions; and although, in this case, a great many had doubtless been presented, yet he did not place much faith in them. Some of them might be genuine and some spurious; and they, that day, had placed before them examples of Petitions done up with blue ribbon. But, passing away from that subject, he was glad to find the Government so ably represented on the present occasion by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, because he (Mr. Warton) was anxious to call attention to something directly affecting that right hon. and learned Gentleman. He wished to take the opportunity of reading an uncorrected extract from a speech made by the right hon. and learned Gentleman to a deputation from Cumberland, Durham, Yorkshire, Monmouthshire, Cornwall, and the Isle of Wight. Of course, he (Mr. Warton) was not told who was there; but he saw, amongst others, that the hon. Gentleman who moved the second reading of this Bill was present. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would explain what that speech meant, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman's delicacy of feeling prevented his doing so himself. To his (Mr. Warton's) own mind, the language was most extraordinary. The members of the deputation came before the right hon. and learned Gentleman, to ask him to grant them facilities for proceeding with Sunday Closing legislation. The House well knew what that phrase meant. It meant that these Gentlemen might obtain, somehow or other, some time to which they were not entitled. He appreciated, so far, the right hon. and learned Gentleman's reply, when he said—"So far as giving you facilities, we are rather in the position of asking for them ourselves." That was fair enough; but next came the sting in the tail. "He would ask these influential gentlemen"—flattery went a long way in this world—"who represented so many parts of the Kingdom"—that was, all these sectional counties that enjoyed Sunday Closing—"and so many interests and sections of thought and sections of Party, to combine"—who was to combine them?—"to give to the Government and to the Legislature"—the Government first—"such facilities as would enable them to carry out legislation in this and other Departments." What that meant was this. There were two ways of translating the speech—the Scotch way and the American way. The Scotch way was—"I'll scratch you, if you'll scratch me;" and the American—"You roll my log, and I'll roll yours." And so the position of this powerful Ministry, which gained such a tremendous majority, was reduced to this—"We are not going to consider this question on its merits; but as you represent so many sections of thought"—of course, the right hon. and learned Gentleman gave them credit for thought, because that was another piece of compliment—"and so many sections of Party, if you will only combine to give us facilities, we will do the same for you." Was that high principle? It might be the doctrine of expediency; but a Government must be in a sorry position before resorting to such aid. He would say nothing about the Kilmainham Treaty, because they were told, upon high authority, that there was no such thing; but he supposed that, after this, they would have a Treaty of Durham negotiated by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. Politeness always flowed from the lips of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, when he had something to gain by it for his Party. But such manifestations showed the weakness of Her Majesty's Government, who were trying to hunt with the hare and hold with the hounds—the same Government who were prepared to sacrifice the health of the troops to the dictates of cant—and the hope of these fanatics appeared to lie in that weakness. But there was one argument that had been used on the present occasion in favour of the Bill *ad nauseam*, and that was, of course, based upon the Petitions in its favour; but everybody knew how those Petitions were got up, and that many of the signatories were women and children, who were not fit to have an opinion. But, admitting that a large number of persons in the county of Durham—nay, supposing even that a majority of the inhabitants—were in favour of the Bill, he (Mr. Warton) said that even that argument ought not to be decisive in a matter of this kind. He said that a statesman, who carried on the Government of the country on high moral principles, ought not to look merely to a majority in a particular district, because where was that kind of thing to stop? What was to be the limit? If they gave Sunday Closing to the county of Durham, because it was represented to be a particularly drunken county, how could they refuse it to a village, if the same plea of drunkenness were put forward? They had already a Bill for the Isle of Wight, which was less than a county; and nobody knew what was the vague and never-yet-defined area which the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) meant by his "locality" for the purposes of Local Option. The word "locality" was vague, and so was the word "inhabitants," which might mean responsible ratepayers, or might mean a parcel of women and children; and in this convenient atmosphere of vagueness the whole scheme was wrapped up. He asked distinctly, had the Government given way to that principle of Local Option or not? If they had, why did they not bring in a Bill themselves to establish Sunday Closing all over the country? If they had not, why did they not object to these county Bills, resolutely and firmly? He remembered that, during the first year of their being in Office, they put up the hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick (Mr. A. Peel), to argue against sectional legislation, which the hon. Member did, very ably and powerfully; so that when the Government were strong they objected to it, but now, he was afraid, they would not stick to their text. Probably they felt that they must carry something or other this Session, now that they had thrown over so much cargo to lighten the sinking ship. But, if they did not intend to favour these fractional measures, let them put their foot down plainly and straightforwardly. Let them show that they were guided by a principle; and then, if they only kept their supporters a little more in hand, they might be able to prevent a repetition of these pitiable spectacles of a number of sensible men, animated by a spirit of fanaticism, trying to foist upon the Legislature ridiculous measures of this kind.

MR. W. H. JAMES: Sir, not much has fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) that any hon. Member of the House need deal with; and the House is quite familiar with the various forms of opposition indulged in by the hon. and learned Member, not only with respect to Bills like the one now before the House, but with respect to other measures; and I also think the opinions he expresses are perfectly well understood, not only within these walls, but by the bulk of the people outside. There are one or two matters, however, upon which I should like to say a few words. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport has quoted from a statement that has been circulated this morning, amongst hon. Members, by one of the Licensed Victuallers' Protection Association. That statement demonstrates that, in the past year, there has been a considerable increase of drunkenness in Ireland, attributable, according to this statement, to Sunday Closing. We are all familiar with the very peculiar circumstances of Ireland last year; and everyone must be aware that, in times of great excitement and popular disturbance, it is probable there will be more drunkenness, and that the evils of drink will be more aggravated than at any other particular time; and, therefore, those who support this measure have a little reason to complain that garbled and delusive statistics of this nature and kind should be brought before the House just before the introduction of this Bill. The statement merely contrasts the year 1881 with the year 1882. If the House will take the three and a-half years before and the three and a-half years after the passing of the Sunday Closing Act for Ireland, it will be found that the arrests for drunkenness on Sunday stood thus—There were 15,942 arrests in the three and a-half years prior to the Sunday Closing Act, and in the three and a-half years after the passing of that Act there were only 6,788, showing a reduction of 9,156, or at the rate of 57 per cent. In the exempted cities there has been a great reduction since the shortening of the hours. For instance, there were 9,870 arrests for drunkenness in the three and a-half years previous to the passing of the Act; whilst there were only 6,573 in the three and a-half years after the passing of the Act, a reduction of 33 per cent. If you examine the Criminal and Judicial Returns for the years from 1877 to 1882 inclusive, you will find that the arrests for punishable drunkenness were—In 1877, 110,903; in 1878, 107,723; in 1879, 90,021; in 1880, 89,980; in 1881, 78,573; and in 1882 (the year upon which the whole statistics and statement of the Licensed Victuallers' Association are based) the figures increased from 78,060 in 1881 to 87,000 in 1882. There are other facts and figures with regard to the statement respecting Ireland, both general and otherwise, as to the results of the Sunday Closing Act, which I will leave other Members to deal with. I think it would be difficult to find, in the county of Durham, a feeling of opposition against the Bill that is not infinitesimal. There are two classes whom I feel are distinctly interested in passing this measure. There can be no doubt whatever that it is practically the unanimous wish of the working people this measure should become law; and, in the next place, amongst the publicans themselves—though I do not know that I can say there is a majority in the constituency I myself represent—I know there are many who would be very glad to see the closing of their houses, along with other tradespeople of the place, if they could have their Sunday as a day of rest and relaxation, and that, on that day, the barmaids and barmen should have some opportunity of rest. I stated that I thought the degree of opposition to the Bill was almost infinitesimal, and I will give an illustration of that. In the town of Jarrow, with which I am very familiar, there is a local branch of the Licensed Victuallers' Protection Association. In that town there is a population of 18,000, almost exclusively belonging to the working classes. A meeting was held about 10 days ago in support of my hon. Friend's Bill, and that branch of the association issued a circular, calling upon the working classes to attend the meeting, and defeat the objects of the promoters. It was only known that any opposition would be raised shortly before the meeting was held; but in a very short time after it was known large bodies of working men assembled in the hall, and the amendments that were proposed against the Bill were rejected by an overwhelming majority. I think we have reason to hope that the Government will look with favour on this proposal; and, whatever may be said against piecemeal legislation, so many of these matters are distinctly local, that I would wish, not only in this matter of Sunday Closing, but in many other matters, that far greater powers were given to different communities than they have at the present time. It is a matter for congratulation that we see so little opposition has come from the other side, and I hope this Bill will pass the second reading practically unopposed; and not only that, but that the Government will give facilities for passing it into law. There can be no doubt there will be some disappointment if, after the exhibition of public sympathy which exists on this matter in the county of Durham, or upon the general question of temperance which the people there have been much interested in, if this Session should pass with merely the affirmation of the principle, and that the Bill should not pass into the law of the land. I believe, moreover, I am speaking the feelings of many sitting on these Benches when I say we should be prepared to make considerable sacrifices to assist the Government in any attempt to pass the measure into law.

Mr. THOMASSON, in proposing an Amendment, said: Sir, I do not propose to enter into the general question of Sunday Closing, but will confine myself strictly to the terms of my Amendment. That question may, or may not, be a question to be dealt with by the counties; but it seems to me very clear that if it be such a question, it ought to be dealt with by representative bodies, elected in those counties, and not by this House. On the other hand, if it be a question not affecting counties, the hon. Members who are in favour of Sunday Closing should confine their efforts to the passing of a Bill affecting the whole country. At present, the House has no sufficient means of ascertaining the opinion of counties on this question. The hon. Member who moved the second reading of this Bill (Mr. Theodore Fry) has given us statistics which I admit, at the first sight, appear to point with some force to the majority of opinion in the county of Durham as being in favour of the measure; but, at the same time, I would put it to the House whether, after all, those statistics do not rather point to the fact that the people of Durham are in favour of a general Bill affecting the whole country, rather than of a local measure, because the majority of the signatures to the Petitions are in favour of the general application of the Sunday Closing principle? I also understand from the hon. Member that the Petitions from the Town Councils are of the same character. It may, however, be said that the Petitions on the general question are also to be regarded as Petitions in favour of this Bill. This argument may be employed; but while it may be said that the greater object, as a matter of course, includes the lesser, it seems clear to me that the people of the county of Durham do not wish to be singled out for particular legislation on this question. The hon. Gentleman also pointed out that 12 Members from the county of Durham were in favour of the Bill; yet on the back of the Bill I see the names of only 7 Members. I think it would have been better if the names of all the Members in favour of the Bill had been put on the back of the measure, so that we should have had an authentic representation of their opinions on this matter. As the matter stands, it is no proof that the great mass of the population of Durham want the Bill. Even if they did, that would be a strong argument in favour of the question being dealt with by the local authorities. I am sure that hon. Members on this side of the House are prepared to give proper consideration to this question; but my great objection to it is, that it seems to me clearly unfair towards private Members generally that measures in the interest of the public at large should be treated county-wise. There are 40 counties that might be so dealt with; and, as it is, I see by the Orders of the Day that there are no fewer than five other Bills relating to Sunday Closing on the Order Book, one dealing with the general question, and the rest with particular counties, and probably next year there may be 12; for it is obvious that this mode of county legislation, if it becomes a habit, may be resorted to on other subjects. In fact, there is no reason why 40 Members should not introduce 40 county licensing Bills next Session; and if that should be the case, what chance would a private Member, interested in a question affecting the whole country, have as against 40 Members, all having equal chances with himself in the ballot for places, and bringing in Bills on the same subject, but affecting only single counties? It seems to me that that method of procedure would introduce the most elaborate system of Obstruction we have ever heard of in this House. I do not, however, charge hon. Members with having any idea of Obstruction in regard to the Bills they have put on the Paper; but I say that this is what would be the practical effect of the system thus introduced, if it were allowed to develop to any great extent. I would also point out that the next measure on the Order Paper is the Labourers (Ireland) Bill. That, I say, is a far more important question than whether the public-houses in Durham should be closed on the whole of Sunday; yet, on this occasion, the Irish Members, and the House generally, are excluded altogether from discussing that subject by the measure we are now debating. I may also express my regret that the third Order of the Day, which relates to the general question of Sunday Closing, does not happen to be the second; because, in that case, the adoption of my Amendment would not have deprived the House of the opportunity of discussing the general question of Sunday Closing. I do not know whether it is the duty of the Government to protect the rights of private Members; but certainly private Members on this side of the House have shown great willingness to make sacrifices of their time and measures in favour of those of the Government; and I think the Government might very fairly have considered, before supporting the County of Cornwall Bill last Session, the general effect such a step might have on the rights and privileges of private Members. The Government propose to deal with the general question of County Government, and I am sure the House of Commons are quite ready to consider it. Possibly, licensing powers may be given to County Boards; and, in the meantime, it is not desirable to pass local Bills of this kind, which may afterwards be found to be obnoxious to the real feeling of the locality. These things are looked on as precedents, and it has been stated that the Bills for Sunday Closing in Ireland and Wales are precedents for the county measures; but I would point out that they operate in entirely the other direction, for it has never been proposed to pass a measure of Sunday Closing for any single Irish or Welsh county. On the contrary, measures have been passed affecting those countries as a whole; and I hope that neither my hon. Friend the Member for Darlington nor this House will venture to compare either Ireland or Wales with a single English county. This being so, I fail to see what other precedent can be brought forward in support of the present Bill. I hold that a great principle is involved in the settlement of this question, and that the supporters of Sunday Closing would do well to direct their attention to measures affecting the general interests of the entire community. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR: I beg to second the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Bolton (Mr. Thomasson). I do not wish to speak of the Bill merely as a sumptuary law, which prevents the people from getting a glass of beer, because that has become so common that no one in this House appears to think it extraordinary at all; but in the Bill now before us there is, as it appears to me, a combination of every evil principle to which such legislation as this is open. Apart from the intolerance which declares that a man may be prevented from getting the glass of beer which he desires, there is superadded the intolerance of Sabbatarian legislation, by distinguishing one day in the week when a man may not be thirsty. And now to these impertinent interventions is added a third—the local one; and under this

Bill a man may, for the present, be thirsty on Sunday outside the county of Durham, but not within. We are to have this Island, once called "Freedom's tight little Island," divided into sections, in some of which people are to be at liberty to drink beer if they like; whilst, in others, they are not to be allowed to drink at all. We are told that England is the land of liberty for everybody; and my opinion is that this country is not so large that liberty need be more confined. It seems to me that if this kind of thing is to go on, there will soon be very little, if any, freedom or liberty left in the land. As is now proposed, it is to be confined to counties. It is no longer to be Britain that is free, but particular counties; or eventually, if there is to be any spark of freedom left, with this trumpery species of legislation, spreading county by county, there may possibly, by-and-bye, be only one county, and that, perhaps, the smallest—Rutlandshire—in which there will be any street of liberty belonging to its inhabitants. I think it is anything but agreeable or creditable to see the House of Commons, composed of some of the wealthiest men in the country, and, to all appearance, not largely consisting of teetotallers—men whose personal liberty and comfort would not be touched or affected by this Bill—trooping in to the division, as will probably be the case, in order to vote away the right of working men—the poorest of the people—to obtain a glass of beer on Sundays, their supporters being the groups of Petitions signed by Sunday school children. ["Hear, hear!"] That may be a pleasing task to those hon. Gentlemen; but to me, as a democrat, it is a painful spectacle. Who are the real supporters outside of the House of such measures as this? Why, they are men not one in 50 of whom I believe will be affected by this Bill, if it becomes law. It is not the class who will suffer from the closing of the public-houses who sign these Petitions; but only a set of Pharisaical theorists, who want everybody to conform to their particular views. It is so hard to understand the reason for all this agitation, that one is almost tempted to regard it from a commercial point of view, and imagine that there must be a magnificent syndicate in the neighbourhood of Threadneedle Street, the design of which is to lower the value of property by these restrictions, in some particular part of the country, in order to buy it up on good terms, and then to sell again when the people will no longer endure such restrictions. The Bill is an attempt to interfere with democratic rights. It needs all my faith in democratic principles to view without sadness, and almost with dismay, that the first steps of an enfranchised democracy are almost always taken over the neck of individual liberty, resulting in laws, such as that we are now discussing, which, under existing conditions, no despotic aristocracy would venture to inflict. My hon. Friend the Member for Gateshead (Mr. W. H. James) appealed to the Government for special support, and I dare say they will give it, because it is just the sort of measure the Government would like to pass. It would please many of their supporters, and would oppress only the helpless. Besides, the zeal of new converts is proverbial. But, although we may pitchfork common sense out of nature, it will inevitably, sooner or later, be brought back; and, therefore, I shall not trouble the House now by going through the groups of failures coming of sumptuary laws. This sumptuary legislation has been a failure all the world over; it has been a failure in America, and it will lead to countless evasions. Those who are in the habit of taking long walks in the country are perfectly well aware of this; and I can give an instance of the way in which the law is evaded, which occurred to a friend of mine who was out walking with his wife in a district in which Sunday Closing prevails, and within the prohibited hours. The lady, being rather delicate, was taken unwell, and naturally wanted some refreshment; and, there being a highly-respectable public-house near, my friend applied for assistance, and the proprietor, seeing the *bonâ fide* nature of the case, at once admitted them, after the gentleman had stated what he wanted at the side door. On entering the house, he was at once ushered into a room, from which, to his and his wife's astonishment, they could see around the bar some 30 persons, mostly in their shirt sleeves and aprons—evidently workmen of the immediate neighbourhood—who were freely supplied with liquor. It must be borne in mind that this was during closing time on Sunday, and while a policeman, with the most stolid and unconscious look possible, stood only some 30 yards off to watch the house. That was an instance of the benefit of Sunday Closing, and it is an instance of the sort of thing which occurs now, when you only bother the people with short hours; and there will be ten times as much of it, when you come to keep them out of the public-houses altogether. In Ireland, with its Sunday Closing Act, last year, there were found 800 illicit stills—[Mr. WARTON: 830.]—against eight or nine in England. Scotland boasts of the great things done by the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, and people talk of the enormous progress that has taken place. When that comes to an official test, it does not amount to much. The Committee appointed to inquire into the question of grocers' licences reported, in 1878, that the general result of their inquiry throughout Scotland showed an increase of drunkenness in that country, even where the population had decreased. Are hon. Members acquainted with the fact that one out of every 1,452 persons were convicted of drunkenness in protected Scotland on Sunday; whereas in unprotected England arrests were made only at the rate of one in 1,635? I dare say hon. Members have seen the Papers put forward, in which it is stated that the increase of drunkenness has taken place in the protected districts, rather than in the unprotected districts of Ireland. In Galway, which is a protected town, the arrests for drunkenness increased from 800 in 1878 to 1,577 in 1880, or nearly 50 per cent; whereas in Dublin, the largest town exempted, they decreased from 17,000 in 1878 to 10,000 in 1880. Of course, I know, my protest in such matters as this is entirely unavailing; for at present, until the tide turns, the whole course of legislation is placing the population of the country at the mercy of persons who, I am quite convinced, are making a benevolent mistake.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House, while willing to discuss the question of County Government, declines to consider Public Bills affecting only a single county,"—(*Mr. Thomasson,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. C. M. PALMER: Sir, I should not have risen to say the few words I am about to say, but for the fact that the hon. Member who has moved the Amendment before the House (Mr. Thomasson) has referred to the fact that five of the Members for the County of Durham, although in favour of this Bill, have not put their names on the back of it. I happen to be one of those Members whose name is not on the back of the Bill, and I wish to say that it is by mere chance that that is so, and that the 12 Members alluded to by the hon. Gentleman are all earnest and anxious in their desire to see this Bill passed into law. I believe, even, as has been said, that my hon. Colleague (Sir George Elliot) is half converted to the measure. After the exhaustive speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Darlington (Mr. Fry), who introduced the Bill, I feel it would be improper for me to occupy the time of the House more than to say I am satisfied of the fact that there exists among the working classes of the county of Durham a very strong feeling in support of the Bill. I gather, not only from what I hear from public sources of information, but also from those who are more closely associated with the working class than I am, that the working population of the county of Durham will hail with great delight and the greatest possible amount of satisfaction the passing of this measure. The only objection that exists, and undoubtedly so, is that it is piecemeal legislation; but I reply that where you have a county so strong and so earnest in supporting a measure of this character I cannot see that their opinion ought to be set aside on this ground. I think, on the contrary, that their opinions are entitled to every consideration from the House of Commons. We have been told that if this Bill were to pass we should immediately have clubs established in all parts of the country for the purpose of Sunday drinking. For my own part, I should say that the working men of Durham are every year becoming more sober and more intelligent, so much so, that even if clubs were to be started for the purpose of being used by them on Sundays, they would be as careful and particular to eject from their midst any individuals who committed themselves by drunkenness and misconduct as we are in our own clubs here and elsewhere. I shall only further detain the House by saying I feel it my duty to give expression to the general feeling of the Members for the county of Durham, that the working classes of that county are very strongly in favour of the passing of this measure.

MR. T. C. THOMPSON: Sir, in supporting this Bill, I desire to say that I entirely differ from the views advanced by my hon. Friend the Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor), and I always differ from him with regret. I think my hon. Friend has misinterpreted this Act, when he says that it will interfere with the liberty of the subject. We do not purpose to interfere with the liberty of the subject generally; but what we seek is to put the publicans into exactly the same position as other tradesmen. If my hon. Friend's arguments are right, we are doing wrong in closing any shops in the county of Durham on Sundays. At present, we close the shops of the baker and draper, men who are quite as necessary, and far less injurious than the publicans. I remember, some years ago, having to canvass a large borough in the North of England, and I was then very much struck by the application made to me by poor people, who complained of the hardships of all shops being closed on Sundays. They said their husbands came home very late on the Saturday night; so late, indeed, that it was impossible for them to make use of the earnings which had come into their hands, for when they went out to the shops they found them closed. Their only means of dealing was by going to traders who were carrying on an illicit trade on the Sunday morning. I confess I was very much struck by that argument, and the contention that it was a hardship to the poor that all shops should be closed on Sunday; but if you poll the working classes, how many will you find willing to do away with the restrictions on the Sabbath? Would you find many who would vote for the mines and workshops being opened on Sundays? But if my hon. Friend's argument is true, we should open these, as well as the public-houses. The hon. Member for Bolton (Mr. Thomasson) has contended that there should be no legislation for counties; but he has forgotten the physical character of the country. We are divided, in some respects, and in no respect more, than in the different employments carried on in different counties. In that part of England of which I represent the chief town we are almost entirely engaged in mining. Surely, we have a right to say that we are specially interested in this matter, and to ask for special assistance from you to enable us to carry out the work in which we are engaged. Surely, there can be no objection to that? The same thing might be said for Lancashire. Surely, the people of Lancashire could ask for legislation on the subject of the cotton trade, without Wiltshire and Dorsetshire being necessarily consulted on the subject? But if anything tends to the well-being of the country, it is that the special energy of each part of the country should be brought forth. I believe it was Richard Cobden who said that there was by far the greatest political energy developed in the small Republics. He pointed to Greece and other countries, where history taught that there was more energy developed in such small States than in the great Empires which these Republics had often put down. If that is so, why should not Durham be encouraged, by this special legislation, to develop her energies, without obtaining or asking the consent of other parts of the country? As I have said before, our occupation is chiefly in mining, and what do the workmen of Durham ask for? The population of the county is 867,000, and a Petition was yesterday presented from 140,000 persons, praying for legislation on this subject. You may ask—"Why close these public-houses? Why cannot you resist the temptation to enter them? Why, if you do not want drink, cannot you abstain, and allow those who want it to have it?" Well, you are strong moral men, and may be able to resist it; but what is the answer of the working men of Durham? It is the answer given over and over again to gentlemen who have canvassed that county—"You know we are efficient workmen. We can build ships, which will ride safely through the most violent tempests. We can go down into the bowels of the earth, and draw up coals in such quantities, that you are enabled to carry on your manufactures more cheaply than any other country in the world. We can go into the workshops, and forge iron so quickly, so carefully, that the absence of accident is a marvel; so abundantly that the only fear is, lest by our very skill, we cheapen the value of our labour. We can do all this; but there is one thing we cannot do. Strong as we are in other respects, we have not sufficient courage, if you leave the public-house open, to avoid drink." I have heard that answer given by intelligent men in the county from which I come, and men from other counties will tell you the same. And is it likely that this should not be true? Is there anything in it at variance with our common humanity? What would be your conduct supposing you had no place of resort on Sunday, supposing you were deprived by the want of education from the pleasures of reading, and supposing there were no public rooms or parks to go to? What would you give way to? Possibly, to sensual gratification and degrading pursuits; and it is because these pleasures, this refinement, are denied to the working classes, that it is fair and just that you should close, in their interest, and at their request, these public-houses on the Sunday. The House has heard what the people of Durham say themselves; but by whom was this matter pushed forward? A canvass has been made of the county of Durham, village by village, and house by house—not by political adventurers anxious to obtain some political credit from it, but by the clergy of every denomination, and more especially of the Church of England, which I so much venerate, and which, in my opinion, is likely to become the Church of the future, because she is leading herself, by the self-denial and forbearance of her members, to carry out those primitive doctrines of Christianity which may yet be proved to be the truest political wisdom. By that canvass it has been found that the large majority of the people are in favour of Sunday Closing; and are you going to deny these men this right for any argument that has been advanced to-day? What has been the argument of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton)? He said he was going to make a dry speech of statistics, but he soon left the statistical part of his remarks. The only statistics he put forward were with the view of showing that, by Sunday Closing, drunkenness had increased instead of diminished; and by whom was that argument used? Why, it was put forward in the papers sent us to-day by the publicans of England. Therefore, they have advanced, as an argument against Sunday Closing, that their trade would be increased. They would have you believe that their opposition to this Bill arises from their conviction that, by closing public-houses on Sundays, there would be more drinking. Do you believe that will be the result; and, if you do, do you believe that the publicans oppose this Bill for that reason? Can any proposition be more monstrous? My hon. and learned Friend passed away from that, and seeing the stalwart form of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department opposite him, began to abuse the Government. That is an occupation which always finds favour with many hon. Members of this House. But to return to the subject. Why do we specially want these houses closed on Sundays? Have any hon. Gentleman in this House heard of St. Monday? Do they know that men do not go to their work on Mondays? That it is very often a day of enforced idleness, because the dissipation of the Sunday has unnerved the men for the Monday? They know that they cannot trust themselves, and their fellows—whose lives depend upon their care—know that they cannot be trusted, after the Sunday's debauch, to give the needful attention in the dangerous works in which they are employed. What do they ask? They say—"Close these public-houses on the Sunday. Take away that temptation which renders us unfit for work. We will then add to the wealth of the country. Nay, we will do more than that. We will raise our own moral character and the moral character of the people which is so dear to the House."

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, that, while sorry to incur the reproaches of his hon. Friend the Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor), he was perfectly prepared, when the great body of the people demanded it, to give his support to a further measure of Sunday Closing; and he should do so, without feeling that he had been doing anything in the direction of imposing any restrictions on the liberties of the people. The question before the House, however, was one of procedure, and there appeared to him to be great difficulties in the way of accepting this Bill. No doubt, it would not be easy to pass a general measure; but that was not the only alternative. It was not necessary to relegate the question to a general measure. It was quite competent, he thought, for the House to give this power to the local authorities, in connection with the policy which found so much favour. That seemed to him a way of proceeding with this question very much more in accordance with the accepted principles of legislation, and more likely to avoid difficulties, than would be the passing of a measure having reference solely to the county of Durham. He hoped that they would have a County Government Bill by next Session at the latest; but if the views of Durham were now entertained, nothing was more certain than that the Order Book of the House of Commons would be crammed, page after page, with all sorts of measures dealing with counties. In his opinion, it was open to grave consideration whether the House ought to adopt this method in connection with such subjects; but, on the other hand, when he looked at the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bolton (Mr. Thomasson), he found that it asked the House to adopt a not less serious departure from the general mode of proceeding, for, by it, that hon. Gentleman asked the House to affirm that, under no circumstances whatever, would the House be a party to a Bill affecting only a single county. There were, however, certain occasions when it might be necessary for the House to pass a Bill for a single county, a Bill, for example, relating to the defence of a single county, or for matters connected with local institutions. He therefore could not support the Amendment, neither did he think the House would accept it. With regard to the Bill itself, while he sympathized with the general object the proposers had in view, and while he was certain that temperance was at the root of social, as well as of all other, reforms in this country, the question was, whether the House should, immediately preceding the consideration of important reforms in local government, legislate for a single county. So great was his hesitation upon the point that he could not take part in the vote.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, speaking as one who knows the county of Durham well, I think there is great justification for my hon. Friend the Member for Darlington (Mr. Theodore Fry) in bringing forward this Bill; and those who know anything about the mining districts will, at any rate, agree with its objects. I should like to call attention to the fact that the rights of individual liberty, as to which we have heard such an able discourse from the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr .P. A. Taylor), are very good so far as they do not interfere with the liberties and interests of others. But the exercise of that liberty by those who frequent public-houses on Sunday, especially in the mining districts, does, to a great extent, interfere with the interests and the happiness of others. It brings starvation upon families; it leads to the commission of crime; and it is frequently likewise the cause of accidents which inflict a large amount of injury upon property and upon fellow-workmen. Allusion has been made by my hon. Friend the Member for Durham (Mr. T. C. Thompson) to what is called St. Monday. In the mining districts we are all familiar with it, and we know it to be a fact that on the Monday, and often even on a Tuesday, there is very little work performed by those who go to public-houses on Sunday. This means that these men subject not themselves only, but their fellow-workmen, who are engaged in the same pit, to a reduction of wages in consequence of the increased cost of production. On one occasion, at the Mining Institute, I called attention to the difference which would result if a colliery, producing about 150,000 tons of coal per annum, was worked on Monday, instead of lying practically idle on that day. As a result of a calculation I made on the subject, I found that the difference would be £7,000 or £8,000 a-year—sufficient, in fact, to give the working men an increase in their wages of something like 20 per cent, and still leave a handsome sum in the hands of the employers. That is a very serious matter, and if the closing of public-houses on Sunday would in any way mitigate that, and would lead to Monday and Tuesday being working days like other days, such a desirable result should be brought about. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) endeavoured to show that the removal of this temptation had led to increased drunkenness. I do not know whether the hon. and learned Member has paid much attention to that subject, or whether he has ever tried to realize in his own mind what the temptation is to a working man to see the public-house open at the end of his week's work. If we take the case of a man earning 24*s.* per week, and deduct from that what he pays for rent, coal, light, and clothing, we shall find that, taking six in a family, that does not allow 1*d.* per meal per person; and to men who are working hard all the week, and have so little to maintain them, surely the temptation must be very strong indeed when they see the public-house constantly open to receive them on Sunday, when they are released from the requirements of labour. I am fully convinced that the working population, especially in the mining districts, are by a very large majority in favour of the principle of this Bill, and that the women are especially sensible to the evils which arise from the drunkenness of their husbands. In fact, we have seen Petitions presented to-day from a great many women who have signed them. They know that their families are pinched on account of the wages that are spent, to a large extent, in the public-houses on the Sunday; and they know that their husbands' lives and their sons' lives are often jeopardized by accidents caused by the indulgence in Sunday drinking; and, being sensible of all this, we cannot wonder that they are interested in a measure such as this before the House. As to one argument that has been used —the argument against piecemeal legislation—I do not see myself why, if it be a good Bill, it should be set aside because it happens to be only a county measure. Surely, it is desirable, on its own merits, that Durham or any other constituency should bring forward a Bill of this kind, and endeavour to mitigate great evils such as those that have been mentioned; and it is for these reasons I heartily support it.

MR. J. G. TALBOT said, he had waited for some little while, expecting to hear what the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (the Secretary of State for the Home Department), on the part of the Government, should have to say with regard to the Bill. As he had not done so, he (Mr. J. G. Talbot) could not help giving expression to the feeling of surprise which he experienced at the silence of the right hon. and learned Gentleman on such an important matter. He considered the subject was one on which the House had a right to expect that the Government would give its advice and instruction, by stating what it intended to do. Such a measure as that of the hon. Baronet the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease), containing a moderate extension of the principle of Sunday Closing, would commend itself to the general sense of the country, and ought to be supported by the House; but, when they came to consider the sweeping measure now before the House, they were in a very different position. First of all, they had to deal with the whole question of Sunday trading; and had to ask themselves, whether they were not in danger of going in advance of public opinion upon the question—which was one of degree—and so running the risk of a possible reaction in the future? They had also to ask themselves, whether it was wise to pass a Bill for the total closing of all public-houses in a thickly-populated district, in which there was probably a large floating population who were not represented in any of the Petitions that had been laid before the House? Besides this, the House had the very grave question to consider of, whether this was the best method of dealing with the subject. He considered that, instead of this being the right way, it was by far the worst way that could possibly have been conceived. He entirely disapproved of this sort of County Home Rule, with reference to a matter that was of Imperial concern, neither did he think that any county, as such, was either entitled or qualified to express an opinion on the subject. The hon. Member for the City of Durham (Mr. T. C. Thompson) almost proved the point; for, in order to support Sunday Closing by means of county legislation, he said he should be prepared to support a mining Bill brought forward for Durham, and a cotton Bill brought forward for Lancashire. But was it to be contended that, because mining was the staple occupation of Durham, and cotton the staple trade of Lancashire, Bills confined to those counties should therefore be passed dealing with these important matters? He was quite sure the common sense of the House of Commons would repudiate such an idea. As an advocate of temperance in the proper sense of the word, and as distinguished from total abstinence, and being, therefore, in favour of any proper restrictions on the liquor traffic that could be suggested in the House of Commons, he (Mr. J. G. Talbot) regarded these county measures as an absolute obstruction to a well-considered scheme of universal Sunday Closing. What would happen? If the House passed this Durham Bill, they would not be advanced a step in the direction of obtaining Home Rule for the whole country. What was to be done for the other counties? Were they to wait until 40 Bills had been passed for the 40 counties of this country? If the country had arrived at a time when Sunday Closing was to be the rule of the whole of the community, in the name of common sense let them have a comprehensive measure for the whole of the country; meanwhile let the county Bills be withdrawn, and this miserable system of piecemeal legislation be discontinued. He wished to know, whether the Government had got an opinion on the subject; and, if they had, he hoped the Secretary of State for the Home Department would give the House some explanation of the attitude of himself and his Colleagues respecting it.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, the hon. Member opposite (Mr. J. G. Talbot) is wrong in supposing that the Government have not an opinion upon this subject, and are not prepared to express it. I simply waited, as is usual in these debates, until others had expressed their opinion upon it, before giving expression to my own. This is no novel proposal, and there never has, in fact, been any doubt whatever as to what the opinion of Her Majesty's Government is upon this subject. It was expressed, in the most full and explicit manner, last year on the Sunday Closing Bill for Cornwall; and, since the passing of that measure, we have not changed our opinion, and we have nothing to alter or nothing to add to what was then said. I am willing to address myself in a practical manner to the subject; and, in the first place, I am bound to say that the arguments of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down do not assist very much the practical solution of this question. What was his last observation? He says, he does not think Sunday Closing can be applied to many of the populous parts of this country; and he asks us, therefore, in effect, to wait until we have a general Sunday Closing Bill, applicable to the whole of the country, although he knows very well that there are parts of the country to which it could not be easily applied. What does that mean but the rejection of Sunday Closing altogether in England?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: I beg the right hon. and learned Gentleman's pardon. What I intended to say was, that I was in favour of the Bill of the hon. Baronet the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease), which treats the populous places in an exceptional manner.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: That points to exactly what I call, and the hon. Member calls, piecemeal legislation. The words "piecemeal legislation" seem to have been used by the hon. Member as a disparaging epithet; but I do not see that piecemeal legislation is of necessity an objectionable kind of legislation. The hon. Member says—"Do not let us have piecemeal legislation;" but the fact is, that this House, for more than 25 years, has treated this subject as properly a subject of piecemeal legislation. It began with Scotland; and, surely, Scotland is not the whole of the Empire. The hon. Member again uses those disparaging adjectives, which, he thinks, supply the place of argument, and says—"Do not let us allow Home Rule to the counties." But you gave Scotland Home Rule on the liquor question; you gave Ireland Home Rule on the liquor question; and you gave Wales Home Rule on this question; and now you say—"Do not let us have Home Rule for Durham." The common sense of the country says that this question must be dealt with in a piecemeal manner, and it has been so dealt with in a piecemeal manner. I sympathize with the wail against Democracy which came from that stalwart Democrat, the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor). He is shocked at the result of the Frankenstein monster which he, himself, has so largely helped to create, for he has found, as the dreadful consequence of giving the people power, that they are no longer to be governed according to the views of enlightened persons as to what they ought to want, but by what they themselves believe. If my hon. Friend the Member for Leicester does not know that the progress of Democracy means government by the people, and not for the people, he has not yet learned, I think, even the catechism of Democracy. Well, no doubt, this is a democratic subject; and the question is, what do the people—it may be the whole of the community, or a section of it—desire? It will be found that, when the overwhelming opinion of the majority of the people of Scotland was in favour of Sunday Closing, Parliament had the good sense to allow the people of Scotland to have their way in the matter. You find the same thing in Ireland; you find the same thing in Wales. Yet the opponents of this Bill say you are violating all the principles of the Constitution if you apply to other sections of the community that which you have already applied to several. We are also told that these experiments ought not to be tried; and hon. Members opposite say, that if you tried it in one place, that would be an obstacle to the adoption of the same principle elsewhere. I must say that I cannot follow that argument. Has the experiment which has been tried in Scotland, Ireland and Wales advanced, or retarded the question? Why, it has decidedly advanced it. We are in a much stronger position to judge of the matter when we find that the experiment has been tried in those parts of the United Kingdom, and that it has done no harm, but, on the contrary, so far as we can judge, it has accomplished good, and that nobody, in the counties to which it has been applied, wishes it to be revoked; but, on the contrary, they require rather that it should be extended. I would ask, what is the reason to be advanced against this proposal? Now, to my mind the question is this. Is there such an overwhelming proof of the feeling of the people, in this section of the community, as will justify Parliament taking action upon it? That, I think, is the true test. I spoke on the Resolution of my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), and I said — "I think it is a question of areas, and I think it is a question of opinion within those areas." I should be very glad if there were a chance, immediately, of giving, in some organized and regular manner, to these communities the means of expressing their opinions, and of giving effect to them on this question. But that is not the matter which is immediately before us. The question is, whether this community does desire this Bill? Does anybody doubt that? Let hon. Members look at the Petitions in favour of it. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) casts contumely upon Petitions; but it is not a question of Petitions signed by, as he says, women who are not entitled to an opinion on this subject. If there are any people in this country who are entitled to an opinion upon this subject, surely it is the women of this country. If the women of Durham, as well as the men of Durham, are in favour of a measure of this description, I know no argument more conclusive in favour of its being passed. But where are the Members of Durham to speak against this proposal? Where is the hon. Baronet who sits on the other side of this House (Sir George Elliot), who is so well acquainted with the interests of the mining population? Where is he, to protest against the measure? Everybody knows that hon. Members who sit in this House are very good barometers of the political temperature of the communities in which they live; and, do you believe that if there were any doubt whatever of the sentiment of that Democracy which my hon. Friend (Mr. P. A. Taylor) regrets, that they would not have found some spokesman from that part of the community? Everyone must know that, practically speaking, we have all that reasonable certainty of the feelings of the people in the county of Durham, that Parliament can desire, in acting on a question of this description. It is said that you ought not to allow one part of the country to have different laws from another part. That, however, is a general proposition, which has very large exceptions to it. I admit that you cannot allow particular parts of the community to have special laws affecting personal liberty; but we know perfectly well that in matters of police and sanitation you do allow particular communities to have their own bye-laws and to have legislation special to themselves. A Committee of this House upstairs, last Session, considered a Bill providing for the local authorities to deal with sanitary matters. The same principle applies to various things relating to the well-being of the population, which are different from the general laws affecting all parts of the community. Therefore, it is entirely untrue to say that Parliament does not allow particular sections of the community to have laws which are appropriate to their condition. The mining populations of Durham have very good reasons for having strong opinions on this subject, through the incapacity that is brought upon the workmen for their regular occupation by Sunday drinking. Everybody knows that the great danger of Sunday drinking is in regard to the fact that Sunday is the day which comes after the day on which wages are paid. There is the danger of a pocket full of money and of the want of regular occupation. What is the result? Why, that we have not merely the mischief produced by drinking on this particular day, but also the immense mischief to the individual himself and his fellow-workmen on the Monday, and to the country at large, owing to their incapacity to carry on their regular avocation. These are the reasons why there should be a strong opinion on the subject, and why Parliament should pay attention to that opinion. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. J. G. Talbot) says, that if you pass this Bill, you will obstruct the general Bill for the whole of the country. On the contrary, if you pass this Bill for Durham, and it is successful in producing the good effects anticipated, instead of retarding the question of applying the law to the whole of the country you will be advancing it. May be a general Sunday Closing Bill for this country would create, in various parts of the community, a strong opposition, and might be a very difficult thing to pass. But, surely, there is nothing more unstatesmanlike than to say, that if there is a good to be accomplished in one part of the country, with the wish and support of that part of the country, we should not allow it, because another part of the country would reject it, and because we cannot at present make such a measure acceptable to the whole country? The hon. and learned Member for Bridport appears to have been scandalized by the observations I made the other day, to a deputation that waited upon me, to ask the Government to give facilities for the passing of this and similar Bills. I was obliged to confess that facilities for legislation were not a commodity with which Her Majesty's Government abounds; but I told the deputation that I believed this question was not a Party question, for there are hon. Members on the other side of the House as strongly in favour of this legislation as any who sit on the Ministerial side. I said to the deputation—"The Government have great difficulties in passing measures that we think of advantage to the community; but when private Members bring forward Bills which we think are for the advantage of society at large, let all Parties combine and try and pass them." That was the spirit of my remarks, and I have nothing to withdraw, or to apologize for. For the same reason which induced the Government to support the Sunday Closing Bill for Cornwall last year, I shall, on behalf of the Government, support this Bill. Although I hope more general measures of this kind will hereafter be brought forward and applied to the country at large, I think we should do wisely in applying them, in the first instance, to those communities who are most ready to accept them. They have in them nothing of evil, but, on the contrary, they are very beneficial. In fact, the principle of this Bill has been adopted in our great Australian Colonies, in the cities of Sydney and Melbourne. Those cities have felt the evils of intemperance, and adopted Sunday Closing; and I should say that the men who, in our great Colonies, have exercised the gift of self-government, and whose industries are very similar to those of the people of Durham, understand this matter thoroughly well; and if the great Colony of Australia, if Ireland, Scotland, and Wales have all been allowed by the Imperial Parliament to pass measures for the benefit of their own communities, I cannot understand the principle on which the House of Commons should refuse to the county of Durham that which it evidently desires in the shape of this Bill.

Sir GEORGE ELLIOT said, that the subject before the House had received his very serious attention. He had hitherto maintained that the people ought to be judges for themselves as to whether their public-houses ought to be closed or not on Sundays. He had thought, more particularly in connection with that mining population, that if there was one class of men who more than another had need of liberty to move about and see their friends on Sunday, and to whom facilities for enjoyment ought to be given on a Sunday, it was the mining population, for there was no class of men better disposed or more religiously inclined than they were. But such representations had been made by ministers of religion, and others most competent to give an opinion on the subject, that he felt bound, as a reasonable man, to pause before he could offer his vote in opposition to the Bill. On the whole, he felt he could neither support, nor would he vote against it, though he should have preferred that some other county than Durham should have been selected for this experiment. There was a great deal of drunkenness in Durham, but not among the miners; they had never, in his recollection, been a dissipated race, and what was now proposed to be done would touch them keenly. He would like to have seen some expression of opinion from the Trades Unions, who were so ably represented in that House. He was not aware that those powerful Bodies, which could make their voices heard upon the extension of the franchise and other questions in which they were interested, had, either by Petition or otherwise, expressed any opinion on this subject. Upon a question which affected their domestic and social life, they seemed to be totally silent. The opinion of the men who represented these institutions would have as much weight with him as anything else. He happened to have mining property in Wales, for which Parliament had passed a Sunday Closing Act. But there was a little stream which separated Monmouthshire from Wales, and the people now flocked over it on Sundays to the public-houses, and he was told that public-house property there was worth four times as much as before. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: There is a Bill for Monmouthshire.] He should have been disposed to vote for the Bill, if it had been a comprehensive and general measure. When, however, he saw such a preponderance of feeling in favour of the Bill, he bowed to it, though it was at variance with his own views.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished, before the debate was closed, to give his reasons why it was his intention to oppose the second reading of the Bill, and he might say that he was well acquainted with mining populations. He felt it all the more incumbent upon him to address the House in consequence of the remarks which had fallen from the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who, he was sorry to see, was not now in his place, probably being much more agreeably engaged. He proposed to take his cue from the speech of his hon. Friend (Mr. J. G. Talbot), for there was no man in the world who was more anxious than himself to serve the cause of true temperance. He had two capital objections to the Bill. He was by no means converted to the principle of piecemeal legislation by the arguments of the right hon. and learned Gentleman; indeed, they had pushed him (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) further than before in the opposite direction. He must say that the observations of the right hon. and learned Gentleman on that point had rather surprised him. The right hon. and learned Gentleman told them that because Scotland, Ireland, and Wales had Home Rule on this question, there was no reason why they should not have it in the county of Durham. In the first place, he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) contended that there was no analogy between England and Scotland in this matter. Scotland, it should be borne in mind, had Home Rule to a very considerable extent. She had her own Church, her own laws, and her own procedure; and with regard to Ireland and Wales, he denied that Sunday Closing was successful in those two countries. All the objections that were urged against Sunday Closing had proved to have a true foundation in what had taken place in Ireland and Wales. He found, by studying the statistics of the question, that so far from drunkenness being diminished by the Irish and Welsh Closing Acts, there had been an increase of drunkenness in both places. As to the *bonâ fide* traveller, that was a fraud; and, in Scotland, obtaining drink on Sunday was merely a question of money, for there was no difficulty in anyone obtaining what one wanted in the way of liquor, if they had the money to pay for it. A man had only to say that he had come from a place a certain number of miles off and he was sure of being served with whatever refreshment he might call for. The right hon. and learned Gentleman tried to make out that piecemeal legislation was beneficial by referring to police bye-laws; but there really was no analogy in the matter. But, after all, his (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck's) strongest argument against this Bill was, that it rendered drinking on Sunday illegal on one side of the hedge, and legal on the other. The old Whig cry used to be for diversity of the suffrage; but the great Liberal Party now went in for uniformity of the suffrage. In this question, they went back to diversity; so that a man living on one side of a street, or just over the border line of a county, would be able to drink on Sunday, while a man on the other side could not. The only logical Member on the other side of the House on this question was the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), who would not, if he had his way, allow drinking on either side of the street. The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle supported these county Bills, however, because he thought if the House once passed small measures, it would clear the way for a large one. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) also objected to this Bill, because it was class legislation, and any measure of this kind was essentially class legislation. The Welsh Sunday Closing Act was passed by the aristocratic Members of the House; and, now, this Bill was being pressed on by the aristocratic and wealthy Members for the county of Durham; and he, for one, doubted their political sincerity. It appeared to him that, if working men were to be prevented from obtaining liquor on Sunday, the promoters of Bills like the present ought to apply the principle to their own cases. They ought not to consume champagne or other wine on Sunday, and ought to refrain from joining Sunday dinner parties at the Trafalgar at Greenwich, or the Star and Garter at Richmond. It seemed to him that this was a law for the working classes only; and that to be logical, if they passed laws to make it a crime for the working classes of the people to drink in public-houses on Sunday, it ought to be made equally criminal to drink at the West End Clubs, or in Buckingham Palace. Then, with regard to the practical results of such legislation. It was said that, in Durham, the miners' wages were paid on Saturday, and in many cases spent in drink on Sunday. Men did not, however, wait till Sunday to begin drinking, but, probably, commenced directly they got their money on Saturday. It was, therefore, an argument in favour of closing public-houses on Saturday and not for closing them on Sunday. Any hon. Member, who took the trouble to go into some of the poor neighbourhoods of London on Saturday afternoon and evening, would soon see for himself that the drinking took place on Saturday. It was contended that if only public-houses were closed on Sundays, then the working man would become virtuous and sober for all the rest of his life. He could not agree with such an idea. He maintained that no more drinking took place on Sundays than on any other days; certainly not so much as on Bank holidays. He found, from a Return which had been made on the Motion of his hon. Friend (Mr. Onslow), that there were very few arrests on Sunday for drunkenness. For instance, in the county of Durham, in 1882, out of a population of 867,000, there were only 60,000 such arrests. Those figures, however, did not give a true idea as to the numbers, because, no doubt, a large proportion of the arrests that were made early on Sunday morning were attributable to Saturday drinking. In fact, the facilities for getting drunk on Sunday at the present time were very limited, as the public-houses were only open for an hour or two in the daytime, and from 6 to 11 at night. Personally, he had every desire to advance the cause of temperance, and he would be in favour of still further limiting the hours of keeping open on Sunday. But, in his opinion, there was at present no such case against the people of Durham as had been alleged by the hon. Member for Darlington (Mr. Theodore Fry); or, at any rate, it was not of sufficient magnitude to justify the House in violating the principles of English legislation. Believing that this was an attempt, in the name of temperance, to take away the privileges of one class, while leaving those of other classes untouched, and objecting, moreover, to piecemeal legislation, he should feel it his duty to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Baron HENRY DE WORMS said, that, as the Representative of a large working-class constituency, he was opposed to the Bill. He regarded the subject not as a Sabbatarian matter, but as a purely social question of very great importance. He had listened with great attention to the observations of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and he must say that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had astonished him considerably. The right hon. and learned

Gentleman said that a Democracy was government by the people, and not for the people. Government by the people must necessarily be government for the people; and, therefore, it could only be assumed, when the right hon. and learned Gentleman used the above singular phrase, that what he meant to say was that a Democracy was government by the Caucus, and not for the people. The whole of this Sunday Closing agitation arose from the action of a small number of men, actuated, no doubt, by excellent motives, but belonging to the growing class of crotchet-mongers, who took up eccentric views, and were not very charitable to those who disagreed with them. These people accused all those who opposed them as being the friends of intemperance, while they claimed for themselves the position of sole champions of temperance. Such a proposition was a gross and calumnious misstatement, and he earnestly protested against it. The views of the right hon. and learned Gentleman with regard to the advantages to be derived from piecemeal legislation he regarded as the most extraordinary ever enunciated by a Minister in that House, and they meant that the Government were pursuing their usual tactics of following, instead of leading. Indeed, could anything be more absurd than that they should have legislation in one county which was not to be carried out in another? If it were carried, out they would have, supposing that the Bill were to achieve its object, men sober in Durham and drunk in Yorkshire; and they would have England divided into zones of temperance and intemperance. That was the sort of legislation which was supported by Her Majesty's Government. The Government were afraid to bring in a general measure to deal with the whole subject, because they knew the voice of the people would be against such legislation. The hon. Baronet the Member for North Durham (Sir George Elliot) said he was not aware whether the Trades Unions had expressed any opinion on this subject. He (Baron Henry De Worms) could inform his hon. Friend that he himself had presented many Petitions from Trades Unions, representing hundreds of thousands of working men, against this Sunday Closing legislation; and, only a day or two ago, Mr. George Potter—who, it would be admitted, certainly was a typical working man—told him that the working classes were immensely against Sunday Closing. Sunday Closing was a regulation which affected the poor, and not the rich. He would ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the hon. Member for Darlington (Mr. Theodore Fry) and his Friends, whether, if the public-houses were closed on Sunday, they would also close the Reform and the new National Liberal Clubs? He thought they would not; yet, to be consistent, they ought to do so, and empty their own cellars into the streets. It did not follow, because keeping open public-houses was not a temptation to hon. Members, who had the means at their command of gratifying their desire for drink at any time, that they should deprive the great mass of the people of what hon. Members themselves enjoyed. If that was a specimen of Liberal legislation, it was only Liberal in name. Take the case of a working man who left London for his Sunday holiday at Richmond. Under the Bill he would be unable to obtain any sort of refreshment from the moment he arrived there until he got home again.

MR. THEODORE FRY asked to what Richmond the hon. Gentleman referred, because the Bill related only to Durham?

BARON HENRY DE WORMS said, he was illustrating a general principle. If a man wished to enjoy his day of rest, this Bill deprived him of the chance of getting any refreshment; because, under it, to be consistent, they must close all the hotels, as the sham of the *bonâ fide* traveller could not go on. So that every hon. Member who went to Brighton for the Sunday would find the hotels closed to him, and he would have to return as he came. He (Baron Henry De Worms) objected to special regulations which applied to working men, who would thereby be deprived of obtaining any refreshment on their hard-earned holiday, and not to the Gentlemen who advocated this measure. How did hon. Members know what were the wishes of working men? Where was the evidence of their wishes? The House had only the statements of Gentlemen who were *doctrinaires.* Members of the Government said piecemeal legislation was very good, and a certain number of pieces made up the whole;

so they hoped gradually to pass a measure which they could not pass in its entirety. That was the present position of the case. The statistics for Wales and Scotland showed that the amount of good predicted had not been realized by the Sunday Closing Acts. In fact, it had been exactly opposite to what the Government had predicted. In Cardiff the Head Constable reported that the convictions for drunkenness on Sunday had increased 50 per cent since the Act had been in operation. In Scotland a Parliamentary Return issued in January showed that during the last four years the convictions for drunkenness on Sunday had increased from 1,886 to 2,530. Hon. Members seemed to forget that it was impossible to compare their own social position in this matter with the position of the men whom they represented. Did they know that a working man with his family frequently occupied only two rooms; and he was only too glad to be able to leave them on Sundays? Where, in the future, would he go, and what would he do? Instead of taking a single glass of beer at a public-house, he would lay in a gallon of beer on the Saturday, and would "soak" at home from Saturday evening to Sunday night. From his experience as a magistrate he knew that would be the case, and was satisfied that, if the statistics were investigated, it would be found that the bulk of the cases of drunkenness occurred less at public-houses than from drinking at home. The passing of this Bill, so far from meeting the evil they desired to remedy, would increase it; and, therefore, he should vote against it.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he very much regretted that he had been absent from the House during the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite the Secretary of State for the Home Department. From the comments he had heard on that speech, he thought the doctrine which he understood was laid down by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, that Democracy was government by the people, and not for the people, was one of very serious importance. He (Sir R. Assheton Cross) should have said that the government in this country was government by Parliament, the House of Commons being the Representatives of the people. It appeared that the reason why the Government had supported this Bill, was to avoid the responsibility of taking it on their own shoulders. He knew the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not like responsibility; for instance, he did not like the responsibility of the Water Bill on a former occasion. Probably, the experience of the last three years had shown him that if he had recognized his responsibility, and taken a little more upon himself with regard to that case, the question of water supply in London would not have been in the condition it was at present. If the Government really wished to give localities the power of dealing with the question touched by this Bill, there was only one way of dealing with it, and that was by Parliament giving to the authorities of those localities the necessary control—namely, by passing a general measure for that purpose. But to make an exception with regard to particular counties simply because it was said the inhabitants wanted it, without any official means of ascertaining the wishes of the people, was a very different thing indeed. In this case the House had no such official knowledge. He would call the attention of the House to the Preamble of this Bill, which commenced by reciting that, whereas the provisions in force against the sale in certain places of fermented liquors on Sunday were of great public benefit, it was expedient that those provisions should be extended to other places. He would ask, what official knowledge had the House to that effect? Where a Bill in Parliament contained a recital of that kind in the Preamble, the usual course was to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, to report whether the Preamble had been proved before them, and that course ought to be adopted in the present instance. Certainly, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had received a deputation, who told him the measure was desired in the county; but that was not the official proof which the House wanted. On the Orders of the Day, there were no fewer than four Bills of this character; one relating to Durham, one to Yorkshire, one to the Isle of Wight, and one to Northumberland. How was the House to decide, in each of these particular Bills, whether there was a strong local feeling in favour of it passing? That was a difficult question, to which the Government ought to give an answer.

He understood there were 20 counties, in respect of which similar measures were to be brought forward. How were they to decide which to grant and which to refuse? There ought to be some plan, by which the House could ascertain whether the feeling in each of these counties was sufficiently strong to warrant them in passing the Bill. Then, how far were they to carry the new-fangled doctrine, about passing measures for particular places which were said to desire them? The other day, they had a measure on the subject of contagious diseases, and it was evident that the inhabitants of the places affected by that measure were as nearly as possible unanimous in favour of the maintenance of the Acts. Why should counties be selected? If counties, why not boroughs? Why should not the city of Liverpool or the city of Manchester have a Bill to itself? If they carried the principle to its legitimate conclusion, these and other places should have special Acts; and let the House consider what confusion would ensue. Moreover, a measure of this kind would work great hardship, for, taking the case of Durham, there were populous districts exactly on the borders of the county, partly within and partly without, so that this Bill would leave the inhabitants of those districts in a singular condition. It would, therefore, be hard on the neighbouring county which might prefer to leave the Sunday Closing question as it is. It was, moreover, impossible to evade the fact that this was an Imperial question, for it must be remembered that large sums of money had been invested on the faith of licences. Publicans who took out a six days' licence were allowed a considerable remission in the duty they paid to the Government; and, if the Government meant to pass Bills of the character now before them, they must allow the same remission. He was as strong an advocate of temperance as any man, and he rejoiced to see that among the working men there was an increasing feeling in favour of temperance; but care should be taken not to go in advance of public opinion on this subject. Otherwise they would find secret clubs springing up, which, when once established, it would be exceedingly difficult to put down. He hoped, on this point, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would make some inquiries as to the secret clubs that were springing up in Wales and other places, for the House ought to have some information on the subject. He hoped the House would consider whether it was not wiser to legislate in one general measure, and that the Government would undertake the responsibility which was theirs, and which belonged to them alone. Then he thought that they would, under an altered state of public opinion, arrive at the conclusion that was generally accepted—namely, that those who had engaged in business on the faith of Parliamentary sanction were entitled to consideration; and he believed more would then be done to diminish drunkenness than by passing such a measure as this.

MR. HIBBERT: Sir, in the absence of my right hon. and learned Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department, I can assure hon. Members that he has fully satisfied himself as to the beneficial nature of this measure. I wish only to say one word more, and will not detain the House a moment in doing so. I merely wish to give expression to my opinion as to what is the feeling of the county of Durham upon this point. Out of the entire number of the Representatives for the county and borough of Durham, all, with the exception of one hon. Member, intend to vote in favour of the Bill; while the one exception is that of an hon. Member who has stated to the House that he does not intend to vote at all. This fact alone is sufficient to show that public opinion in the county of Durham is strongly in favour of the Bill.

MR. CALLAN said, that he was glad to hear the announcement, that if all the Members for any particular part of the country were in favour of a Bill, that was sufficient to show that the majority of the people were in favour of it. They would soon bring forward a measure conferring a considerable amount of Home Rule in Ireland, and he hoped that the same principle would then be admitted. No one had been able to refer to Ireland as exhibiting a satisfactory example of Sunday Closing except the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who, he (Mr. Callan) believed, had never been in Ireland. Scotland was the most immoral and most drunken part of the United Kingdom, although Sunday Closing had been in operation for more than a generation; but in Ireland, statistics showed that convictions for drunkeness had increased in the districts subject to the Irish Sunday Closing Act to the number of 11,000, or 21 per cent, whereas, in the exempted districts, where the system was not in force, it had diminished at the rate of 13 per cent; and Mr. Justice Fitzgibbon had expressed himself in terms unfavourable to the working of the Act.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he wished to say that, when the Irish Sunday Closing Bill came before the House, he should be prepared to refute all the arguments of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan). As an Irish Member, he did not propose to take any part in the discussion of a Bill relating only to a portion of England.

Question put.

The House *divided:* — Ayes 153; Noes 57: Majority 96.—(Div. List, No. 108.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, who spoke amid great interruption, said, he had to complain of the manner in which the arguments of the opponents of the Bill had been treated by a Government, presided over by a Minister who had no mind of his own and no policy of his own. His objection to the Bill was that it was a piece of class legislation of an unjust description. The Government supported it, yielding to the clamour below the Gangway, in the hope of catching as many votes as possible. He intended to move to amend the Bill in Committee by prohibiting the consumption of intoxicating liquors in any place on Sunday.

Mr. LEVESON-GOWER stated, that on the division with regard to this Bill he, in common with other hon. Members serving on Committees, had been shut out from voting through not being allowed sufficient time to come down into the House.

Mr. TOMLINSON rose, and was proceeding to speak as to some of the clauses of the Bill, when—

Mr. SPEAKER called the hon. Gentleman to Order, informing him that the proper time for doing so was when the Bill was in Committee.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Tuesday* next.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.—[Bill 29.]

(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Parnell, Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Callan, Mr. Lalor.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was necessary for him to explain to the House that, owing to circumstances over which he had no control, the Bill was not distributed at an earlier period, as he would have wished. The promoters of the Bill, however, did not intend to take Government by surprise, as, on Saturday last, they sent the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland an advanced copy, in order that he might have an opportunity of considering it. Now, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did not propose to make any lengthy observations in moving the second reading of the Bill, for the reason that the evils which it proposed to remedy were admitted on all sides of the House, and by all sections and classes in Ireland. Indeed, in Ireland, the competition had rather been as to who should show themselves the best friends of the labourer—the representatives of the landlord or the representatives of the Land League; and he had reason to believe that, at least, one Representative of the landlord party in that House would support the principle of this measure, while objecting to some of its details. There was a general agreement with regard to the unhappy condition of the labourers in Ireland. Everybody acknowledged that they were in a most unhappy condition, and perhaps there was no part of their hard lot in which they were worse off than the accommodation which their dwellings provided, and the distances which those dwellings often were from the places in which the men earned their daily bread. Not only was the accommodation given in their dwellings miserable, but the men also had frequently to pay most exorbitant rents for them, rents which were far above what they were able to afford, when compared with the little they earned. A second point, and one on which they were all unanimous was, that the efforts hitherto made by the Legislature to improve the condition of these people—and they had been several—had not been attended with anything like success—he meant the provisions made in the Land Act of 1870 and in the Land Act of 1881. As he did not wish to raise any question of controversy, he did not propose to deal with the reasons why the efforts already made by the Legislature had failed, but would content himself with merely stating the fact, and that new legislation was required, and proceed at once to state the purposes of the measure at present under discussion. Now, the question with which the Bill dealt was a most difficult and a most complicated question. In the Bill he did not profess to solve that difficulty, neither did he profess to have devised a remedy which was complete and exhaustive; but he thought that any person studying the matter would admit that a candid and fair attempt had been made to deal with this most complex question, and it was as such, and not an ambitious attempt either, that he submitted it to the judgment of the House. The only point on which discussion could fairly arise was as to the principle of the Bill, and that principle was contained, he might almost say, in the Interpretation Clause of the Bill, in which it was stated that the sanitary authority for the purposes of the Act would be the rural sanitary authority—that was to say, it was proposed to grant to the rural sanitary authorities throughout the country the same powers that were now exercised with regard to artizans' dwellings schemes by the urban sanitary authorities, and the machinery devised in this measure was the machinery devised by Parliament in the case of urban sanitary authorities in previous Acts of Parliament. The course of proceeding would be this. It would be necessary that a representation should be made by 12 ratepaying residents of a district to the local sanitary authority, setting forth the condition of the labourers' dwellings in the district, and affirming that, owing to dilapidations, the want of air, light, ventilation, or proper conveniences, or any other sanitary defects, the dwellings were unfit for human habitation, and that such deficiency, or sanitary defects, could not be remedied otherwise than by an improvement scheme for the erection of other dwellings, and so on. The sanitary authorities then, if they saw fit, should pass a resolution agreeing with the representation, after which they should prepare a scheme to be submitted for the approval of the Local Government Board. He might say that, in the preparation of this scheme, provision was made for the protection of the public, and for the protection of the landowners whose land it was proposed to take for the purposes stated. In the first place, the landlord with whose property it was proposed to interfere, might do the work of providing the necessary additional accommodation himself, with the provision that it should be done under the control and superintendence of the local sanitary authority. But, in case a scheme should be adopted by the rural sanitary authority, the scheme should be forwarded to the Local Government Board, who would satisfy itself, by an inquiry, as to the necessity of the proposed grant or Provisional Order, which would then be submitted to the Legislature and passed by it in the ordinary way, the money necessary for the purpose to be obtained from the Treasury, through the Board of Works. In that way, it would be seen that there would, therefore, be three safeguards for the proper administration of the Act, if passed. There would be, in the first place, the Board of Guardians, or the local sanitary authority; then the Local Government Board; and then the Legislature. From what he had now said the House would see that, although not a very exhaustive measure, the Bill was a modest one, and one that made an honest and fair attempt to deal with this question. It would not interfere with the rights of any class in Ireland, and he hoped it was one which would commend itself to the favourable considerations of all sections of the House. He had great pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he had put down a Notice of opposition to the Bill; but he merely did so, in consequence of the fact that it was not in the hands of hon. Members at an earlier date, so that they might see what it contained. However, as he found the delay occurred through a mistake, he would not persevere in his Motion. Now, however, that he had seen it, he must say that it appeared to him to be a Bill of a very complex character; and, while he did not wish to pronounce it absolutely unworkable, still he thought there would be great difficulty in working it. However, the Preamble of the Bill was so essentially true, that he did not intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. There could be no doubt that the condition of the labourers of Ireland was most deplorable. In fact, he believed that there were few countries in the world in which the condition of the labourers was more deserving the commiseration and help of those who desired to assist their fellow-creatures. The condition of the Irish labourer was always bad; but, of late years, it had gone from bad to worse, inasmuch as a few years ago there were a large number of resident landlords, who gave considerable employment to the labourers throughout the country; but many of those landlords had been driven out of the country in consequence of recent legislation, and in consequence of recent agitation. Before the recent land law legislation, the landlords were quite able to give sufficient employment, and build labourers' cottages. [An hon. MEMBER: Never.] Frequently. He (Colonel King-Harman) knew it himself, though he would admit it was not so often as he could have wished. That power was taken away through the operation of the Land Act, which contained a clause enjoining the Sub-Commissioners to provide that in certain cases, when a fair rent was fixed, that the farmers should provide a suitable dwelling and a small plot of land for the labourers. He had been in constant communication with the Sub-Commissioners, who had done their very best to carry out the Act in a manner most friendly to the tenant; and he was informed that in every case where the tenant had been ordered to build a cottage, he had refused to do so, or had evaded it in some way. He believed that the position of the labourers was certainly worse than before the passing of the Land Act. He believed there could be nothing better for the welfare of Ireland, than that the labourer should be provided with a decent dwelling and a plot of ground, to be cultivated in his spare time; and if that was done for him, he thought the man would be in a position to rear his family more comfortably than at present, and there would not be the same rage for getting hold of what was called a farm on some miserable mountain side, where lives were worn out in almost useless labour. The improvement of the dwellings of the Irish agricultural labourer would have a beneficial effect in an economical point of view, because it would prevent members of that class from falling into the state of lawlessness that was engendered by extreme poverty. Whether the Bill was actually workable, he would not say; but he was afraid, if it was not very much improved in Committee, it would be found to be unworkable. He should, however, support the second reading, reserving to himself the power to move the necessary Amendments in Committee. He feared, however, there was one serious blot in it, and that was that the sanitary authorities in the rural districts in Ireland were not, as a rule, the class of men who would go much out of their way to do anything for the agricultural labourers. They were mainly composed of farmers of small means; and, in his experience, there was great difficulty in getting them to do much in the direction indicated. He did not wish to find fault with them; but they had not shown themselves very careful of the labourers' condition during the past two years, and he merely wished to throw out a hint as to whether the duty of dealing with these matters could be handed over to other bodies more fitted to deal with them. Then, he thought the amount of land to be given to the labourer should not be fixed, as it was, in the Bill; inasmuch as half-an-acre of good land would be very useful to a labourer, but half-an-acre of bad land would be utterly worthless to him. Then, how did the Bill propose to deal with the resumption of the land, in case the labourer getting it turned out to be a worthless, thriftless character? [Mr. PARNELL: That will be part of the scheme.] In that case, he thought it ought to be put prominently forward in the Bill. There were no places in which the Bill would be of more use than in those parts of Ireland where cottiers had congregated upon commons, and were living in a most miserable and wretched and squalid manner, and utterly unable to benefit themselves or provide better accommodation. That was a matter which would have to be dealt with, and he presumed the intention of the promoters of the Bill was to take powers, according to the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, of laying out commons; but, from his knowledge of the people who usually squat upon those commons, he thought such a proceeding would be absolutely impossible. They were ignorant men, and would only know that some person with authority had come down to them, with powers of purchasing their common, and they would think it a gross fraud, and resist by all the means in their power. Perhaps the difficulty could be got over, but it was only by surmounting it that the Bill could make way. The remaining clauses were for the consideration of the Treasury; and he regretted not to see any Representative of the Treasury present. While he had tried to point out a few of the blots which appeared to him to stand out most strongly in the Bill, he was himself as anxious as anybody to assist in passing this or any other suitable measure for the amelioration of the condition of the labouring class of the people of Ireland.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, he was very glad his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the county of Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) had not opposed the Bill. He (Colonel Colthurst) looked upon the Bill as valuable, not so much for the provisions which it contained, as for the principle which it asserted—namely, that Boards of Guardians, as sanitary authorities, were responsible for the well-being and comfort of the inhabitants of their districts. Whether they would, without being compelled, be disposed to carry out this measure was a matter, of course, upon which everybody must hold his own opinion; but, judging of the future by the past and the present, and considering that they had had for many years very large powers of borrowing for sanitary purposes, for the provision of water supplies, the disposal of sewage, and other purposes, and that the cases in which they had exercised those powers were very rare, he thought that they must feel that they were likely to make very scanty use of the powers to be conferred by the Bill. Nevertheless, he thought the hon. Member who had brought forward the Bill (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had acted rightly in not making the Bill compulsory. It was worth while to try the experiment, and he hoped the pressure of public opinion would induce the Boards of Guardians not to shirk the responsibility which would be cast upon them. He thought it was well to remember, however, that there was a large class of labourers whom the Bill did not touch—namely, the labourers living on farms where they worked. After all, it was a far more desirable position for a labourer to be living on a farm, than in a village or town. They knew that in the Land Act there were clauses for the purpose of enforcing the erection of suitable cottages, or of improving unsuitable cottages, where the rent was to be fixed by agreement in Court. His hon. Friend the Member for Waterford (Mr. Villiers-Stuart) suggested, at the passing of the Act, the putting of strong penalties on those occupiers of land who did not carry out the orders of the Court in the matter. But, unfortunately, owing to the action of the Treasury, he was obliged to withdraw from the Bill a provision which enabled Inspectors to be appointed, who should be responsible to the Commissioners to see that their orders were carried out. Consequently, that Act had been absolutely a dead letter. He (Colonel Colthurst) did hope that, in this Bill, some attention might be given to that subject. Possibly, however, those who were responsible for the Bill considered it wise to confine it to one subject. He could only say, further, that having always advocated the extension of the powers of Boards of Guardians, in order that they might do in Ireland what Boards of Guardians had to do in England and Scotland—namely, assist in relieving the poor—he looked upon this Bill as at least a tribute to that end, and would vote for its second reading.

MR. PARNELL said, he fully agreed with what had been said by several speakers as to the experimental character of this measure, so far as the probabilities were concerned that the Boards of Guardians as the sanitary authorities in rural districts would make sufficient use of it. Still, at the same time, in considering the local authority they should name in the Bill as the authority to put the provisions of the Act in force, they were bound to take advantage of the only materials which existed. It might, or might not, be that the sanitary authorities were not the best authorities which could be constituted for the purpose of the Bill; but, at the same time, they were, practically speaking, the only authorities which existed in the Irish counties at the present moment within the rural sanitary districts; and he and his Friends, therefore, felt compelled to make the best use of them they could. He himself thought that, in a great many cases, the sanitary authorities would take suitable action for the benefit of the labourers; while, of course, there could be no doubt that, in other cases, they would be remiss in their duties, as public bodies very often were. He did not attach very much importance to the analogy drawn by the hon. and gallant Member for the County Cork (Colonel Colthurst), in directing attention to the subject of the neglect of the sanitary authorities hitherto to take adequate advantage of the powers intrusted to them, because, he thought that, probably, Boards of Guardians, composed as they largely were of farmers and others, who did not attach very much value to drains of any kind, so far as their own houses were concerned, were the last persons who would institute the works of sanitary importance in the towns under their charge, which they were hitherto empowered to make. But as regarded the question of the erection of labourers' dwellings, he anticipated, to a great extent, an entirely different result. He thought the farmers would be anxious to see the best use made of available sites for the purpose of housing their labourers. He knew that many farmers objected to have labourers living on their farms in separate dwellings. The reasons they gave were various; but, as a matter of fact, he knew that the objection very largely prevailed. It might not, however, take place where sites might be found obtainable in fields and towns within the area of the sanitary authorities, or where it might be possible to purchase waste nooks of land, the loss of which would not inconvenience anybody, for the purpose of forming clusters of little houses for the benefit of the labourers. He himself had always felt it would be of great importance to give the labourer a house to live in, and a small garden plot, apart from the immediate influence of his employer. He thought that every person who sold his labour was entitled to have a house to dwell in, and that he should not be compelled to look for shelter for himself and his family to the success of his exertions in coming to an agreement with the man who employed him. In other words, he thought the employer of labour was given an unfair advantage over the labourer in this respect, that when a dispute as to wages or any other subject arose, it should result in the loss of shelter to the labourer and his family. So far as a roof-tree and a small plot of ground went, the Government ought to place the labourer in an independent position. That was the principle taken up in the Artizans' Dwellings Act as regarded the artizans in towns. They now simply asked that the principle which had been worked out successfully, by Corporations in towns of 25,000 inhabitants and upwards, should be extended to rural authorities in Ireland, who governed much larger numbers of people. They excepted from the operation of the Bill urban authorities, who did not come within the operation of the Artizans' Dwellings Act. He thought they ought not to be entitled to the permissive powers given by this Bill, should it be passed. He hoped the Bill would be read a second time, and, speaking for them, he said that himself and his Friends, who were responsible for the Bill, would do their best to make it workable in Committee. Indeed, he thought it was workable already, because its provisions were all adapted to suit the special circumstances of the case from the Artizans' Dwellings Act; and he did not think, so far as any alterations in Committee went, that it would be possible to add very much to make it workable. The chief doubt, in his mind, was the doubt expressed by many speakers, as to whether it would be possible to get Boards of Guardians to carry out the provisions of the Act satisfactorily. He thought some would do so, and more would make no effort to do so; but, in two cases, the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881, the House had legislated in a different direction for the benefit of the labourers, and both these attempts had been failures. They, therefore, asked the House now to go in the direction indicated by this Bill, the principle of which had already proved most successful in the operation of the Artizans' Dwellings Act in the large towns of England and Ireland; and they believed it would go, to a very considerable extent, to redress the sufferings and evils under which a patient and long-suffering class in Ireland had laboured for so long. He felt sure that the law-abiding qualities which had been exhibited by the Irish labourers as a class would commend their case to the attention of Parliament, and that the House would not think the time occupied in Committee, in shaping this non-contentious and non-political Bill, had been lost, and that something might be done to benefit this meritorious class of Her Majesty's subjects.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he only wished to make a very few remarks. He must be allowed to confess that he saw great difficulties in the working of some clauses of the Bill. He agreed with the fear expressed by several hon. Members that they would be disappointed at the extent to which the sanitary authorities would make use of the Bill. He hoped the second reading would be accepted by the House, however; for there could be no question whatever that, of all the causes of misery in Ireland, none were much greater, or, rather, one ought to say, there was no more evident effect of poverty and misery in Ireland, than the very poor accommodation given by the wretched cabins of the peasantry. He thought it quite possible that, in this direction, some good might be done by the Bill. He would not detain the House with any further remarks, because it was very important that the second reading should be taken that night. And he trusted, if that were the case, there would be a wish on the part of all hon. Members of the House, even considering the pressure of Business, to allow it to get through the remaining stages by taking it rather late at night, or whenever opportunity arose, in order that it might pass this Session.

Mr. BRODRICK said, he was glad to see that a measure like the present had been brought forward, and equally glad to find that it had the support generally of hon. Members. He was also glad to hear the desire of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) that the Bill should pass, remembering that he opposed a previous Bill for the erection of labourers' cottages, which he (Mr. Brodrick) had brought forward himself on the passing of the Land Act in 1881. However, putting aside what had been done hitherto, he hoped the House would agree to the second reading of the Bill that evening. However desirable the Bill was in principle, he thought, judging from past experience, it would not be worked to any great extent. He would suggest to the hon. Gentleman who had introduced the measure (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) whether it would not be desirable to include also the provision of the Artizans' Dwellings Act, which had taken effect in many places—namely, that in the case of isolated houses of very unsanitary condition, and which were reported upon by a competent officer as unfit for human habitation, Her Majesty would have the power of ordering them to be summarily closed. Beyond that, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would give them an assurance, if they supported this Bill, that they intended to enforce the clause in the Land Act enabling Sub-Commissioners to call upon tenants to build suitable cottages for their labourers. In dealing with a country like Ireland, he thought it absolutely necessary that the existing law should not be allowed to slide, because fresh legislation had been set on foot. In Committee it would, he thought, be necessary to consider whether some better authority than that of Boards of Guardians might not be established; whether some authority should be added to the Boards of Guardians as a sort of spur in dealing with this question; and he was quite certain that, whatever differences of opinion there might be in Committee, there would be a general feeling that any measure honestly desiring to ameliorate the condition of the labouring classes in Ireland would receive the support of the House.

Mr. LEA said, he most heartily supported the Bill, and cordially joined in the wish expressed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) and the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Brodrick) that the second reading would be taken that evening.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE said, he fully agreed with previous speakers that the Preamble of the Bill merited their support; and if there was a division he should certainly vote for the second reading; but he thought the Bill required much alteration before it became law, as many of its provisions were unworkable. He wished, however, to point out to the promoters of the Bill what seemed to him to be a fatal omission. A great majority of the labourers' cottages in Ireland were in the hands of tenants. He had not been able carefully to study all the clauses of the Bill, since he had received it only that morning; but, so far as he understood it, there was no provision for that class of labourers at all. Provision was made only for labourers where the landlords could put them into better houses. ["No, no!"] He might be wrong in that idea; but, however that might be, if any provision was inserted in Committee that the labourers under tenants should have better accommodation, in Committee as well as on the second reading the Bill would have his most hearty support. The labourers of Ireland, he believed, had not been in a happy state for many a day. He hoped the Bill, when amended, would promote their prosperity.

Mr. BERESFORD said, that, so far as the Preamble of the Bill was concerned, he was quite prepared to support it, as he agreed that the condition of the agricultural labourer in Ireland was capable of great improvement. In many parts of Ireland the labourers were in a very poor condition; and as to their residences, some people would not place their animals, their dogs, he might say, in some of the houses the tenants had to habitate. As he had only received a copy of the Bill that morning, he had scarcely time to look into it; and, therefore, he could not say much on the clauses. He was afraid, however, that there would be great difficulty in making Boards of Guardians carry out the provisions of the Bill; for, generally speaking, people in Ireland were against any improvement from a sanitary point of view. He knew a village, the unsatisfactory sanitary condition of which had been reported to the Board of Guardians by the Inspector, and perpetual opposition had been offered to any alteration. It was only when attention was called to its condition in the House of Commons that any measures were taken to improve it. At present, it was in a very bad condition, and required still further improvement. But what did they find? That the principal opposition came from the very people who might be expected, under this Bill, to carry out the object in view. He would not say more on the clauses, but would support the second reading.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the debate had been a very remarkable one, and the Government was in a very remarkable position. The hon. Members who their names on the back of the Bill had introduced a measure which might be important, as tending to the benefit of Ireland; but which, if passed exactly in its present shape, might not operate to its advantage, with perhaps the shortest possible notice that had ever been given on any question, it having been only circulated that morning. He was bound to admit, however, that, so far, the shortness of that Notice had produced no element of discordancy. As far as he could gather, it was only on Saturday that the Bill was in shape for printing; and the hon. Members in charge of the Bill took the earliest opportunity of placing the Government in possession of it. But, early as that opportunity was, it was obviously not sufficiently early to enable the Government to give the Bill full, or, indeed, for practical purposes, any adequate consideration. Hon. Members, he thought, forgot that this Bill, important as it was in its relations to Ireland, was important, to a very great degree, also, in its relations to the country at large. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) said that the principle of the Bill had been accepted in two Acts—first of all, in the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act; and, secondly, in the Land Act of 1881. Now, he (Mr. Trevelyan) must say that, so far as this Bill coincided with the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, it was a very serious thing, indeed, off-hand to extend the Act to the rural districts in Ireland, when they considered that no adequate reason could be given, so far as the sanitary state of a particular district was concerned—and he was not speaking of the labourers' cottages only—for extending it in the same way to England. The hon. Member for the City of Cork must recollect that there were several Departments in England

and Ireland, the opinion of which would have to be very fully taken before that principle could be acted on; because it was quite impossible that they could act in this matter, first of all, without the recommendation of the Irish Government, which could only be given after careful consideration. Then the Cabinet would have to consider and accept the Bill. The English Local Government Board would require, to a great extent to give its sanction and approval, and a Department which he (Mr. Trevelyan) thought was somewhat overlooked in the debate—the Treasury—would have to be consulted; because, undoubtedly, under the Bill, the funds would have to be provided in the first instance by the Treasury. Then the hon. Member for the City of Cork referred to the principle having been accepted in the Land Act; and in that respect he (Mr. Trevelyan) heartily agreed with him. He considered that the intention of the Land Act undoubtedly was, that the labourers of Ireland, so far as the machinery for giving them the boon could be introduced within the four corners of the Land Act, should have proper cottages and a sufficient plot of land. The Commissioners, as he ascertained by telegraph that morning—everything connected with this Bill was so rapid, that they had to take the rapidest means of communication that science had placed at their disposal—by the orders made by the Commissioners, the half-acre had almost invariably been taken as the extent of land which they thought should stand round the cottage. The hon. Member for West Surrey (Mr. Brodrick) spoke of the very small effective operation that had been given to these powers on the part of the Land Commission; and he said he wished the Government would take the matter into their own hand. It was, unfortunately, true that the action of the Commissioners in this matter had, as yet, been small; but there was no subject which interested the Government more keenly than the very inadequate results of this clause of the Land Act. In order to make it more effective, it would be necessary, he thought, to have further legislation, because the powers the Government had over the proceedings of the Land Commission were, in fact, *nil*, and ought to be *nil;* and the Land Commission did not see their way, at present, to make a larger use of these powers, owing to the very great mass of business at present on their hands. The hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), who introduced the measure, said it was not an ambitious measure. However that might be, it would be considered a most ambitious measure on this side of the Channel; but it did not follow that, because the measure was ambitious, it should be a measure that was disadvantageous to the public welfare of Ireland; and, therefore, the Government, being in the position which he had described, had listened with very great interest to the debate—a debate which he characterized as remarkable in the first sentence of his speech, and, he thought, not without reason. Four hon. Members spoke who might fairly be taken as the Representatives of the landlords in Ireland; two hon. Members had spoken who might, he thought, with equal justice be characterized as Representatives of the tenants in those controversies which now, he hoped, had been put to sleep, which had occurred between the landlords and tenants in that House; and a seventh, a right hon. Gentleman, had spoken, whom they would all accept as a Representative of the administrative element in that House—a Gentleman thoroughly conversant with the Administration, and perfectly well aware of what could, and what could not, be done by an Administration; and these seven Gentlemen, so representative in a high degree, all agreed in speaking on behalf of giving this measure a second reading. They had all spoken in favour of the principle of the measure; and not one dissentient voice had been raised against it. Well, the Government had proved, by the clause in the Land Act, that they also approved of the principle and the object at which this measure aimed, and after that debate the Government would not oppose the second reading. He could only say, for himself, in the debate which had come upon them so suddenly—every Member of the Government had to speak for himself—he could only say that there was absolutely no question in the rural districts of England in which he had, during the last 10 or 12 years, been more interested than in watching the extent to which labourers were put in the position of improving their condition by labour outside that which they gave for wages. But there was a very great step between accepting the object of the Bill and accepting the machinery by which that object was required to be attained. He had used the interval which the hon. Member for Galway gave him to study for his own part, and with the best advice which he could obtain, the Bill, both as regarded its objects and machinery. He had come to some conclusion in the matter, and he had come to the first germs of some other conclusion; and he must say that he thought the machinery was, in some respects, too weak, and in others it might possibly be too powerful. He thought that there were certain large classes of the people whose interests might be extremely and injuriously affected by the Bill as it at present stood. It was most necessary, to begin with, that those persons who were put in possession of the advantages of good cottages and plots of land—for he confined himself to that as the real essence of this Bill—should really and truly be labourers; and that there should be no encouragement to squatters on small farms which could not by any possibility grow more than three or four tons of potatoes a-year, and could only reproduce—and not reproduce, under certain conditions of Irish society—the worst conditions of sub-division in the days when sub-division was at its worst. Then, again, it was extremely necessary to see that anything done under the Bill should be done without injustice to the holders of land, and it was still more necessary to see that no injustice should be done to the ratepayers. There were cases in which one or two great ratepayers might be taxed and mulcted by people who were the representatives of the great mass of the community, to a degree that would be positive oppression and persecution. And, again, must it be seen that the Treasury was not damnified by the operation of the Bill. The preliminary stage must also be gone through of asking the Treasury whether they approved or disapproved of the burden, the responsibilities, and risks that were placed upon them. The practical result that he wished to be drawn from the observations that he had made was this—that the Government would gladly see the labourers in possession of a decent house and a garden of adequate size and adequate fertility. Any measure by which that object could be promoted without private injustice and public inconvenience the Government would, in their turn, be glad to promote; but when the hon. Member for the City of Cork said that he was ready to do anything to render the Bill workable in Committee, he (Mr. Trevelyan) must say that the Government, in acceding to the second reading, would make very large drafts indeed upon that willingness. This was a private Member's Bill; but the Government could not undertake to let it go to any further stage until they had practically accepted the responsibility for what was done under it; and, although the Amendments which they would place on the Paper would convert it into a Government Bill, in so far as the propositions and the safeguards were concerned, he did not say that the Government would not gladly leave the whole credit of it to those private Members who had supported it, who had introduced it, and to those private Members who, during the debate on the Land Act, supported the principle of this measure in whatever part of the House they sat. The Government, then, would accede to the second reading, on the distinct understanding that they would do everything in their power to oppose the next stage until they had had full time to consider how the Bill might be put into a shape that they conceived to be safe and efficient. He did not say it was not in that shape now; but he said the Government must have full time to consider the matter, with just as much care and attention, and as much sense of responsibility, as if the Bill had been originally their own; but measures to insure that should be taken promptly, zealously, and energetically; and as soon as the Government were prepared to allow the Bill to go forward they would follow the advice of his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford, and would gladly see it pushed forward at a time of night at which Bills seldom could be put forward, unless supported with such unanimity of opinion on both sides of the House as this Bill had just enjoyed.

Mr. GIBSON said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had certainly vindicated his right to be regarded as a Gentleman of great literary and intellectual capacity from the way in which he had presented to the House his conclusions, and first germs of conclusions. There was no one who would not readily concur with the terms made use of in the Preamble of the Bill—that it was expedient to make provision for the building and maintenance of improved dwellings for labourers in Ireland, and better sanitary accommodation for themselves and their families. But it was a great deal more easy to agree with the Preamble than to say by what particular methods they would accomplish their good intentions. It was an immensely difficult question; and the more one looked at it, the more one realized how hard it was in this world to make one's good opinions harmonize with what was really capable of being carried out. He did not think anyone who had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman could complain of its tone or its request. The Bill dealt with a great question. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had said it was a tentative measure. Of course that, in a sense, was true; but it was an immense experiment, and it was an experiment of a wide and far-reaching character; and, obviously, a debate carried on within a few hours after the Bill had been distributed was carried on under considerable difficulties. There were few hon. Members who could have their thoughts matured in a few hours on this difficult and important subject. He thought, then, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland was warranted in his main contention—that the Government were entitled, upon a Bill of that kind, to a fair and reasonable, not an undue time, for considering how to shape and mould the Bill into what they considered a practical and feasible form. As he understood, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman came to this—that the Government, in assenting to the second reading of the Bill, assented to the principles contained in the Preamble, that it was proper that there should be an improvement in the position of the agricultural labourers in Ireland, but that they would themselves place on the Paper Amendments, which would practically make its proposals the proposals of Her Majesty's Government. There were two broad considerations never to be lost sight of in considering this difficult question, on which he (Mr. Gibson) was glad to think everyone was substantially agreed. Let them take care that this was a real Bill, and not a sham Bill. Let them take care that it was for labourers. He emphasized that, because he was satisfied that, as it stood, it was not a Bill for labourers. Anyone who read the Definition Clause would see it was a Bill that practically would not include the labourers, but would include the farmers, large and small, who employed labourers. He was sure that was not the intention of the framers of the Bill; but it was quite obvious that the Definition Clause would require to be stated with more precision when the Government came to deal with the Bill. An agricultural labourer was a man who worked for hire on another person's land; but the Definition Clause stated that it meant persons who were habitually employed in the cultivation of the soil, or who gained their livelihood thereby, including the families of such persons. In other words, the Definition Clause comprised tenants, and the families of tenants, and did not point at the agricultural labourers, properly so called; and under it the members of the rural sanitary authority would be enabled to provide improved dwellings for themselves. Of course, that was a matter to be set right. He made no imputation; but only pointed out the defect so as to prevent this being a sham Bill. His second consideration was as to the machinery. The selection of machinery was one of the greatest difficulties which beset this question; and he was not prepared to say, off-hand, what should be the machinery. The framers of the Bill had selected—and they had warrant in the history of similar matter for selecting—the rural sanitary authority, which really meant the Poor Law Guardians. That was a tribunal which, left unfettered and alone to their own untutored discretion, would not have the confidence of the labourers; and he was not sure that their past history showed that they had particular sympathy with the question of how the labourers lived, and how they were clothed, or anything, except how to get the greatest amount out of them for the smallest possible wages. He could well imagine that the Bill would not be a dead letter in the hands of the Poor Law Guardians, if the clients of the Bill were the persons at present pointed out in the Definition

Clause; because the rural sanitary authority might readily provide improved dwellings for themselves and families, but when the Definition Clause was put right, and confined to real agricultural labourers, they should have independent men as the machinery. He thought hon. Members who had discussed this question had not sufficiently borne in mind what little use this authority had made in the past of the ample sanitary powers they possessed as to many important sanitary questions. It was true that in too many Unions they were only the rural sanitary authorities in name. They had got the widest powers; but, in too many cases, they had left the Public Health Act a dead letter; and in other matters he was doubtful if they had administered statutes in the past in a way to encourage Parliament to confide to them, in the future, the delicate considerations which must influence them in working a measure so important and difficult as the present one. He thought one of the greatest difficulties on this point that would be found by the Government, when they applied themselves to the task of making this Bill workable, and in consonance with Government ideas, was this—that if they built and improved the houses of agricultural labourers, what was to be the guarantee that real agricultural labourers, for whom this exceptional legislation was attempted, would inhabit them? No Act of Parliament could compel a farmer to employ a labourer one day beyond what he felt necessary; so that the man who this week had his house improved, and was in receipt of wages as an agricultural labourer, might next week be dismissed—what was then to be his tenure of the house which they had built or improved? Was he to walk out of it, or was he to have a tenure more durable than his employment? If so, who was to be his landlord, and who would recover the rent from him? Was the sanitary authority to press him for rent when he was out of employment? They would unquestionably be beset with these difficulties, which everyone must recognize as of the gravest possible character, which many regarded as insurmountable, and which he himself was not at that moment able to solve. None the less, however, would it be the desire of every Member of the House to see, if it was possible, some Bill pass which might have the effect of improving the condition and the dwellings of the agricultural labourers of Ireland; and he only hoped that the course proposed to be taken by the Government would result in the passing of a practical measure to that end.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, that, while anxious to see labourers' cottages erected and decent accommodation provided, he must confess that he could not see how the Bill would secure that object satisfactorily. It seemed to him that the mode pointed out in the Bill to effect that object was rather a singular one. In many parts of Ireland it had been complained that labourers were driven by the effect of the Poor Law from cottages in the country to dwellings in small towns, from which they had long distances to travel to their labour; and he saw no provision in the Bill to secure that labourers' cottages should be on the farm where they laboured. The Bill was not wanted for the benefit of jobbing carpenters and others, who lived on the outskirts of the villages, but for *bonâ fide* agricultural labourers; and care must be taken that the rates were not burdened for the benefit of the wrong people. A cottage improved, or built in the manner proposed under the Bill, might, at first, be occupied by a *bonâ fide* labourer; but how did the Bill secure that, at his departure, it might not come to be occupied by someone who was not of the same class? Compulsory powers of purchasing land also were sought to be given to the sanitary authority; but those powers were open to abuse. Although these were all points upon which Amendments were required he would not oppose the second reading of the Bill. He trusted that the cottages would be properly distributed, and the occupants of them would not be allowed to acquire a right of occupation independent of the continuance of their labour on the farms. He hoped the Government would take the Bill into their own hands, and reconstruct it upon a better basis, and that they would take care that a new class was not created like the miserable cottier class, which had been the cause of so much riot and disturbance in Ireland.

Mr. MOORE said, he thought there was no backbone in the Bill. He, therefore, hoped the Government would take it up, re-model it, and supply what was wanting in that respect. He did not wish to speak with any hostility of a measure intended to relieve the Irish labourer; but he was perfectly convinced that the Bill would be so much waste paper if it was entrusted to the Boards of Guardians to carry out. As to the sanitary authority in Ireland, which at present was the Boards of Guardians, they were so simply in name, for the manner in which they discharged those duties was simply a farce, and to entrust them with additional powers would be a greater farce still. The position of the labourer, instead of being improved, was positively worse since the Land Act, as the farmers did not carry out the orders made by the Sub-Commissioners in their favour. In the Boards of Guardians, the farmers, instead of attending to the Poor Law business, occupied their time in political debates, which they had neither the capacity nor the intelligence to entertain. Having no care for them, they never would do anything for the labourers; and if the Bill was to have any backbone it should not be entrusted to them, or to the Local Government Board, but to a working Department of the Land Commission. That Commission should have power to appoint Inspectors, in order to investigate the cases which would arise, and to see to the carrying out of the admirable provisions of the Bill. He objected to placing the Bill under the control of the Local Government Board, which he considered was not at all fitted to deal with it.

Mr. VILLIERS-STUART: Sir, I hope that Her Majesty's Government will give their support to the passing of this Bill, even though they may see objections to details in it. There is no class of Her Majesty's subjects who have been more cruelly mocked by recent legislation than the agricultural labourers of Ireland. They were led to expect some relief from the 19th clause of the Land Act of 1881, and from the Labourers' Cottages and Allotments (Ireland) Act of 1882. But what has been the result. How have the promises contained in those Acts been fulfilled? I find that, out of 45,000 farms, on which judicial rents have been fixed by the Land Commissioners and Sub-Commissioners, and 37,000 farms, on which rents have been agreed upon out of Court—that is, in round numbers, rents have been fixed upon 80,000 holdings under the Land Act — well, in how many cases out of those 80,000 have the Labourers' Clauses been put into force? Why, only in 350—that is, one in 250. Well, but out of those 350 cases in which orders have been made, in how many have those orders been carried out? Why, I have put this question more than once to Her Majesty's Government, and have as yet got no answer. My belief is, that the cases in which the orders have been carried out are so few that they might be counted on one's 10 fingers, and leave several of them idle. I should be simply rehearsing a thrice-told tale, were I to tell the House of the miserable, squalid surroundings of an average Irish labourer's dwelling; of the one room doing duty as a kitchen by day, and a dormitory for all ages and both sexes, combined with a pig-stye and hen-house, by night. Englishmen desire to see Irishmen loyal; but how can they expect the class in question to be loyal, when this is how they fare under English rule? It avails nothing to ask, how can we help it? This House admits its power to help when it passes laws on the subject, but shows itself wanting in will when it permits those laws to be a dead letter in the hands of the officials appointed to carry them out. The Commissioners would bestir themselves fast enough to carry them out, if they believed that there was in high places a resolute determination that they should be carried out. Then, why is there not? Why, because these poor men have no votes. I had hoped that nobler motives might have prevailed; but it is evident that no class, lacking political power, stands any chance in this age of getting its grievances redressed. Sir, if redress cannot otherwise be obtained for the labouring class, it is the strongest possible argument in favour of household suffrage. As for the Bill now before the House, I am well aware how inadequate it is; still, as far as it goes, it is a step in the right direction. I proposed an Amendment to the Land Bill, providing that the sanitary authorities should be empowered to intervene.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* 7th June.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (YORKSHIRE) BILL.

(*Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Barran, Mr. Caine, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Isaac Wilson, Sir Matthew Wilson, Mr Pease.*)

[BILL 56.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Charles Wilson.*)

MR. CALLAN said, he objected to a Bill of that character being introduced at that period—20 minutes to 6. The hon. Member was still speaking when——

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

QUESTION.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he wished take that opportunity of asking the Secretary of State for the Home Department what Business would be taken to-morrow? It had been understood, according to the arrangement intimated yesterday, that if the Agricultural Holdings Bill was read a second time yesterday, which it was, the Corrupt Practices Bill would be taken on Thursday. But he saw that the Bill was down for Monday, and he did not see what Business was to be taken to-morrow. Perhaps the right hon. and learned Gentleman could tell the House what class of Supply would be taken, and whether a Vote on Account would be taken; also, what Business it was proposed to put down for Monday?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that no doubt it was taken for granted that the Agricultural Holdings Bill would be debated two nights, and hence the Corrupt Practices Bill had been put down for Monday. It was impossible now, under the circumstances, to change that arrangement; and, therefore, it was proposed to take Supply to-morrow, and the Vote on Account after Supply. The Supply would be the Civil Service Estimates. After that Business the Constabulary Pay and Pensions (Ireland) Bill would be taken.

MOTIONS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (DISTRICT COURTS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, Bill to amend and extend the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts 1873 and 1875, and to make provision for the better local administration of justice in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, Mr. EUSTACE SMITH, Mr. ROWLEY HILL, and Mr. JOHN MORLEY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 203.]

STATUTE OF FRAUDS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. REID, Bill to amend the Statute of Frauds, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. REID, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. ARTHUR ELLIOT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 204.]

COMMONS AND INCLOSURE ACTS AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. BRYCE, Bill to amend the Commons and Inclosure Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. BRYCE and Mr. STORY-MASKELYNE.

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 31*st May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Earl of Lonsdale, after the death of his brother.

SELECT COMMITTEE—House of Lords (Construction and Accommodation), The Viscount Enfield *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) * (67); Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders * (68); Criminal Law Amendment (69).

Second Reading—Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders * (60); Poor Law Conferences * (65).

Third Reading—General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Broughty Ferry Paving) * (45); Local Government Provisional Orders * (54), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Tithe Rentcharge (22).

Royal Assent—Customs and Inland Revenue [46 *Vict.* c. 10]; Isle of Man Harbours [46 *Vict.* c. 9]; Glebe Loans (Ireland) Acts Amendment [46 *Vict.* c. 8]; Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Orders Confirmation [46 *Vict.* c. x.].

LONDON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY (ADDITIONAL POWERS) BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE, in rising to move—

"That it be an instruction to the Committee to which the Bill is referred that the Railway Company shall not be empowered to appropriate a larger portion of the Parochial Burial Ground of St. James' than is proved to be absolutely required for the necessary convenience of the travelling public, by means of the enlargement of the railway station and of the substitution of a new street in lieu of the existing street which is to be absorbed in the process of the enlargement of the station."

said, the question he desired to raise was one of policy and principle, and therefore it ought to be raised in the House. Committees often considered it their duty to restrict their attention to a decision on the conflicting claims of parties pecuniarily interested, and not to enter upon public policy. The Bill was an Omnibus Bill, containing many provisions to which there was no objection, and therefore he did not move its rejection; but he asked the House to express its opinion on the two clauses relating to the burial ground. An open space in London ought not to be sacrificed unnecessarily; and the Metropolitan Board of Works desired to take charge of this burial ground, and to maintain it as a place of public recreation, as they had done in the case of seven or eight other burial grounds. The Railway Company sought to take two portions, and one of them they did not require, for their counsel admitted that one acre given to them by this Bill was not necessary for the enlargement of the station; and they proposed to utilize it for stabling and the storage of omnibuses, and for the parcel post, and this space might be taken from private property instead of from the recreation of the public. It would be necessary for the Company to cart away 17,000 remains, and many of the relatives of those interred had petitioned their Lordships, praying that desecration might not be permitted. There would be no desecration of any part handed over to the Metropolitan Board, as there had been no desecration in any of the other burial grounds handed over to them. The trustees sought to escape from their statutory obligation to maintain this open space for ever. The House would disregard its duty if it sanctioned this breach of trust. As a matter of policy, he contended that their Lordships ought not to allow any of these parochial burial grounds to be desecrated without proof of the clearest necessity. The noble Lord concluded by moving the Instruction.

THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND said, his noble Friend entirely misapprehended the wishes of the London and North-Western Railway Company on this point. No one was more desirous to increase the lung power of the Metropolis than they were. In the present case, however, there were other considerations besides that of open spaces. That part of London which was situate near Euston was not badly off for open spaces. Regent's Park was only half-a-mile away. Primrose Hill was under a mile, and there was a churchyard which might be easily converted into an open space. There were several other open spaces all round the neighbourhood. Therefore, he did not think his noble Friend's remarks were quite appropriate to this particular graveyard. They all knew what an inconvenience it was for railway stations to be overcrowded. This proposed change would give ample space for increasing the accommodation of the station; and, now that the Government intended to introduce a new system of Parcels Post, it was most necessary and desirable that there should be more space. At present the limited space was not only an inconvenience, but also a great source of danger. It was a curious fact that nobody ever thought of converting this old graveyard into an open space until the Railway Company obtained a slice of it. The Company only wished to take about two acres and a-half, leaving two acres and a-half which would be available for garden ground, and most useful for the Temperance Hospital that was close to the place. He hoped their Lordships would vote for the Bill on its merits. An hon. Friend of his, when asked why he had voted against the second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons, said—"Because the London and North-Western Company have behaved very badly to me," Asked further in what way they had behaved badly to him, he replied—"They weighed my luggage." That showed him how reasonable much of the opposition to the Bill was. He trusted that their Lordships would, on consideration, view the matter in the same light as he (the Duke of Sutherland) did, and commit the Bill as it stood; for surely five Peers could be found to do justice on all sides without any Instruction from their Lordships.

THE EARL OF DALHOUSIE said, he agreed with the noble Duke in hoping that the House would vote on the merits of the question, but was unable to concur with his view of the case. Why was the Company asking for land which they did not originally require? At first they only asked for a very small portion of the burial ground. The Trustees of St. James's Parish, seeing their way to make a good thing out of the space, insisted on the Company taking two-thirds and paying the sum of £15,000 for it, which would be devoted to ecclesiastical purposes in the Parish of St. James's. On the showing of the Railway Company themselves, the quantity of land proposed to be given to them was unnecessary for the station. This was pre-eminently a question for the consideration of their Lordships' House, as this populous and very poor neighbourhood was practically voiceless in regard to it. In the division which took place in the House of Commons there were no fewer than 50 Railway Directors in the majority, and only four in the minority. It was only natural that Railway Directors should be somewhat prejudiced in favour of Railway Companies, and should exaggerate the advantages conferred by them on the public. He hoped the House would reverse the decision of the Select Committee of the House of Commons.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he objected to the question being referred to a Parliamentary Committee, as it was one of principle, which could be discussed more satisfactorily by their Lordships than by a Committee. Besides, there was great danger that interests adverse to the Railway Company would not be adequately presented to the Committee by counsel. The Company would have the best counsel on their side, while the poor population, whose welfare was in danger of being sacrificed, would probably be unrepresented. Many years ago he had served on a Committee of the House of Commons, which inquired into the conduct of its Private Business; and the evidence then showed conclusively that, though Parliamentary Committees generally decided justly between the contending parties, the public interest in different places, if there were no rich persons sufficiently affected by the proposed Bill to make it worth their while to pay counsel, was apt to suffer in consequence.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he hoped the House would agree to the Motion of the noble Lord. A certain question of public policy was involved. He objected to giving the Company any portion of the land at all, and would have supported still more cordially a proposal that none of the land should be acquired by the Railway, but that the Railway should buy even at a higher price whatever land they needed. He should certainly vote for a proposal which should give the Company exactly the quantity of land required for their undertaking and no more. He supported the Motion, first, because the London and North-Western Railway Company did not want the whole of the land; and, secondly, because the Parish of St. James's had no local interest in the matter, and the parish affected was a poor and crowded one which greatly needed open spaces. He thought, too, there was something in the argument of the noble Earl on the Cross Benches (Earl Fortescue).

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN supported the Motion. It was doubtful whether the vicar and churchwardens of St. James's had the power of selling the land. They had buried 15,000 persons in the churchyard, and the burial fees had been paid. Thus it was not clear to whom the land belonged, as many of those whose relatives were buried in it might have bought the fee simple of the graves. He hoped their Lordships would pay particular attention to the 13th clause.

LORD COLVILLE OF CULROSS said, he trusted that their Lordships would treat the measure as they were accustomed to treat similar measures coming before them, and send the Bill to a Committee of the House without any Instruction. It was hardly complimentary to their Lordships to give such an Instruction to a Committee. It was said that the Company were buying more land than was actually required. But it should be borne in mind that since the contract was entered into new obligations had been imposed on Railway Companies. The Parcels Post system would come into operation in August next, and a large and important service would have then to be discharged by the Company. He hoped the Bill would not be met in the spirit in which a Member of the House of Commons had approached it. A noble Lord, a Member of the House of Commons, related at a railway charity dinner the other day that he met a Member in the Lobby who said he was going to vote against "Forbes and his blowholes." He was then informed that the Bill did not relate to the Metropolitan or District Railway at all. But the hon. Member replied that he should vote against it "because Railway Companies wanted sitting upon." He hoped the House would treat the Bill in the ordinary manner in which such Bills were treated. The Open Spaces Committee never contemplated putting this ground in a condition for the use of the public; whereas the Railway Company had, by the promotion of this Bill, brought about an open space which would be utilized for the public benefit.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON said, that the Trustees of St. James's had no wish to disturb the dead, and were not desirous of selling the burial ground; but the Railway Company were promoting this Bill to enable them to purchase it; and, if so, the parish to which it belonged would seem to have the first right to profit by the proceeding. The ground in question seemed to be one of the last places which ought to be chosen for a playground. It was damp, and the Trustees never could drain it properly. On all sides was a larger number of open places, squares, and crescents than can be found in most parts of London. On the other hand, the Parish of St. James's, Westminster, to which the ground belonged, which was considered a rich parish by those who only moved in Western and Southern boundaries—St. James's, Pall Mall, and part of Regent Street—had, East of Regent Street, a population as poor as any in the East End of London. It contained 18,000 working men and their families. Each of these families, instead of occupying small houses or flats, were compelled to crowd together in one room, eight or ten such families occupying each house. These houses were erected in the time of Charles II. and Queen Anne. It was proposed to use the money to be paid for the ground in question for the purpose of building new houses for the working classes; and he was of opinion that in applying the money for that purpose the parish would be doing more to promote the temporal comfort of the poor of London than by securing another open space for their recreation, where it was much less needed.

THE EARL OF COURTOWN said, he thought that every argument which had been urged against the Bill was a strong one in favour of sending it before a Select Committee, who could inquire into the validity of the objections which had been raised to the proposal.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said, he would point out to the noble Earl that while before a Select Committee the Railway Company and Trustees would be represented by counsel, it would be nobody's business to support the objections to the Bill on behalf of the public.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said, he thought that the Metropolitan Board of Works would be able to defend the public interests before the Committee.

EARL CAIRNS pointed out that the Vestry of St. Pancras intended, as was understood, to oppose the Bill in Committee.

THE EARL OF CORK said, he hoped that their Lordships would not be prepared to take any unusual step in this matter, but would allow the Bill to be read a second time, with the object of its being sent before a Select Committee.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2ª, and *committed.*

Moved, "That it be an instruction to the Committee to which the Bill is referred, that the Railway Company shall not be empowered to appropriate a larger portion of the Parochial Burial Ground of St. James' than is proved to be absolutely required for the necessary convenience of the travelling public, by means of the enlargement of the railway station and of the substitution of a new street in lieu of the existing street which is to be absorbed in the process of the enlargement of the station."—(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

EARL CAIRNS asked their Lordships to consider whether there was any precedent for an Instruction of this nature. The object of an Instruction to a Committee was to enlarge the power of a Committee, and to enable them to do that which otherwise they could not do. There was no precedent for an Instruction to limit the power of a Committee, and to require them to discharge their duty in a particular way.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he thought that the principle which had just been laid down by the noble and learned Earl was a very unreasonable and dangerous one. A great number of things might be proposed by these Private Bills in which public interests were incidentally concerned; and if that House was never to be at liberty to express an opinion by way of Instruction that something ought not to be done which was proposed to be done by such Private Bills, but was to be bound to leave the remedy to the technical rules of *locus standi* which prevailed in respect of these Committees, the result would, in his opinion, be the increase of that encroachment, which he had observed to be continually tending to increase, of Private Bills upon the province of public legislation.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he felt bound to say, as regarded the practice of Parliament, that he remembered as distinctly as possible that it was ruled again and again that Instructions could not be moved upon matters which were within the competency of a Committee. The object of an Instruction was to enlarge the powers which a Committee possessed. Of course, if the House desired to take some course different from that which was recommended by the Committee, its course was obvious. It could either re-commit the Bill to a Committee of the Whole House, or move for an alteration upon Report or third reading. But, for the sake of the order of their proceedings, he hoped this Instruction would not be accepted.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 49; Not-Contents 89: Majority 40.

CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Archp.
Selborne, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)

York, L. Archp.

Bath, M.

Amherst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
Derby, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Morley, E.
Northbrook, E.
Onslow, E.
Ravensworth, E.
Shaftesbury, E.

Powerscourt, V.

Carlisle, L. Bp.
St. Asaph, L. Bp.
Winchester, L. Bp.

Alcester, L.
Bramwell, L.
Braye, L.
Carlingford, L.
Carrington, L.
Chelmsford, L.
Dorchester, L.
Emly, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Hammond, L.
Hylton, L.
Kenmare, L. (*E. Kenmare.*)
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Mostyn, L.
Mount-Temple, L. [*Teller.*]
O'Hagan, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*) [*Teller.*]
Reay, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Somerton, L. (*E. Normanton.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Grafton, D.
Richmond, D.
Somerset, D.
Sutherland, D. [*Teller.*]

Bristol, M.
Salisbury, M.

Cairns, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Devon, E.
Ducie, E.
Ellesmere, E.
Feversham, E.
Harewood. E.
Innes, E. (*D. Roxburghe.*)
Jersey, E.
Kilmorey, E.
Lathom, E.
Lonsdale, E.
Lovelace, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Mar and Kellie, E.
Milltown, E.
Redesdale, E.
Rosse, E.
Sandwich, E.
Selkirk, E.
Sondes, E.
Stanhope, E.
Wharncliffe, E.

Cranbrook, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Sherbrooke, V.
Sidmouth, V.
St. Vincent, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, L. Bp.
London, L. Bp.
Peterborough, L. Bp.

Auckland, L.
Brabourne, L.
Breadalbane, L. (*E. Breadalbane.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Calthorpe, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E Carysfort.*)
Clanbrassill, L. (*E. Roden.*)
Clifford of Chudleigh, L.
Clinton, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Cottesloe, L.
Crofton, L.
Denman, L.
de Ros, L.
Derwent, L.
Digby, L.
Douglas, L. (*E. Home.*)
Fitzgerald, L.
Forbes, L.
Gerard, L.
Hare, L. (*E. Listowel.*)
Harlech, L.
Harris, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hopetoun, L. (*E Hopetoun.*)
Hothfield, L.
Howth, L. (*E. Howth.*)
Inchiquin, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Leconfield, L.

Lovat, L.
Lyveden, L.
Moore, L. (*M. Drogheda.*)
Norton, L.
Oxenfoord, L. (*E. Stair.*)
Romilly, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden and Campbell, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Sudeley, L.
Suffield, L.
Thurlow, L.
Tollemache, L.
Truro, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford*)
Ventry, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)

Resolved in the *negative.*

The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

TITHE RENTCHARGE BILL.—(No. 22.)

(*The Earl Stanhope.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

EARL STANHOPE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said: My Lords, before entering into the proposals contained in the Bill which I have the honour to submit to the House, I trust that I may be allowed to explain how tithes are at present calculated, and how collected and paid. There are two sorts of tithes—ordinary tithe, and extraordinary tithe—the first calculated on the price of grain; the second on hops and fruit. Very frequently land is subject to both these kinds of tithe; but I am not going to allude to extraordinary, only to ordinary tithe. I will not enter into the history of tithes, or do more than touch on the Acts which regulate their payment. Certain Acts in the Reign of Henry VIII. enforced the punctual payment of tithes to the Church; but it was not until the year 1836 that tithes were commuted into a tithe rent charge, representing £100, and calculated on the average price of grain seven years previous to the year 1835. The standard prices of grain were fixed as follows:—One bushel of wheat at 7*s.* 0¼*d.*; one bushel of barley at 3*s.* 11½*d.*; one bushel of oats at 2*s.* 9*d.* Thus the yearly rent charge is so much higher or so much lower than the sum fixed by the award, according as the authorized averages are higher or lower than the standard prices given in the Commutation Acts. By a later Act in 1864, the average prices of wheat, barley, and oats are taken in 149 boroughs in England and Wales, and the average market price is given weekly in *The London Gazette.* In January, the seven years average of tithe rent charge is announced. The House is well aware that tithe rent charge is apportioned to each field, and a tithe map kept in every parish. Tithe rent charge is now recoverable by means of distress on the land, and it can rarely happen that there is neither crops or stock on the land which cannot be seized to pay off tithe. If nothing can be recovered, application can be made to the High Court to recover tithes by means of taking possession of the land, and farming it by the tithe owner. My Lords, it is clear that, by the 80th section of the Tithe Commutation Act, landlords were required to pay tithes. I think there is no doubt on this point. But at present, though in the North of England they pay the tithes, it is the usual custom in other parts of the country for the tenant to pay tithes, and on that account paying a smaller amount of rent for his land to the landlord. As to the objections to tenants paying tithes instead of landowners, I think they may be generally stated to rest partly on the altered conditions and prospects of agricultural pursuits, and partly on the disinclination which exists among tenants to pay tithes, taxes, and rates, at other times than at rent days—that is, half-yearly. It is now the usual custom for large land surveyors and valuers to value land tithe free, and then the landlord makes his agreement with the tenant. In consequence of a succession of bad seasons and agricultural distress which has prevailed during the past six years, much arable land has been laid down to grass, yet, though the farmer receives less profit, he has still to pay the same amount of tithe, as it is all separately apportioned on his land. I have already said that tenant farmers are disinclined to pay tithes at odd times, and prefer only to make their half-yearly payment of rent, considering tithes a landlord's charge. I may be allowed to remind the House that in Scotland, tithes or "teinds" are, and have been for many years, paid by the landlord, and no trouble or friction exists in the collection of these teinds. I now come to the seven years' average system of calculating tithe rent charge, and I think it will be seen at once how unfairly the average system now works. For instance, when agricultural seasons are the worst, and the farmer is making the least profit, he has to pay the highest tithe. In 1875, which was not a good season, tithes stood at £112 15*s.*; and in 1878, which was a disastrous year, tithes stood at £112 7*s.* It is with the hope of removing these objections that I have ventured to bring this Bill before the House; but I should have deemed it a presumption on my part, had I, on my own responsibility, brought forward this proposal. This recommendation, however, originates from the Report of the Royal Agricultural Commission, of which the noble Duke below me (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) was the Chairman. What did the Royal Agricultural Commission say? They recommended that the tithe rent charge

> "Should be a fixed sum, that it should be paid by the landlord, and that every facility should be given for its redemption."

This proposal is signed by 18 Royal Commissioners—indeed, all of those who were present. Among many witnesses who gave evidence in favour of this recommendation, I will only quote the words of one whose opinion will carry great weight, I mean Sir James Caird. Sir James Caird was asked—

> "Would you see an advantage, or a disadvantage, in compelling the landlord to pay the tithe in all cases?"

He replied—

> "It was the spirit, undoubtedly, of the Tithe Commutation Acts that it should be so, and it is so enacted."

Sir James was also asked—

> "Would you like to see an Act passed by which it should be made imperative upon the landlord to pay the tithe?"

The answer he gave was—

> "I think it would be an advantage both to the landlord and the tenant."

He was further asked—

> "Would you like to see the tithe a fluctuating sum, as at present, or a fixed sum, as has been suggested to us, of £100?"

And he replied—

> "I would rather have it a fixed sum."

The Commissioners also give the various reasons in favour of such a change. They say—

> "A very general complaint is made by witnesses of the way in which tithe rent charge is calculated. The grounds of objection are thus briefly put by one witness. The big measures have never been reduced to standard Imperial measures fixed at a given weight. A very small number of towns have been selected from which to get the prices of the corn returns, in order to arrive at an average. The large quantity of seconds and tail corn has never been taken into consideration in the calculation. The merchant's profits have often been added to the prices that the growers receive as the basis upon which to make the Return. These causes together have operated to create a higher average for the tithe than should fairly be the case."

Well, as regards the want of uniformity in the Imperial measures, the Corn Average Act of last Session had, to a great extent, remedied the evil. As to fixing tithe at £100, now was the time to do it, because the average stood this year at par, or nearly so, being £100 4*s.* 9¾*d.*, and next year it would probably fall to £98. It was urged that as tithes were falling the tithe-payer should have the advantage, and pay less than £100; but I venture to think that this is a somewhat narrow and short-sighted policy. It was originally intended that tithes should be commuted to £100; and, looking forward for some years, it was not unlikely that tithes would average above £100, as they had in past years. Since the Commutation Act tithes had averaged, during a period of 47 years, £103 2*s.* 0½*d.*, even though, between 1850 and 1858, they had fallen considerably below £100. Then, again, it was obvious that it was more probable that tithes would be redeemed if they stood at a fixed sum. No one would readily redeem a fluctuating average. It might seem, at first sight, as if gold would fall in value, and the produce of land would improve in value. But this is contrary to the opinion of those who have studied the subject, and who are the greatest authorities on currency questions. Monsieur de Laveleye, in a pamphlet published in 1881, maintains that gold is gradually increasing in its purchasing power; and Mr. Goschen, in an able lecture recently delivered, fully corroborates this view. Mr. Goschen shows that because Germany, Italy, Holland, and the United States have adopted a gold currency, there is annually an enormous demand for gold, and that they absorb about £200,000,000 in 10 years. He goes on to show that the supply of gold is falling off, and that, whereas in 1852 the amount of gold produced was £36,000,000, it is now only about £20,000,000 per annum. From this it follows that unless fresh discoveries of gold are made the value of gold will rise, and its purchasing power will increase. My Lords, the advantages to the tithe owner under this Bill will be that he will secure prompt payment of his tithes, all friction between himself and the tithe-payers will be avoided, and he will save largely in the cost of collection. As regards the cost of collection, it is usual to pay 5 per cent for collecting tithes; then there is a tithe audit dinner, and with delay in payment and bad debts the cost of collecting amounts to sometimes 8 and 9 per cent. In the Bill existing leases are exempted; but I cannot think that it will be any drawback to landlords in the South of England to be obliged to pay tithes, as is the case in Scotland and in Ireland. Yearly agreements may require endorsement; but no new 6*d.* stamps will be required. It is not intended by the Bill to give the tithe-owner power to levy tithes where before they could not be recovered; and, if there is any doubt on this point, it will be easy to introduce a clause to remove all such doubts. Her Majesty's Government do not object to the principle of the Bill; and I, therefore, urge the House to allow it a second reading, both in the interests of agricultural tenants, and for the purpose of carrying into effect the recommendations of the Royal Agricultural Commission.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl Stanhope.*)

LORD BRAMWELL, in moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said, that this was the second legislative effort this Session of the noble Earl. In his first Bill there was a Preamble which became inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill after their Lordships had directed certain Amendments; and he had recommended the noble Earl to get rid of the difficulty by omitting the Preamble. Although the noble Earl did not take his advice then, he had taken it as to the Bill before the House, and had omitted any Preamble. He should, however, very much liked to have seen how the noble Earl would have framed one. The only Preamble he (Lord Bramwell) could conceive would be—"Whereas it is desirable to meddle with the law and alter it." As there was no Preamble and no principle in the measure, he (Lord Bramwell) must deal with it as a collection of clauses. He had not heard at any time during the existence of the present law that there was any difficulty in the collection of tithe. He did not mean to say that persons who had to pay liked it; but solicitors of great practice had told him that the present means were amply sufficient. First, as to Clause 3. No doubt, the landowner was the person really affected by the tithes, and not the occupier; and the Tithes Commutation Act had contemplated that. The consequence was that in certain cases, no doubt, the landowner had paid the tithes; but he believed that in the majority of cases the landowner, for convenience sake, had stipulated that the tenant should pay the rent charge. The noble Earl's proposition was that, no matter how convenient it might be that the tenant should pay, and no matter how inconvenient it might be that the landowner should pay, if they made a bargain between themselves that bargain should be void. What was the good of this? Was it supposed that by that 3rd clause the burden could be shifted? Even if it were so, why should it be done?—unless, indeed, their Lordships were of opinion, as some people were, that landlords were the proper persons to be plundered. But it was manifest that if the clause were passed the consequence would be that the tenant would have to pay a higher rent, and the landlord would stipulate with the tenant to get him to pay the tithe for him, and the only effect of the 3rd clause would be that some slight alteration would be made in the phraseology of leases; and, therefore, the clause was positively ineffective. As to the 4th clause, there was very little in it, except that it said that if the tenant paid the rent charge he should be at liberty to sue his landlord for it, or to deduct it from the next payment of rent. He would now call attention to the 5th clause. It said that the tithe rent charge might be recovered from the owner by action as a simple contract debt. At first sight that seemed to be a benefit to the tithe-owner. But what was the consequence? Suppose the tithe-owner, if he were a clergyman—or, for the matter of that, if the tithe were in lay hands, but particularly in the case of a clergyman—went to the tenant for the tithe rent charge, the tenant would say—"Go to the landlord, who is the real debtor, and not trouble me." So that the clause, although it seemed to give a benefit to the tithe-owner, by giving him a right to sue the landowner, would, in fact, practically take away from him his power of distress against the tenant. The next clause was really most extraordinary. It was as follows:—

> "Any guardian, trustee, committee, husband, or attorney who, for the purpose of the Tithe Commutation Acts, represents any owner under disability of lands subject to tithe rent charge, shall represent such owner for the purposes of the Act, but not so as to incur any personal liability; and any goods of such owner which may be vested in or under the control of any such guardian, trustee, committee, husband, or attorney may be taken in execution of process under this Act."

This word "attorney" was sensible in the Commutation Act, but was absolutely unnecessary in this Bill. Again, the consequence of that section might be that for a debt recovered from A B, the goods of C D might be seized; and the goods of the man himself would never be taken in execution unless they were vested in, or under the control of, any such guardian, trustee, committee, or attorney. Then, again, the owner was spoken of; but what did the noble Earl mean by the owner?

EARL STANHOPE: The tithe-payer.

LORD BRAMWELL: But they were told, by the 2nd section of the Bill, that the words used in this Bill were to have the same meaning as those in the Tithes Commutation Act. Now, the latter Act had excepted from its scope tenants for life or years holding under leases; and, therefore, the noble Earl would be obliged to leave out of his Bill such tenants, and so a very large portion of the landowners of the country would have to be left out. He would not occupy their Lordships' attention any further on this clause; but there was one—the 7th—which he was much surprised to find in any Bill introduced into that House. Clause 7 provided that—

> "When the owner of land subject to tithe rent charge shall not himself be in occupation of such land, he shall, if such rent charge be paid within one month after the same shall be due and payable, be entitled to deduct a sum equal to three per cent of the same from such payment, or from any future payment of such rent charge."

So that gentlemen in England were to be allowed a discount of 3 per cent for paying their debts properly. Why that benefit should be given to the owner in respect of a farm which he did not occupy, and not in respect of the next farm which he did occupy, it was difficult to see. He wondered whether the noble Earl had realized what 3 per cent meant to a man whose tithe rent charge supplied him with food and clothing. It meant a week and a-half without anything at all. Besides, it was clear that clergymen could not sit at home to receive their rents; they would, no doubt, as they had hitherto done, employ a collector, and the only result would be that they would receive so much less money than they had been in the habit of getting, as the 8th clause declared that the rent charge was not to vary, if a sum could be agreed upon. It should be borne in mind, however, that the mode of fixing the rent charge was adopted to guard against a change in the value of money and its consequences. It might be that, notwithstanding this consideration, a fixed sum and a fair one would be preferable. There was, however, one clause—the 10th—which he entirely agreed with. The clause provided that the Act should not extend to Scotland or Ireland. He wished to go a step further and provide that it should not extend to England.

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day six months.")—(*The Lord Bramwell.*)

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY said, the only advantage of the Bill would be getting rid of uncertainty and troublesome calculations by fixing tithes at par. There was no reason for restricting the discount the Bill proposed to owners who were not occupiers, since the greatest difficulties of collection were in the cases of small freeholders who were owners and occupiers. If the tithes were added to and merged in the rent, as the Bill took no precaution against it, farmers would be rated on their gross rent—that was, on the tithes which were not their property; and, on the other hand, owners would, if they did not take much care and trouble, pay Income Tax upon these tithes, which would be included in their rent. There was no advantage in the Bill equal to the trouble it would give.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, he was convinced that the noble Earl who had introduced the Bill had done so from the most laudable motives, and had attempted to find a satisfactory solution of what was, no doubt, a question of no ordinary difficulty. After the criticism of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Bramwell), it appeared that the clauses had the singular disadvantage of not being of a perfect kind. He hoped his noble Friend (Earl Stanhope) would forgive him for saying that he was not personally enamoured of the provisions of the Bill; and, without going into details, he would appeal to his noble Friend if he would be satisfied with the discussion he had raised, leaving the Government to deal with the subject in a more ample manner on some future occasion?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he was afraid he must join in the appeal of the noble Earl who had just sat down. The grave recommendations of the Royal Commission, however, certainly did invite Parliament to legislate on the subject. For his own part, he felt a strong sympathy with the object the noble Earl had in view in introducing the Bill. He could not entirely agree with the remark of the noble and learned Lord that there was no grievance or evil to remedy. No doubt, the noble and learned Lord spoke from a legal point of view, and perhaps in that view there was no difficulty; but, undoubtedly, it was very inconvenient for a tithe-owner to be obliged to enforce his remedy of distress. This was felt particularly in the case of clergymen, who were often unable to give time to tenants, as landlords usually could. They were compelled to distrain, thereby exposing to the world the position of their debtor, and bringing his other creditors upon him. He was unable to concur in the opinion that there was no evil to be remedied; but it was expedient that a remedy should be sought by a Bill less open to criticism and objection. He was not so sanguine as to believe that the noble Earl would be satisfied with the discussion; but he thought there were only two courses open to the noble Earl. One was to withdraw the Bill, in order that it might be re-introduced in a better form; and the other was to refer it to a Select Committee. Before he heard the speech of the noble and learned Lord he was in favour of the second alternative; but as it had been pointed out that there was so much objection to so many of the clauses, on the whole, he thought the sounder proceeding would be to withdraw the Bill.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE wished to confirm what had fallen from the noble Marquess. There were practical difficulties in the way of collecting tithe, and it was not so easy and pleasant a matter as the noble and learned Lord implied. While he regretted the unsuccessful attempt made by the noble Earl to remedy the defects of the existing law, he was of opinion that the noble Earl was entitled to the thanks of the tithe-owners for his exertions.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR wished to recognize the good intentions with which the Bill had been drawn; but he felt that the subject was one which it was not desirable to deal with in a piecemeal or imperfect way, and the Bill did not contain any provision with respect to extraordinary tithe, although it was affected by the 8th clause. The whole matter ought to be dealt with at the same time.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH said, that the tithe was less than the rent, and if the tenant could not pay the tithe, he could not pay the rent, so that they would not improve the position of the tithe-owner by referring him to a pauper landlord, instead of a pauper tenant.

EARL STANHOPE said, he regretted to find that the recommendations of the Royal Agricultural Commission were so little acceptable to their Lordships, and the more so as the present year was specially favourable for dealing with tithes. He felt confident that ultimately the principle of the Bill would be adopted, and that landlords would pay tithes in England as they did in Scotland; but, in compliance with the evident wish of their Lordships, he would withdraw the Bill.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, as President of the Royal Agricultural Commission, was not surprised at the reception the Bill had met with, because it did not carry out the views of the Commission, or respond to the evidence taken by them. He agreed with the strictures of the the noble and learned Lord (Lord Bramwell), and was glad that the Bill was to be withdrawn.

Amendment, Original Motion, and Bill (by leave of the House), *withdrawn.*

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER—PETITION OF THE BISHOPS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

PETITION PRESENTED.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN, in calling attention to a Petition from the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland against legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister, said: My Lords, I have the honour to present several Petitions to your Lordships against the Bill for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister; but there is one Petition, and only one, upon which I would ask to be allowed to say a few words, and in doing so I will abstain from offering any remarks on the Bill itself, which would be to anticipate a future debate upon it; but I will confine myself to the Petition I am about to present. That Petition emanates from a learned and venerable Body, and it comes from the whole of that Body. It is subscribed with the names of all the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. My Lords, the Bishops in Scotland are not now represented in either House of Parliament; but they are the legitimate successors of Bishops who were Peers in the Parliaments of Scotland, some of whose Episcopal Sees were anterior to the Norman Conquest; and, although these Bishops are now reduced to half of their former number—namely, to seven — yet they fill the original Sees, some of which have become blended together. The present time is a memorable one in the history of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and suggests some interesting reminiscences. Nearly two centuries ago—namely, in the year 1689—that Church was disestablished, and greatly it has suffered from its disestablishment. All the Bishops of Scotland were deprived of their secular rank, civil privileges, and temporal revenues for conscience sake, because they refused to take the Oath of Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary as their Sovereigns *de jure* in place of King James II., although they were ready to affirm that they would submit to them as their Rulers *de facto*. My Lords, a good deal has been said lately as to the Oath of Allegiance being a mistake; but if the Oath of Allegiance is a mistake, the Disestablishment of the Episcopal Church of Scotland was a crime. But, to pass on to the year 1884. That will be a remarkable one in the history of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and of Christendom. Just 100 years will then have passed away since the disestablished, suffering, afflicted, and persecuted Episcopal Church in Scotland bestowed the gift of Episcopacy on America. It did this by the hands of three of its Bishops at Aberdeen, on November 14, 1784, in the consecration of Dr. Samuel Seabury, the first of a line of Bishops who now amount to no less a number than 60 in the United States of America alone, to say nothing of British America. The grain of mustard seed sown a century ago at Aberdeen has now become a great tree, and its branches overshadow the Western World. The noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack will remember how a venerable and learned person—one of the most venerable and learned in the University of Oxford, whose life was extended to nearly 100 years—the President of the great and magnificent College of St. Mary Magdalene—of which the noble and learned Earl himself is so distinguished an ornament—I refer to Dr. Martin Joseph Routh, when he had gathered together the precious remains of primitive Christian antiquity, he inscribed that valuable collection and literary work, his *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, to the Bishops of the Episcopal Church of Scotland and their Clergy, and showed his reverence for them in a respectful and laudatory dedication. My Lords, since that time the Episcopal Church in Scotland has distinguished itself in a manner which I believe no other Church has done in the last 50 years—namely, by building two noble Cathedrals—one at Inverness, and the other at Edinburgh; and it is a happy sign of the abatement of religious strife, and a fortunate augury of a future reign of peace in that country, that at the consecration of the Cathedral at Edinburgh the Bishop of that City and his Episcopal Brethren were honoured by the presence and cordial support of the Lord Provost of the capital of Scotland. My Lords, having been honoured by these right rev. Persons with the charge of their Petition, I have thought it my duty to request your Lordships' indulgence on this occasion in presenting it; and now that, happily, by the spirit of liberal and enlightened toleration which characterizes your Lordships' proceedings, those penalties and disabilities have been removed which formerly pressed upon them, I feel confident I may assure them that the Petition which has been presented to your Lordships to-day will receive that consideration to which it is so fairly entitled from the character, learning, and offices of those who have signed it. I would, in conclusion, request the leave of your Lordships to read it, and I have to add that in presenting it I entirely agree in the substance and prayer of the Petition.

Petition read, and *ordered* to lie on the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—THE CONVENTION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Viscount St. VINCENT, in rising to inquire, Whether Her Majesty's Government propose to retain our representative in the Transvaal; and, if so, whether they intend to modify or cancel any or all of the provisions of the Convention of 1881 ? said, that in view of the apparent intention of the Government to abandon the Natives, both within and without the boundary of the Transvaal, to their own devices—and of allowing the Boers to work out the policy of revenge that they appeared to have inaugurated since the signing of the Convention of 1881—he would ask whether the more honourable course for the Government to pursue, short of declaring their fixed determination to abide by the spirit, if not the letter, of this Convention, would not be to withdraw our Representative from the Transvaal, and to cancel a Convention the terms of which they appeared to be either unable or unwilling to carry out. Without wishing to revive any old contentions on this question, it seemed but just to observe that the possible consequences of a war with these Boers had not been previously sufficiently considered by the Government before they undertook that war; that the information received by them prior to the commencement of that war had been of a distinctly misleading character; and that, after the deplorable series of reverses suffered by our troops at Brunker's Spruit, Lang's Nek, the Ingogo River, and the Majuba Mountain, it became a question of our future operations having to be conducted, not only against the Transvaal Boers themselves, but also against the Boers of the Orange Free State, and possibly against a rising of the whole Dutch population of South Africa. Under these circumstances, in view of such a contingency, what wonder that our Government should be anxious to come to terms with these Dutch farmers at almost any sacrifice short of the entire sacrifice of national honour and tradition? Moreover, in order to lead the English people to believe in their philanthropic and disinterested motives in so doing, it became necessary that a Convention of some sort should be entered into, to grace our retirement from the country, and to smooth the ruffled feelings of the English nation. But was it by the Government for one moment believed, any more than it was by any single Colonist of any standing in Natal at the time, that the Boers would abide by one single Article of that Convention, if at any time it became their interest, as it most undoubtedly would become their interest, not to do so? Were they aware that the Boers themselves—and he had an opportunity of talking to a number of them soon after and before the signing of this Convention—openly and avowedly declared their disbelief in its terms being carried out, and, further, their intention of not abiding by them? These Dutch farmers knew, if the English people did not, the futility of any terms in such circumstances. They, moreover, knew that the English Government would scarcely be prepared to make any fresh sacrifices to retain a merely nominal authority in a country, the inhabitants of which were avowedly hostile to their rule. It did not matter to the Boers themselves that in following their traditional policy with regard to the Natives, both within and without their own boundary, they would ruin all that had hitherto been done in the interests of civilization in those parts. It did not matter to the Boers themselves that in that land-greed and love of annexation which appeared to be a part of the Boer nature they would trample under foot the interests of those Native races that might stand in their way towards the attainment of that object. Such being the case, the question must naturally arise, how did all this affect the English nation? Were we to pose as the champions of civilization in a country which would repudiate our Suzerainty, and owned to little or no controlling influence of ours? As to Suzerainty on these terms and in such circumstances, the country wanted none of it. The Colonists of Natal, the Boers of the Transvaal, even the Natives themselves, had learnt to say that they, too, wanted none of it. Whatever our future policy with regard to this country was to be, let it be no longer one of procrastination, hesitation, and delay; and, if needs be, let us accept the situation we had created, retiring whence we came, learning, from experience gathered in the past, lessons which might serve as a guide to our actions in the future. Or if it were decided in any way to control the actions of those outside our own boundary, then let them be taught to know clearly and intelligibly what they had to expect, and how far we meant to go in the protection of civilization and Native interests in that portion of the globe. We should thus, he ventured to predict, avoid those harassing complications which seemed so persistently to follow us in our dealings with these South African questions.

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, I am not quite sure that I fully understand the argument of the noble Viscount. This is my fault, however, and not his, as I was unable to hear all he said. But I understand his contention is this—that the Convention into which we entered two years ago with the Government of the Transvaal was now practically inoperative, and that, being inoperative, it had better be put an end to. That is a very fair matter for argument; but I do not think it would be possible to enter upon it on the present occasion. I have no objection to admit as much as this—that the Convention, as it now stands, does not give Her Majesty's Government any large amount of power, and that it is an arrangement which cannot be made to work satisfactorily unless it is carried into effect with the goodwill and sincere co-operation of both parties. Up to the present time, I have only received a general and unofficial statement of the wishes of the Transvaal Government. They have communicated with me, but not through an accredited agent. The next step to decide upon is whether we shall enter into formal and official negotiations with that Government with a view to consider the expediency of a revision of the Convention. That is a matter which is still under consideration. If the negotiations, as is probable, be continued, then, undoubtedly, the matter which is the subject of the noble Lord's Question—that of continuing or withdrawing the British Representative at Pretoria—will be one of the points which will have to be considered. I have no doubt, before the present Session closes, I shall be in a position to give more information to your Lordships than I am at the present moment.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I only wish to observe, on the somewhat important statement of the noble Earl, that this Convention differs from the case of a Convention entered into by two parties of their own full and free will for the purpose of carrying out an object in which both are equally interested. It was a Convention which was imposed, or supposed by Her Majesty's Government to be imposed, by us upon the Boers as a consideration for that relinquishment of our dominion over them which we had possessed before the outbreak with the Boers and before the disaster of Majuba Hill. I think if the nation had understood at the time that this Convention, which was to be a substitute and re-imbursement to us for all that was sacrificed then, and which we were told was to exercise so large an influence for the protection of the Native races to whose protection we were so especially bound, was to depend for the whole of its validity and value upon the hearty co-operation of those who were on the other side, it would have been received in a different spirit and in different language from that which actually met it.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—HYDE PARK CORNER—RE-ERECTION OF THE WELLINGTON STATUE.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD STRATHNAIRN, in rising to call attention to the strong public feeling in favour of the Wellington Statue being allowed to remain in its present position instead of being removed to the Horse Guards, said, the Duke of Wellington had rendered unparalleled services to this country, and had, in addition, earned the gratitude of nearly all the nations of Europe, who had conferred many honours upon him, for his aid in rescuing them from French military occupation and despotism. England had possessed great Generals, second to none in their bravery and knowledge of the art of war; but to none had the lot fallen to be so identified with the world's great events, and to take a part so distinguished and glorious, and so conducive to the independence of Europe as this—England's immortal Leader. This country had presented him with Apsley House, containing all the archives relating to his unrivalled career of victories, as well as the numerous and valuable gifts from the Sovereigns and nations whom he had liberated, and had erected in his honour a statue close to that house, which was inseparably connected with the name of the Duke of Wellington. The likeness of the statue to the Duke's features was so striking that no one from John of Groat's House to the Land's End could mistake it. And his attitude, one hand with a telescope pointing to a height to his right front, and his head turned to the left front, as if giving directions for some movement, was very true and characteristic. As regarded the horse, with the exception of his nostrils being too much distended—a fault which could easily be set right, his points—namely, sloping shoulder, good barrel, &c., were good; and he was said to be a good likeness of the portrait of the Duke of Wellington's charger, "Copenhagen," which was in the possession of a noble Friend of his. It was true that the proportions of the horse were disfigured from being three times the size of life, to suit the high arch on which it was placed. But to separate the statue from Apsley House, with which it was so connected, and by such recollections, and to hide it, as appeared to be the intention, on account of the fastidiousness of a few critics, and of these doubtful imperfections, though a good *ensemble*, in a retired corner of St. James's Park, near the milk and bun stalls, the resort of children and nurserymaids, appeared to him—he spoke with great deference—opposed to the object of the statue, and a disregard of the good intentions of his countrymen, who wished to append to Apsley House a lasting memorial in his honour.

Viscount HARDINGE, as a Member of the Site Committee, said, their Lordships would agree with him in thinking that if five men entered a room for the purpose of considering any subject they would probably disagree; but upon this question the Committee, consisting of five men, were unanimous. They considered various sites. Chelsea Hospital and Primrose Hill were thought to be too far removed from the centre of London; and it was felt by those who were Members of the Committee that Apsley House would not be a suitable site for the statue, as its colossal proportions would dwarf the surrounding buildings. They next turned their attention to the site at the Horse Guards, and they came to the conclusion that it should be recommended to the Government, as the Horse Guards was a place which was closely connected with the noble Duke up to the last days of his life, it being where he had so frequently transacted business. The Committee thought it was an appropriate site; and the noble Duke (the Duke of Wellington), who was consulted, fully shared in their views. The Committee were also unanimously of opinion that the statue was not worthy the reputation of the artist. They were told that the Duke never sat to the artist, who modelled the statue from a lay figure. It was a question whether it would have been possible for Michael Angelo himself to have given an artistic appearance to a huge equestrian figure in a stiff cloak and a cocked hat; but, at all events, if it were to be erected opposite the Horse Guards in the enclosure of St. James's Park, its harsh outlines would be somewhat broken and softened by the foliage surrounding and behind it. The statue would be at a greater distance from the Horse Guards than from Apsley House, and therefore would not dwarf that building—it would be immediately in rear of the gatekeeper's lodge. The noble and gallant Lord had talked of the strong public feeling against removing it from its present site; but as no Questions had been asked in Parliament, nor had any letters been written in the newspapers, he was at a loss to know how he had gauged public opinion. The cost of removing the figure would be only £600 or £700, a sum which he did not think should weigh with the Government when they were selecting a new site for the statue.

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE remarked that, in his opinion, the country would not hesitate for a moment to expend the sum necessary for the re-erection of the statue of so great a man as the Duke of Wellington in a suitable position. The question, however, was, whether the site selected was the best that could be found. He did not pretend to be an artist; but he must confess that he could not see the artistic advantages of the Horse Guards' site. It would be a very unfortunate thing if the Horse Guards' Parade were to be entirely destroyed by the erection of this great statue in the middle of it. To place it in the enclosure, however, would be merely to hide it behind the trees; and was that the way to treat the statue of so great a man? He was no great admirer of the statue; but still, when it stood on its last site, everyone who came to London used to ask—" Who is that?" and was told—" Oh! that is the Duke of Wellington;" and they might depend upon it that, however inartistic the figure might be, it would be the artist and not the Duke of Wellington that would be found fault with. The noble Viscount had said that it was impossible to make a statue having a stiff cloak and a cocked hat look artistic. In that remark he entirely concurred. He trusted, however, that Her Majesty's Government would not come to any immediate decision on the question; because, now that the part of London near Hyde Park Corner had been so much improved, he saw no reason why this statue should not be altogether recast and made the centre of a group of fine statues which already existed in London.

Lord DENMAN said, that he always regarded the statue with admiration as seen from the other side of Hyde Park. In this case distance did lend enchantment to the view. He trusted that the statue would be re-erected where it could be seen from the Marble Arch.

Lord SUDELEY said, that, as the Government were aware of different opinions existing on the subject, a number of people thinking that the statue should remain in the locality where it was, they appointed a Committee, on which were some of the most distinguished members of the Profession of Art; and the noble Duke (the Duke of Wellington) was placed on it to represent the views of the family. That Committee, after due deliberation, had arrived at a most distinct opinion with regard to the matter. They unanimously resolved that—

> " It would be out of harmony with the surroundings if placed at Hyde Park Corner. They recommended that the statue should be placed upon a fitting pedestal on a site immediately within the present railings of St James's Park facing the Horse Guards, and on the central axis of the archway of that building."

The Government, having regard to the eminent gentlemen composing that Committee, to whom they were much indebted, had given the subject very careful consideration, and had decided that it would be advisable, in the first instance, to erect at a small cost a full-sized wooden profile of the statue, showing exactly how it would be if placed in the position recommended by the Committee. When this was done the Committee would be asked to meet again, and probably the wooden profile would be moved up to Hyde Park Corner to be also seen in that position. Until this experiment was carried out no final decision in the matter could take place. As some misapprehension had arisen as to the cost for moving the statue from its present position, and as it had been rumoured that it would require some £5,000 to £6,000 to effect this object, he took the present opportunity of stating that it was estimated that the outside cost would not exceed £750, the risk of moving it being in this case also taken by the contractor. It was estimated that to erect it on a suitable granite pedestal, including foundations, about £4,000 would be required; but this would have to be incurred wherever the statue was placed. As the noble and gallant Lord who introduced this subject appeared to have a very strong opinion on the merits of the statue in an artistic point of view, it would, he thought, be interesting to their Lordships if he read a Report from a distinguished Academician to Lord Morpeth in 1847, the artist having been consulted on the merits of the statue—

> " My feeling is that the appearance and effect of the said bronze equestrian statue is as detestable as the design is. If such art is intended to remain anywhere, the top of the Oregon Mountain or the summit of the loftiest mountain the Straits of Magellan, where it could never be hoped to be seen again, would be the place; but as a national memento of the sovereign General of the living world and our progress in design and genius, in my humble opinion it will cause the whole people of our Em-

> pire to feel disgraced by it. My objection to the statue itself is a want of action. Such a hero, so active and so full of manly fire, can never be represented by a tame, lifeless position. The wind might have been allowed to blow out the mantle to give some spirit. The horse is merely sniffing the wind; and the action of his forelegs is utter weakness. The pastern joints are too bent, especially the off one, which straightens in being behind the near one in stepping, and *vice versâ*. The body of the horse is too short, which makes the legs too long. The horse has not received the conventional form of a charger. He felt sure the Duke would not mount such a neck-stretching animal on any account; and certainly not go to battle on it."

Such was the opinion of the well-known Academician of that day, Mr. Reimagle; and, without divulging a secret, he thought he was not far wrong in saying that this was pretty nearly the opinion of the Royal Academicians of the present day.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he was very glad to hear what had fallen from the noble Lord speaking on behalf of the Government, especially in regard to the determination to follow the Continental system of erecting a wooden profile before coming to an all-important final decision on the question of site. He hoped this plan would be adopted in the case of other statues.

THE EARL OF POWIS said, that, on the question of taste, the opinion of the intelligent foreigner might be of service; and to that end he might quote the opinion of M. Lemoinne, who said that the real Duke was not the one represented by the Achilles which had been subscribed for and erected near Apsley House in questionable taste; he was the man on the top of the Arch who, going at a foot's pace all his life, always arrived in time. As the Government were going to put up a profile at Hyde Park Corner as well as the Horse Guards, he ventured to commend M. Lemoinne's opinion.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES) expressed his preference for the site at Hyde Park Corner; and he thought such a statue was all the more desirable now, on account of the improvements just effected there as a central object in the great space opened up.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH said, he was not an admirer of the site opposite the Horse Guards. He defied anyone to say where the central point of the Horse Guards' Parade was; but he believed the site fixed upon was where there had recently been erected a magnificent mud mountain near a bun shop. He could not see any reason why the monument should not be retained on its present site.

LORD TRURO said, he was glad the Government had not yet come to any decision on the question. He entirely agreed with the observations of the noble Earl (the Earl of Wemyss), and trusted his suggestion would be considered.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY, in presenting a Bill providing for the better protection of young girls, said, he had to call the attention of their Lordships to a subject of a very distasteful nature; but there was a popular feeling about the Bill he desired to submit to their Lordships which made him anxious to introduce the measure without delay. He should not then enter into a detailed statement of it, but would simply allude to the foundations on which the Bill rested. It would be in the recollection of their Lordships that in 1881, in consequence of certain facts which were brought under public notice, it was deemed necessary to appoint a Select Committee of that House in reference to the protection of young girls, and that Committee was presided over by the noble and learned Earl (Earl Cairns). A great mass of evidence was taken, and it had been carefully analyzed; and the Secretary of State, in preparing this Bill, had followed as closely as possible the recommendations of the Committee. He had, in fact, embodied in the measure all the recommendations of the Committee, except the one which suggested that the limit of age for illegal forcible abduction should be raised from 16 to 21 years. After giving the matter full consideration, the Secretary of State had not seen his way to adopt that recommendation. Much regret had been expressed in the districts where the Contagious Diseases Acts had been in operation because it was alleged that the abolition of those Acts would relax the hold which the police had over young girls in deterring prostitution. But he wished to point out that if this Bill became law the local police of the districts referred to would in future be able to exercise all the powers in those respects that the Metropolitan Police had exercised under the Contagious Diseases Acts. He was aware that the Bill contained provisions of great and peculiar stringency; but their Lordships would have the opportunity of discussing and, if necessary, of modifying them; and he hoped they would recognize in it an honest attempt to carry out the recommendations of their own Select Committee.

Bill to make further provision for the protection of women and girls, and for the suppression of brothels; and for other purposes—*Presented* (The Earl of Rosebery).

Earl CAIRNS said, he was quite sure the Bill was one that would be received with much interest and with very general satisfaction by the House and the public. He should reserve the remarks he had to make in reference to one or two clauses in the Bill until he knew more of the reasons which had led to their introduction, and should be glad, when the proper time came, to hear some detailed explanation why the Government had not adopted the recommendation of the Select Committee in regard to the maximum age in cases of abduction. It was the one point about which the Committee had the least doubt, and it was adopted on the suggestion of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Bramwell), from his long and wide experience in the administration of the Criminal Law.

The Earl of CARNARVON rose, in order to continue the debate, when——

Earl GRANVILLE, interposing, said, he must deprecate any discussion on the first reading of the Bill. The noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) had only made a statement in introducing the Bill; and there would be ample opportunity of discussing the Bill at a later stage.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, he had no intention of debating the Bill; but the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) went through the clauses of the proposed Bill; and he was, therefore, entitled to an explanation on one or two points. He would like to know if the term "procuring" was used in its technical sense; and, also, whether there was any power in the Bill for removing young children from the custody and care of their parents, or so-called parents, living in unwholesome and demoralized atmospheres?

The Earl of ROSEBERY said, there was nothing in the Bill which would enable interference to be made between a mother and her daughter, even though she were living in a house of ill-fame; nor was there any power of interfering between parents and children. Certain stringent powers had been taken to remove children under the Industrial Schools Act; but they could only be enforced if the children were found wandering in the streets.

Bill read 1^{a}; and to be *printed*. (No. 69.)

House adjourned at quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 31*st May*, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Service Estimates — Class I. — Public Works and Buildings, Votes 19, 20, 22, and 23; Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Civil Departments, Votes 1 to 7, 9 to 11, and 14; Further Vote on Account, Civil Services and Revenue Departments.

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Fish Exchange (Blackfriars) *.

Public Bills—*Ordered—First Reading*—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) (Leeds) * [206].

Select Committee — Forest of Dean (Highways) [148], *nominated.*

Committee — Report — Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) [171]; Lord Alcester's Annuity [145-207]; Lord Wolseley's Annuity * [146-208].

Third Reading—Local Government (Gas) Provisional Order * [164]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) * [170]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) * [176]; Lands Clauses (Umpire) * [160], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

WINDSOR, ASCOT, AND ALDERSHOT RAILWAY (*re-committed*) BILL.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON brought up the Report of the Committee upon this Bill, and moved that it do lie upon the Table.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Report do lie upon the Table."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE said, that if he was in Order he would move that the Report be read by the Clerk at the Table.

Sir ERSKINE MAY read the Report of the Committee.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON remarked that, perhaps, as this was a question which was rather novel, the House might wish to hear one or two words from him, as Chairman of the Committee, as to the facts which had been brought to their notice in the course of the investigation.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER *reported* the *Royal Assent to* several Bills.

WINDSOR, ASCOT, AND ALDERSHOT RAILWAY (*re-committed*) BILL.

Question again proposed.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that he was remarking that the House would probably expect him, as Chairman of the Committee, to mention the reasons which had induced the Committee to make the alterations contained in the Report which he had just presented. He had considered, and the Committee thought, that the House desired to have a special Report from the Committee, not only as to the classification of particular goods for which rates were charged, but of the rates themselves, which were charged for such goods. The Committee had gone very carefully into both these questions. He was quite aware that many Members of the House seemed to be of opinion that all manures were classed in the lowest class and carried for the cheapest rates. But the House should, he thought, remember that this particular class of artificial manures required a greater amount of care in handling, and that they were, from their nature, so much more liable to have damage done to them, which might entail upon the Railway Companies considerable loss, in the event of actions being brought against them for damage than ordinary manures. He believed he was stating a known fact, when he said that within the last few days a considerable sum of money had been recovered from a Railway Company in consequence of damage done to a consignment of guano in the course of transit. That being the case, and seeing that this particular class of manures did suffer from exposure to the weather, and that it had to be carried in covered vans instead of open trucks, and, further, that it was liable to deterioration if allowed to be exposed to the outward air, he thought they were reasons sufficient to satisfy the Committee, at all events, that, as far as the question of classification was concerned, they were justified in maintaining a difference between artificial manures and common dung and other manures carried in trucks. Therefore, they had maintained that classification. What they had done was to reconsider the rates in both cases; and they had reduced, in the present Bill, the rate on common manures to the lowest possible sum that was charged. The maximum had now been placed at 1½*d.*, instead of 2½*d.*, as it stood in the Bill originally. They had also brought under that class a number of other articles—such as chalk, and materials for the repair of highways; and with regard to artificial manures and guanos, they had taken them from Class 9, in which they stood in the Bill, and placed them in Class 8, where the maximum charge was 2½*d.*, instead of 3*d.*, which was originally charged on these particular commodities, so that, practically, the Committee had made a reduction of the rates on artificial manures of ½*d.*, and of 1*d.* upon common manures, leaving the distinction between the two classes now at 1*d.* He thanked the House for permitting him to make this short statement. He could assure the House that the Committee had gone most carefully into the whole question of the charges. It must be borne in mind that, in addition to the greater care required to be exercised in the carriage of artificial manures, the Railway Companies were required to do a certain amount of work at their termini. Upon all these points the Committee had evidence before them, notwithstanding the fact that they had gone thoroughly into the question before. They had considered it necessary to take further evidence; and, having gone very fully and carefully into the whole question, the conclusion they had arrived at was the one he had just announced.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, he thought the House ought to understand thoroughly the proposal which had just been submitted to them by the hon. Baronet opposite, because it appeared to him that it embodied an entirely new line of policy. Up to this date it had been the practice of Parliament to class all sorts of measures together, and to fix one maximum rate for the whole. That was the policy adopted in old times; and if hon. Members would compare the Returns of the Board of Trade, they would find that there were only some 12 or 15 instances in all the Railway Acts now in existence throughout the Kingdom in which artificial manures were taken out of the class of all sorts of manures and put in a higher class. The new system had crept into Railway Bills, more particularly in the last few years; and it had never been the subject of a discussion in the House as far as he was aware. He therefore thought that the House ought to understand that the proposal now submitted to it was a new departure and a new line of policy. There were several Bills now before the House containing this new principle; but the House ought to be acquainted with the fact that there had been a great many more Railway Bills before the House during the Session, some of which had already passed, which adopted the old system; and if the arguments of the hon. Baronet were sound, the House must have done great injustice to those Railways which were content to carry manures at the old rates. The difference between the value of ordinary manures and artificial manures was said to be so considerable as to justify a difference in the maximum rate of carriage the Railway Companies were allowed to charge. The hon. Baronet said that 1½*d.* per ton per mile was the lowest rate authorized; but if the hon. Baronet had consulted the Report of the Board of Trade, he would have found that they expressly stated that the usual rate of ordinary manures was about 1*d.* per ton per mile. He believed, unless he was greatly mistaken, that a declaration to that effect would be found in the Report of the Board of Trade upon this very Bill. That was the maximum rate for ordinary manures, and not 1½*d.* per ton per mile; and, in point of fact, the Railways never got more than 1*d.* per mile, because if they did not carry common manures at a low rate, they did not get any to carry. But in the case of artificial manures the Railway Companies had, practically, a monopoly; and when that was the case the Railway Companies almost invariably charged the maximum rate. They had no competition; and, therefore, they made the farmers pay the highest rate they could possibly charge them. In point of fact, in some instances, they even charged more than the maximum rate. Now, there was nothing exceptional in the case of this Railway which afforded substantial ground for the imposition of any exceptional rate. The capital of the Company was not large, the line was only a short one, and it passed through an agricultural district towards the South Coast. It was, therefore, to its interest to carry artificial manures at the lowest rate, in order to stimulate the production of the crops which would have to be carried for consumption in the towns. There was another means by which the House would be able to estimate the amount of risk which the Railway Company were put to in carrying goods. They carried goods, and insured their safe arrival at any point between two stations in the United Kingdom, at a cost of 1*s.* per £100. The total charge for such insurance on this line would only amount, for the whole line, to 1*d.* per ton. Nevertheless, in this instance, the Railway Company were seeking to charge the sum of 1*d.* per ton per mile extra, which was altogether out of the question. It was said that these articles carried under the name of artificial manures were of more value than common manures. That might be so; but was it fair to charge for artificial manures as high a rate as was charged for sugar—the two articles being put in the same classification? He had, so far, heard no reason which ought to induce Parliament to deviate from the policy in regard to this question which it had hitherto adopted.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON remarked, that in the Bill artificial manures were not included in the same class as sugar.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, that might possibly be so. They would probably be in a class by themselves; but he knew that in the other Bills objected to artificial manures had been included in the same classification as sugar. Surely it was much more absurd to place them in the same classification as sugar than it would be to include them in the same classification as all other manures. He hoped the House would adhere to its old policy, and not sanction the new policy now sought to be introduced.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, he only wished to correct a mistake into which his hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) had fallen. In former legislation it was not the case that the rates for artificial manures had invariably been the same as those for common manures. On the contrary, in recent years there had been numerous alterations. He held in his hand a list of cases, dating from the year 1857 down to the present time, of Bills in which differential rates had been sanctioned between artificial manures and common manures. He might add that, both in the case which his hon. Friend opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) now brought before the House, and in another instance in which he (Sir Lyon Playfair) was Chairman, the Committee, after hearing the evidence, and after taking the opinion of the district which was satisfied with the differential rate, thought it desirable to sanction the difference. It must be remembered that artificial manures required care in storing and in transit; and, therefore, that the rate for carriage should be higher than that charged for common manures, in regard to which the same care was not required. In many of the cases which had occurred since 1857 the rate had been 3*d.*, where it was previously 2*d.* per mile. The Committee, in this instance, had granted 2½*d.* per mile, which was less than the charge originally sanctioned, and a reduction of the rate which the Committee themselves had originally agreed to.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he thought it would be of advantage to the House if the right hon. Gentleman would state how many exceptions there had been.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, there had been about 20 Bills.

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE asked to be permitted to point out that the list to which the right hon. Gentleman had just referred was a list of some small Railway Companies which had been allowed, by some means or other, to obtain from Parliament in certain Bills power to change the ordinary classification of artificial manures. In former years no attempt of this kind was sought to be made; but latterly, when a differential charge was proposed, and no objection was taken to it, the Committee to which the Bill was referred found themselves unable to take notice of it. The consequence had been that, of late years—and he believed the instances referred to applied to recent years only—there had been Bills passed by Parliament which sanctioned an alteration in the classification of manures, and permitted the Railway Companies to place manures in a higher class than that in which they stood formerly. The result was that in most of the recent Reports upon Railway Bills the Committees were induced to report that the charges for passengers, animals, and goods upon such Railways were not in excess of those passed for like undertakings in previous years. It might be that they were not in excess of some like undertakings in previous years; but he maintained that they were in excess of the average rate which had been permitted by Parliament during the whole time that Railway Bills had been brought under its consideration. He and those who were acting with him, therefore, considered it their duty to do everything in their power to prevent the rates being raised in any inordinate manner, and to prevent the rates so raised by Railway Bills receiving the sanction of Parliament, without fair recognition being taken of the fact. Unless this course were taken, there was no knowing to what extent the Railway Companies might not endeavour to raise the charges upon these articles hereafter. He wished, by bringing the question before the House, to prevent any question being raised in the future as to the continual increase of rates, tolls, and charges.

MR. DUCKHAM said, he rose for the purpose of correcting an erroneous impression which had been produced by the remarks of the hon. Baronet the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson). In the speech of the hon. Baronet he alluded to porterage, storage, loading, and unloading, and other services performed by Railway

Companies in connection with artificial manures. Now, the Railway Company had nothing to do with anything of the kind, either in regard to artificial manures or ordinary manures. If the carriage was charged upon a mileage rate, they never performed any duty in regard to loading or unloading. The goods were loaded by the consignor, and unloaded by the person to whom they were consigned. He thought the question ought to be thoroughly understood by the House. They had already had the matter before them within a recent period, and the Bill had been referred back to the former Committee, in consequence of differential rates being charged. He, therefore, trusted that the question would be so settled that there would be no more discussion upon this point in the future. This was certainly not the time for raising the rates and charges on such articles as the manures required for the purpose of fertilizing the land.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Report to be *printed*.

OXFORD, AYLESBURY, AND METROPOLITAN JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION.

Viscount FOLKESTONE wished to give Notice that, on the Order of the Day for the Consideration of this Bill on that day week, he would move—

> "That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee; and that it be an Instruction to the Committee that guano and artificial manures be included in the same class as dung, compost, and all sorts of manures, and that the maximum rate of that class do not exceed one penny halfpenny per ton per mile."

He thought that course would enable the House to come to a decision upon the matter.

QUESTIONS.

—:0:—

EGYPT—DIPLOMATIC ARRANGEMENTS—MAJOR BARING.

Mr. BUXTON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any successor has been or is to be appointed in the place of Lord Dufferin, who has now left Egypt, or through whom Her Majesty's Government at present communicate with the Khedive and his Government?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether there is any truth in the report that Major Baring has been or is about to be appointed to represent British interests in Egypt; and, whether it is intended to confer on Major Baring any powers beyond those hitherto exercised by Her Majesty's Agent and Consul General in Egypt, and to give to him any official title, and a higher salary; and, in such case, what title and what amount of salary it is proposed to give him, and what functions he is appointed to discharge?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, in reply to the Question of my hon. Friend, and to that of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock, I have to state that Major Evelyn Baring, now Finance Minister in India, will be appointed to succeed Sir Edward Malet at Cairo. His title, rank, and functions will be the same as those of his predecessor. In consequence of the representations of Sir Edward Malet, it has already been decided to raise the salary to £4,000, the amount assigned to the Missions at Lisbon, Rio Janeiro, and Yeddo. It is under consideration to make a personal allowance to Major Baring, in order to diminish, to some extent, the great pecuniary loss which he will sustain in accepting, at the request of Her Majesty's Government and for the Public Service, the present exchange of Offices. The exact amount of this allowance has not yet been fixed; but it is hoped that, by reductions which it is proposed to effect elsewhere, no additional charge will be incurred by the public.

INLAND REVENUE (IRELAND)—SELLING PORTER WITHOUT A LICENCE.

Mr. J. N. RICHARDSON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the following paragraph in the "Irish Times," of Friday, May 4th:—

> "Tilly Fay, a young woman, of 94, Mecklenburgh Street, was charged with selling porter without licence. There were two summonses in this case, one being for the 5th and the other for the 15th instant. The evidence in both cases was to the effect that both full and empty porter bottles, glasses half filled with porter, and men sitting drinking, were found on the premises. In the yard was a basketful of empty bottles. The prisoner lived with her sister;
>
> "Mr. Keys. I suppose these people are very poor;

"31 C. Yes, sir, poor enough. The father is out of employment;

"Mr. Keys. What excuse did they give;

"31 C. No other means of livelihood, your worship;

"Mr. Keys. I suppose these wretched people are really very poor. I shall impose a small fine, only 10*s*. I suppose they will make it up in a week in the old way;"

and, whether the report is accurate; and, if so, whether the Government intend to take any notice of the conduct of Mr. Keys in admitting the pecuniary condition of the defendant as an excuse for a breach of the Law?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am informed, Sir, that the report in question is substantially accurate, except in so far as it conveys that only one fine of 10*s*. was imposed. A similar fine was imposed for each offence. The defendant was a person in extreme poverty, and the magistrate appears to have taken this into account in measuring the money penalty to be imposed. I do not think this can be fairly described as "admitting poverty as an excuse for a breach of the Law."

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE ANTRIM ARTILLERY.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that, since appointment of Adjutant of Antrim Artillery, the Commanding Officer has been in the habit of incorrectly certifying that the Adjutant kept a horse, thereby enabling him to draw forage allowance; and, whether it is a fact that it is only within the last few weeks that this Officer has been in temporary possession of a horse?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, it has been ascertained that the Adjutant of the Antrim Artillery has been without a horse during certain periods for which he claimed forage allowance. This has been a serious breach of discipline on the part of the Adjutant, of which due notice will be taken. The commanding officer has certified incorrectly that the Adjutant kept a horse. He did so on the faith of that officer's receipt for the forage allowance, which he regarded as equivalent to a certificate that the conditions under which the allowance could be drawn had been fulfilled. When the commanding officer visited the regiment, the Adjutant's horse was paraded for his inspection; but this happened to be at a time when the Adjutant was really in possession of a horse. The commanding officer will be informed that it was his duty, before certifying for the forage allowance, to have obtained from the Adjutant a certificate that he was *bonâ fide* in possession of a horse; and he will be directed to comply with this rule in future.

EARL PERCY asked if it was not the duty of the commanding officers of Militia to obtain certificates from Adjutants, showing that they were actually in possession of a horse?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he believed the duty of a commanding officer was to satisfy himself, before signing the certificate, that the Adjutant was entitled to forage allowance for a horse.

EARL PERCY asked whether they were to understand that the War Office considered the word of an Adjutant a sufficient guarantee in a case of this kind?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON asked that Notice of the Question should be given?

LAW AND JUSTICE—COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL—OPINIONS OF THE JUDGES.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether, before introducing into this House the Criminal Appeal Bill, Her Majesty's Government had sought for and obtained, from the Judges of the High Court, any opinion on the principles or details of the measure, or, if not, whether they will obtain such opinion from the Judges, either corporately or individually, and lay it upon the Table, before the House proceeds with the Report stage of the Bill?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he was sorry that his hon. Friend should have put himself to the trouble and inconvenience of asking this Question; because, on the 13th of March, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket) put identically the same Question. The Answer which he then gave his hon. Friend would find at page 366 of *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* of this year.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked whether, before the Report stage, his hon. and learned Friend would obtain the opinions of the Judges and lay them on the Table?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he stated at the time that he had submitted the heads of the Bill to certain Judges, and among others he mentioned the Chief Justice of England.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS—HYDE PARK CORNER.

MR. GERARD NOEL asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he has yet arrived at any decision as to the advisability of further widening Piccadilly opposite Hamilton Place and Park Lane, with a view of easing the traffic at those points?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Sir, I have considered the Question referred to by the noble Lord, and have come to the conclusion that the difficulty referred to by him would not be cured by further widening Piccadilly at the bottom of Hamilton Place. The check to the traffic which occasionally takes place there is due to two streams of traffic crossing one another, and not to want of width of Piccadilly—indeed, the south side of Piccadilly is generally quite free. I am not, therefore, prepared to throw into Piccadilly any more of the Green Park. The block at Hyde Park Corner has been entirely removed. The check to traffic at the bottom of Hamilton Place is comparatively trivial, and will be best dealt with by police regulations.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON asked whether the First Commissioner of Works had considered the proposal to widen Park Lane?

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that was a question for the consideration of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

NAVY—H.M.S. "CLYDE"—THE COURT MARTIAL ON CAPTAIN F. MAXWELL-HERON—THE PAPERS.

CAPTAIN MAXWELL-HERON asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will lay upon the Table of the House, Copy of Proceedings and Sentence of Court Martial on F. Maxwell-Heron, late Commander of H.M.S. "Clyde," with any Correspondence ensuing thereon?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I regret, Sir, that I am unable to comply with my hon. and gallant Friend's request, as it is not according to usual practice to lay on the Table a Copy of the proceedings of a Naval court martial. I have made inquiry, and find that there is no record of such a publication within the last 50 years.

CITY LIVERY COMPANIES COMMISSION.

MR. J. R. YORKE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When it is likely that the Report of the City Companies Commissioners will be laid upon the Table?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that the Report would be published during the course of the present Session.

ARMY—GUARDS AND SENTRIES.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary of State for War, If, following the practice of former years, a Return can be furnished of the guards and sentries mounted daily throughout the garrisons and stations at Home, and the purposes for which supplied; also the effects on the minds of men in causing dislike for the Military Service by such guards; and, whether many of these guards could be dispensed with by employing watchmen, and by providing storehouses with good doors, secured by efficient locks, and thus doing away with the necessity of posting sentries?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, it appears to be upwards of 60 years since such a Return was furnished, and then it applied only to the Metropolis. Returns are received monthly from districts and regiments showing the number of guards and sentries furnished, but not the purposes for which supplied. Sentry duty is, doubtless, irksome, and much disliked; but it is a very necessary part of a soldier's training, indispensable in war, and one for which some practice in peace is requisite. Of course, many of the sentries might be replaced by watchmen; but it would be at increased expense to the public. Attention is paid at all times to reducing, as far as consistent with public safety, the number of sentinels; and I had recently under consideration the possibility of a reduction of their number in London, where the duties are exceptionally heavy. But, for reasons stated to the House by the Home Secretary on the 19th of March last, it became necessary, as a temporary measure, to increase largely the sentry duty of the troops, especially of the Foot Guards in London. I cannot help taking this opportunity of expressing my sense of the alacrity with which these additional duties were undertaken by the Household Troops, and of the admirable spirit, temper, and good conduct of the men under conditions occasionally of a very trying character.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE TRANSVAAL—AGGRESSION OF THE BOERS ON NATIVE TRIBES.

MR. GUY DAWNAY asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he can state what amount of land has up to the present time been taken by Transvaal subjects from the Bechuana Nation, and been incorporated in the so-called "Stellaland Territory;" whether remonstrances on this subject are still being addressed by Her Majesty's Government to the Government of the Transvaal; and, whether Her Majesty's Government have still any reason to believe that such remonstrances will produce the slightest effect; also, whether it is true, as stated in a letter written by an Englishman at Taungs, in the Batlahin Territory, on April 2nd, and published in "England" of May 12th, that, about the month of May last year, one of the Captains of the Volunteer Boer Freebooters brought from Pretoria 300 rounds of cannon ammunition for use against Mankoroane, together with a letter, signed by Mr. Joubert, to the effect that the said ammunition was to be paid for to the Transvaal Government by the Boers fighting against Mankoroane, six months after delivery, and that such payment was to bear interest at the rate of six per cent.; and, whether the Transvaal Government still pretend that they are now manifesting, or have at any time manifested, the slightest desire to put a stop to the depredations committed by Transvaal subjects in the Territory of our late Bechuana allies?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, the only information we have as to the amount of land taken by the Transvaal from Bechuana Chiefs is contained in a telegram from the Cape, in which it is said that, according to newspaper reports, there have been about 1,000 farms allotted. But, as most of these are merely farms on paper, this figure gives no clue whatever to the amount of land that has been actually taken. There have been no recent remonstrances addressed directly by Her Majesty's Government to the Government of the Transvaal, because the whole relations between the two Governments are under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. In answer to the second Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that statements substantially similar to those contained in the Question have been made by a person with a Dutch name, but who requests his name to be kept secret. He sent the statement through Mankoroane himself to the Civil Commissioner at Barkly, but only quite recently, although they relate to matters alleged to have occurred a year ago. As to the second part of the Question, the Transvaal Government still profess to deplore the existing state of things in Bechuanaland; but maintain that as long as they are precluded by the Convention from taking any direct action in that country, they cannot be held responsible for what is going on there. They, however, recently sent Colonel Ferreira to the Border as their Special Commissioner, with a view —to use the words of his instructions— to "extirpate the band of cattle-robbers once for all," but not to cross the Border unless he secured the co-operation of all concerned. But, beyond restoring 75 head of cattle to Mankoroane, we have not yet heard of any result from this expedition.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Will the Papers to which the hon. Member has referred in his Answer be laid upon the Table of the House before the contemplated discussion on the affairs of the Transvaal? It will be necessary for us to have all the information possessed by the Government in connection with the last phase of that question?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: I cannot say positively when the Papers will be laid before the House; but they are being prepared.

EDUCATION (WALES)—CARNARVON TRAINING COLLEGE.

MR. RICHARD, who complained that his Question had been altered, asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether, in view of the practical failure of the Training College at Carnarvon in accomplishing the object for which it was established, that of training teachers for schools in Wales, the large grant of public money now made will be continued for its support?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, we are in communication with the Governing Body of Carnarvon Training College, with the view to such changes in that institution as will render it both efficient and acceptable as a place for the training of Welsh teachers. We shall await the deliberations of the Governing Body before taking any further steps, and we trust that they will concur in our views.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER asked whether the right hon. Gentleman intended this year to propose a Vote for the College?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Yes, Sir, of course; because the Vote is for work already done.

BURIALS ACTS—NONCONFORMIST BURIALS.

Mr. RICHARD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has seen a statement in the "Cornish Telegraph" of May 24th, to the effect that, on May 19th, in the churchyard of Gwinear, Cornwall, the sexton, acting, as stated by him, under the authority of the vicar, endeavoured to prevent the Rev. J. W. Harbord, Wesleyan minister, conducting a funeral service at the burial of an unbaptised child, and proceeded to lower the coffin and to fill up the grave while the service was being read; and, whether he will make inquiry into the facts of the case; and, if they are found to be as stated, will cause legal proceedings to be instituted against the sexton for obstructing a burial under the Burial Act of 1880?

Mr. M'LAREN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the facts referred to in the following paragraph in the "Staffordshire Advertiser":—

> "On May 3rd Mr. Joseph Kinsey, of Stafford, manufacturer, applied at the Cemetery for burial space for a deceased child, and wished to have the grave made by the side of that of his brother, who died some years ago, and was buried in the consecrated portion. Mr. Kinsey is a Wesleyan, and he stated to the registrar that the service at the grave would be conducted by the Wesleyan minister. To this the registrar objected, and declined to allow a Nonconformist service to take place on consecrated ground. In consequence of the registrar's refusal to sell him the site he preferred, Mr. Kinsey proceeded to select one in another portion of the Cemetery. At this moment two gentlemen, friends of Mr. Kinsey, challenged the registrar's ruling, and ultimately appealed to the town clerk, who, after consideration, modified the objection to the extent of allowing the funeral, but confirmed it as to selling the grave;"

and, whether the proceedings on the part of the burial authorities are not contrary to the provisions of the Burials Act; and, if so, whether the Home Office has any means of enforcing obedience to the law in favour of Nonconformists?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, in reply to the first of these Questions, I have to state that I have received a letter from the vicar disavowing any responsibility for the sexton's action. The conduct of the sexton seems to have been very foolish and improper; but as this was the first funeral in the parish under the recent Act, I do not think we need take any further notice of the matter. To the second Question I have to reply that there seems to have been some misunderstanding between the parties referred to. I have a letter about the matter in which I find that no objection whatever was taken to the burial. A service had been conducted that very day in the cemetery by a Wesleyan minister, and there had been other services of that kind previously. The burial authorities at first doubted their power to sell the land; but that doubt was removed, and the land, instead of being refused, was actually sold, and a receipt was given.

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE VATICAN—MR. ERRINGTON.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any correspondence has taken place on public affairs connected with the Vatican between Lord Granville and Mr. Errington; and, if so, whether such correspondence has been deposited in the official archives of the Foreign Department, or whether it is of a private character, and not in any way recorded in the Foreign Office for the information of future Secretaries of State?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, I have nothing to add to the reply which was given by the Prime Minister to a similar Question addressed to him by the hon. Member on February 14 last year. The reply then given still holds good. The Answer to which I refer is a long one; but, if the hon.

Member prefers it, I shall be happy to read it to the House. [*Cries of* "Read!"]

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: Would the noble Lord be good enough to inform the House whether any correspondence has taken place between the date mentioned in the noble Lord's Answer and the present time?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I have already stated that the Answer given by the Prime Minister on February 14, 1882, still holds good; and I will read that Answer if the hon. Member wishes. [*Cries of* "Read!" *and* "No!"]

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: I should be glad if the noble Lord would read the Answer.

After a short pause,

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said: The noble Lord said that if I wished it he would read the Answer of the Prime Minister last year. I should like him to read it. ["No, no!"]

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I said I would read it if the hon. Gentleman desired it, and accordingly I will do so. The Answer of the Prime Minister is as follows:—

"The House is aware that it is contrary to the usage of Parliament—there may be exceptions, but they are exceedingly rare—to produce or lay upon the Table Correspondence, or a single letter which are not of an official or diplomatic character. That being so, the question is open to another Parliamentary objection upon the details of such Correspondence, because it is well known that the House takes objection—it is an established rule to take objection—to accounts given by Ministers of public documents, which they were not prepared to produce. I am afraid, therefore, I have no course but to decline to go further than the statement already made by my hon. Friend near me (Sir Charles W. Dilke) on this subject; but I will endeavour to convey to the mind of the hon. Member with perfect clearness the nature and the aim of such communications as have taken place between Lord Granville and Mr. Errington. I will not enter into the subject as to whether this Question is accurate or inaccurate in all its statements—because they are both. It has been said by my hon. Friend near me, as I shall state in the most distinct terms, not only that there has been no appointing of Mr. Errington, and, of course, no remuneration, but that there have been no negotiations with Mr. Errington, no proposal made to him, and no request tendered to Mr. Errington. The purport of any intercourse with Lord Granville by Mr. Errington has been exclusively with reference to his being a channel or medium of information. Mr. Errington is not exclusively the medium of information, because on any occasion of any other gentleman as well qualified as Mr. Errington by character and intelligence to convey just and accurate information to Rome, Lord Granville might, in the same manner, have been induced to think it well to supply him or permit him to be supplied with information of that character. The purpose has been entirely to convey information, and information upon matters interesting to the Roman Catholic subjects of Her Majesty, and naturally, as connected with them, to the public at large. That is the purpose, aim, and limit of these communications; and I may say that the journey of Lord O'Hagan to Rome, which was, like Mr. Errington's a private journey, taken entirely on his own motion, might as well have been made the subject of a Parliamentary inquiry as that of Mr. Errington. It was a journey for private objects, with which we had nothing to do; but, with respect to the journey, we did think it useful—and we do think it useful—that many matters of great interest with respect to the question of the Roman Catholic subjects of Her Majesty should be made known at Rome in conjunction with the very best information that is to be had on the subject.—(3 *Hansard*, [266] 640-1.)

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: Sir, the Answer to which we have just listened does not convey any definite meaning to my mind. It has nothing to do with my Question, which I will venture to repeat. [The hon. Member read the Question already given.]

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, I consider the Question fully answered by the Answer I have already given. I may add this much:—If my hon. Friend considers I did not answer the latter portion of it, I am of opinion that I did answer it clearly and by implication: and if he wishes for a formal Answer, I would say that the communications referred to in the commencement of the Answer which I read are clearly not communications which have been placed, or could be placed within the terms of the Answer, on what my hon. Friend calls the file of the Foreign Office.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN: I would ask the noble Lord if no communication has taken place between the Irish Office and Mr. Errington; if the late Chief Secretary, or the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, have not had communication with Mr. Errington? If the noble Lord cannot answer that Question I will put it to the Prime Minister, either to-day, or on a future occasion. I wish, further, to ask if Mr. Errington was not publicly received at the Vatican, along with other diplomatists and Representatives of Foreign Powers, as the Representative of this country?

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I would ask the Prime Minister a Question arising out of the Answer of the noble Lord. It is this:—If the Mission of Mr. Errington has had beneficial results in producing a pronouncement from His Holiness the Pope, owing to Mr. Errington having been made the channel of communication between Her Majesty's Government and the See of Rome, whether it would not be of advantage to the Public Service, and of use to a future Government, that a record of those communications should be deposited in the Foreign Office?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, that is asking for an opinion, and an opinion upon a case on which I am not prepared altogether to affirm the accuracy of the statement or implication of the noble Lord. The Answer read by my noble Friend rather tended to show that Mr. Errington had not borne any character whatever, so far as we were concerned, which was not exclusively his own. For example, Lord O'Hagan, who went to Rome at the time I think Mr. Errington first went there, was in a very similar position, and discharged very similar offices on his own account. In the matter relating to the state of Ireland, he took the opportunity, on his visit to Rome, to lay information before the Pope and the Vatican. I may add, Sir, that there are others who have done the same, one a friend of mine, well known to the House, who has been in Rome quite lately. With respect to him, it was by a note received by me from him after he left Rome that I learned of his movements. I am speaking of Lord Houghton. He wrote to me informing me that he had had an opportunity of communicating what he conceived to be information upon Irish matters to the Pope in Rome. Therefore, the noble Lord will see that there is nothing in the nature of the communications between Lord Granville and Mr. Errington which can properly be made the subject of official record. As to communications between Mr. Errington and the late Chief Secretary and the present Lord Lieutenant, I am not acquainted with the facts; but if the hon. Member likes to put down a Question I will endeavour to answer him.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN: Will the Prime Minister state if it be true that Mr. Errington is received in an official character at the Vatican, and that Lord Houghton was not?

Mr. GORST: With reference to the Answer of the Prime Minister, will he object to state whether either Lord O'Hagan or Lord Houghton received from Her Majesty's Government a letter of confidence?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I just stated I was unaware, and by implication I stated that my noble Friend (Earl Granville) was not aware, of Lord Houghton having had any communication with Rome until after the fact. With regard to Lord O'Hagan, I think, considering he had just been holding the Office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland in connection with Her Majesty's Government, it would have been quite unnecessary that Lord Granville should have addressed a note to Lord O'Hagan, as he did to Mr. Errington, stating that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, he was a person of character and capacity such as to entitle any statement he might make to consideration.

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACTS.

Mr. DONALDSON-HUDSON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether a licence which was given to Mr. L. E. Morgan, of Bland Street, Moss Side, Manchester, to keep 10 lbs. of explosives for the purpose of an exhibition with experiments showing the various properties of explosives at Victoria Gardens, Tetley, near Sheffield, was subsequently revoked; and, if so, for what reason?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, these are matters entirely in the hands of the local authorities, who are responsible. I suppose that it was not convenient at the time that the exhibition should be held.

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FINDLATER (for Mr. Maurice Brooks) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, to avoid any possible misunderstanding, he will have any objection to inform intending contractors for the conveyance of the mails between Holyhead and Kingstown that the clauses in the advertisement and tender form, which provide that "it is essential that the vessels to be employed in the service shall be at least equal in respect of speed, stability at sea, and accommodation for mails and for passengers" to the "present mail boats," shall be understood to mean that the vessels to be employed in the service shall be not less in speed, tonnage, engine power, dimensions, draught of water, stability at sea, and accommodation for mails and passengers than the present mail boats?

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, so far as I am able to judge, the words contained in the advertisement are sufficient to secure that boats in no respect inferior to those now employed can be accepted under the new contract. As it is stipulated that the speed shall not be less than that now maintained, I do not see any use in making any stipulation as to engine-power, as my hon. Friend suggests.

ARMY—RIFLE RANGES AT WORMWOOD SCRUBBS.

Mr. TATTON EGERTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the intention of the War Office permanently to close the rifle ranges at Wormwood Scrubbs?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, the range at Wormwood Scrubbs has been re-opened; with the restriction that Range A is only to be used by experienced shots.

MOROCCO—SLAVERY AND SLAVE-DEALING AT TANGIER.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to the following statements made by the Gibraltar Correspondent of the Exchange Telegram Company, and published in many of the London evening papers on Monday last:—

> "Gibraltar, Monday.—I have heard of the sale of another slave in Tangier. It was that of a woman who was sold for thirty-seven dollars. Not long since a slave (a woman) was admitted to the French hospital, who had been compelled by her owner to use her bare feet every day in slacking lime. While she was in the hospital her feet fell off, and both of her legs had to be amputated. It is possible, as stated, that thirty or forty slaves only are sold in Tangier, but that is in the capital alone, where these sales are fewer than in other parts of the country;"

and, whether these statements, or any of them, are accurate?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, my hon. Friend will observe that the report appears to be given merely on hearsay evidence by a correspondent, not at Tangier, but at Gibraltar. If, however, my hon. Friend has any reason for believing it to be true, inquiry will be made into the facts through Her Majesty's Minister at Tangier. The matter would be one to be dealt with by the local tribunals, and would not afford a case for the interference of Her Majesty's Government; the state of slavery, as I have already informed the House, being, unfortunately, legal in Morocco. Her Majesty's Government, I have already stated, have no Treaty rights in regard to the Slave Trade with Morocco.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—ASSISTANT CLERKS.

Mr. R. N. FOWLER (for Mr. Grantham) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to the position of certain junior clerks in the Education Department who entered that office at the age of fourteen, with a promise of a nomination for a permanent clerkship if they had a good character, and remained there till they were nineteen, but who were deprived of that nomination by the alterations subsequently made in the service; whether they are receiving now above £100 per annum, instead of £200 per annum, and with a rise per annum for any length of service of one-third only of what they otherwise would have received; whether the heads of the Department have recommended some compensation to be made to them; and, if the Government will now make them some compensation for the breach of the conditions on which they entered the service; and, if not, on what grounds such compensation is refused?

Mr. COURTNEY: Assuming, Sir, that the Question refers to what are called third-class assistant clerks in the Education Office, I have to say that the information furnished to the hon. and learned Gentleman is not correct; and, especially, that no promise was given to these junior clerks when their service began, and that they have, without such promise, received permanent appointments of greater value than stated. It would, however, be impossible, within the limits of an Answer to a Question, to explain the details of such a case; but I may say that it has been carefully inquired into at various dates since 1879; a substantial boon was given in 1881; and there now remains, in the opinion of the Treasury, no reasonable ground of complaint.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—IRISH CROWN SOLICITORSHIPS.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact, as stated in a recent issue of the "Freeman's Journal," that the county Kildare Crown Solicitorship now vacant is worth £700 per annum; if it is a fact that the sub-inspectors of police prosecute at petty sessions and the Sessional Crown Solicitors at quarter sessions; and, if so, what functions besides attending assizes for six or seven days a-year, and supplying the prosecuting barristers with copies of depositions taken at petty and quarter sessions, devolve upon the Crown Solicitor; if it is a fact that a movement is on foot amongst Irish Crown Solicitors for an increase of pay; and, if this is the only reason why a sum so disproportionate to the incomes made by country solicitors practising at their profession is paid to the Crown Prosecutor of Kildare?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the vacant office, to which a salary of £700 a-year is attached, is for two counties—namely, Kildare and Meath. The duties of a Crown Solicitor in connection with Assizes are but imperfectly and inadequately described in the Question. They must be men of skill and experience in their Profession, and they have responsible and important public duties to perform. These were probably the circumstances which weighed with the Treasury authorities in fixing the amount of their remuneration, rather than a consideration of the average incomes of other gentlemen of their Profession engaged in private practice. I am not aware that a movement is on foot among them to obtain an increase of pay.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—MR. OWEN RYAN (BELFAST).

Mr. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in reference to the case of Mr. Owen Ryan, at the date of his appointment in the Milford Street Male School, Belfast, which was on the 10th October 1882, there were only six assistants previously employed in the School; and, further, if it is true that the manager of the said School has, on several occasions, written to the Board requesting that Mr. Ryan be recognised as seventh assistant; and, if so, why do the Commissioners regard him as the eighth applicant for salary?

Mr. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, that the original application of the manager of the Milford Street Male School, Belfast, was for the recognition of Mr. Ryan and another teacher named M'Dermott as seventh and eighth teachers. The Board could not recognize both, as the school was not qualified for an eighth assistant. It was a matter of indifference to them which of the two they recognized as seventh; and in finally communicating their decision they specified Mr. M'Dermott, as his name had been placed before Ryan's in the latest communication which they had received from the manager of the school. It was the case that the manager wrote several times to the Board; but his letters were quite as much in support of his claim for an eighth assistant as in the interest of Ryan. The hon. Member is, perhaps, not aware that the manager had since dismissed Ryan altogether from his service on account of grave misconduct.

POOR REMOVAL (IRELAND).

Mr. LEWIS asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has been made aware of the circumstances under which a pauper of the name of William Davis, with his wife and three children, were removed from Plymouth Union to that of Londonderry, which place he left fourteen years ago; whether it is true that he had resided at Plymouth ten years continuously, and at the time of his removal was engaged in weekly service, earning 22*s.* a-week, and was the holder of a tenement furnished by himself; that about the 1st of May he was ordered to proceed to Ireland; that a few days afterwards, owing to his refusal to leave Plymouth, his wife and children were forcibly seized by policemen and placed on board ship for Dublin; that the pretence or ground for such proceedings was that during two or three months absence of Davis from work, in hospital owing to ill health early in this year, the wife was allowed out-door relief of 4*s.* 6*d.* per week; that this man had a pension as a retired gunner in the Royal Artillery, in which he served fourteen and a-half years, and had a good character and possessed two good conduct badges; whether the Plymouth guardians could not have recouped themselves the small amount of relief expended on this family by applying for repayment out of Davis's pension; whether the conduct of the Plymouth magistrates and guardians was legal; and, whether he will take any steps open to him to prevent a renewal of such proceedings under the present Law?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Sir, if this were merely the case of an individual, I should not have thought it right to detain the House with the answer I am about to give; but it raises an important question with regard to the Irish poor removal question. The Board have caused inquiry to be made of the guardians as to the facts of the case of William Davis. The clerk to the guardians states that William Davis came to Plymouth, as he is informed, on the 28th of November, 1881, and in that case he "had not resided at Plymouth 10 years continuously." With regard to the question whether Davis, at the time of his removal, was engaged in weekly service, earning 22*s.* a-week, and was the holder of a tenement furnished by himself, the Board are informed by the clerk to the guardians that Davis was in no employ at the time of his removal, and never had, as far as he can ascertain, 22*s.* a-week wages. He had two or three days' work at the Tramway Company's stable during the illness of another man. He rented one room, and some of his things were taken out of pawn for him when he left. The person to whom the warrant was entrusted for execution was a policeman on leave, and he did not act in this matter as a policeman, but as the agent of the guardians. The relief of 4*s.* 6*d.* per week, the guardians state, was continued after Davis was discharged from the hospital, and he applied for a truss, which was granted to him. As regards the guardians being recouped the relief granted by applying for repayment out of his pension, the guardians state that Davis had a pension of 8*d.* a-day, but had received the amount to the end of March before the relief was given, and nothing could have been obtained by the guardians until July, and only then if Davis were living. They were of opinion that, considering the state of his health, the family would be permanently chargeable, and in the case of the man's death would be entirely dependent on the rates for support. The material facts of the case are in dispute; and, this being the case, the Board do not consider that they can express an opinion as to the legality of the conduct of the Plymouth magistrates and guardians. If the guardians of the Londonderry Union think themselves aggrieved by the removal on the ground that the man was not, in law, liable to be removed, and proceed as provided by the 26 & 27 *Vict.*, c. 89, the Local Government Board for Ireland may appoint a person to make a preliminary inquiry into the circumstances attending the removal, and, if they think fit, may appeal, on behalf of the guardians, against the removal. Davis was understood, when before the guardians, to express his willingness to go to Ireland; and the clerk to the guardians states that Davis told him that he did not object to go, but his wife was unwilling. Neither Davis nor his wife made any objection before the magistrates.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR inquired, whether the man was actually in receipt of relief at the time of his removal?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, that, as he understood the statement of the guardians, that was so.

POOR LAW (METROPOLIS)—ST. PANCRAS WORKHOUSE—RE-VACCINATION OF FEMALES.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is the fact, as stated by Mr. Dunlop, Medical Officer of Saint Pancras Workhouse, at an inquest held last week, that the practice of re-vaccinating women in the first days after their confinement (even on the day of confinement itself if that should happen on the usual weekly vaccination day) is under the sanction or by order of the Local Government Board?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, in reply, said, he had not received the depositions taken in this case; but he had written to the Coroner to ask for them. He was not aware whether Mr. Dunlop had made the statement attributed to him; but the Local Government Board had neither suggested nor ordered that women should be re-vaccinated during the first days after their confinement.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—REDUCTIONS OF RENT.

Mr. LEAMY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is the fact that Mr. Croker, Local Government Board auditor, has disallowed the reduction of twenty-five per cent. granted by the Corporation of Wexford to their tenants owing to the bad seasons, and has reserved to himself the right of surcharging the land agent of the Corporation with the amount of the reduction; and, whether the Local Government Board, bearing in mind the large reductions of rent which have been made by landlords all over Ireland for a similar reason, approves of the action of Mr. Croker?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Local Government Board are not yet in a position to give the required information on this subject. They have called upon their Auditor for a Report, which they expect to receive to-morrow.

MEXICO—RENEWAL OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.

Mr. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is now in a position to give the House further information respecting the renewal of diplomatic relations with Mexico?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: It has been arranged with the Mexican Government that Special Envoys shall be simultaneously accredited to London and Mexico respectively, who will be charged with the duty of conducting negotiations for the renewal of diplomatic relations between the two countries. Sir Spenser St. John, British Minister in Peru, has accordingly been appointed Special Envoy from Her Majesty to the President of the Mexican Republic.

Mr. MONK asked whether a Minister would be established with a Diplomatic Staff?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Not at present I think.

MERCANTILE MARINE — SIGNAL WATCH-HOUSE AT DUNGENESS.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether permission has been given to the Committee of Lloyd's to erect a watch house for signalling purposes on Government ground at Dungeness; and, if so, why the contractor employed by the Committee to set up that watch house is not permitted to go upon the ground?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, permission has been given, with the concurrence of the Admiralty, for the erection of the watch house by the Committee of Lloyd's. The ground, however, is in charge of the Admiralty; and it is understood that, owing to some misapprehension on the part of the Coastguard officer in local charge, the contractor was not allowed to commence the work. Steps have already been taken to remedy this, and the work can be carried out at once.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) (IRELAND) ACTS—INFECTED DISTRICTS IN THE COUNTIES OF LOUTH AND MEATH.

Mr. SHEIL asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, How many districts have been declared infected with cattle disease in the Ardee Union, in the county of Louth, and how many in the Trim Union, in the county of Meath; and, on what grounds a licence was granted for the Dunleer Fair, on May 14th, in the former Union, and refused for the Bective Fair in the latter, which was to have been held on May 16th?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, since the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, 14 areas have been, from time to time, declared infected in the Ardee Union, and eight in the Trim Union. In the case of Dunleer Fair, the disease did not exist within, at least, a radius of five miles from the town; and the licence was granted, as it was believed that the fair might be held with safety. The refusal of a licence in the case of Bective Fair was owing to the existence of disease in adjacent places, and the consequent fear of its spread if the fair were permitted to be held. Bective is situate in close proximity to where the Navan and Dunshaughlin Unions—in both of which the disease is prevalent—unite with Trim Union; and four parishes adjoining that in which Bective is situate were infected areas.

INDIA — CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL — REPORTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. PUGH asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the Reports of the Government of Bengal and the other local Governments upon the Indian Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill have been received; and, if not, when they are expected; and, whether he will object to laying them upon the Table of the House?

MR. J. K. CROSS: The Reports have not yet arrived; but there will be no objection to laying them on the Table of the House when they do.

MR. E. STANHOPE asked when they were coming?

MR. J. K. CROSS: I cannot say.

MR. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked whether almost the whole of the officials of the House had reported against the Bill?

MR. J. K. CROSS: I cannot say, as the Reports have not arrived.

EGYPT (MILITARY EXPEDITION)—MAJOR CARRE (PURCHASE OF SADDLERY).

DR. CAMERON asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office, What saddlery Major Carré shipped from Smyrna to Egypt; if he could state by whose instructions he bought it; whether he bought it from the contractor who sold him the mules; what he paid for it; whether it was found to be useless on its arrival in Egypt; and, what ultimately became of it?

MR. BRAND: Sir, as this Question relates to the Department for which I am responsible, my hon. Friend to whom it is addressed (Sir Arthur Hayter) has requested me to answer it. I have replied to several Questions put by the hon. Member on the subject of these mules; and on one occasion I expressed regret that Major Carré should not have acted on the advice of the veterinary surgeon who was associated with him in regard to the purchases that were made. But this inquiry, taken in conjunction with a former Question on the same subject, seems to me to suggest a reflection on the integrity of Major Carré; and I think it right, therefore, in justice to that officer, who is at present stationed at St. Helena, to state that he bears a high character in the Service, and I would suggest to the hon. Member that if he has any charge to make against him, he should state distinctly what it is, and lay it before the Secretary of State. In answer to the specific inquiries now made, I may say that Major Carré bought 300 pack saddles, with nose-bags, curry-combs, halters, ropes, and small stores at Smyrna, under instructions from the War Office, and shipped them for Egypt. These articles were bought from the contractors who sold the mules, or rather from their local agent. The sum paid was £480 17*s.* 3*d.* The saddles were used in Egypt, and were, it may be assumed, ultimately returned into store in the ordinary course.

AFRICA (THE RIVER CONGO)—ACTION OF PORTUGAL.

MR. SLAGG asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that France has proposed an agreement with Portugal to the effect that Portugal may take the south bank of the Congo on condition that Portugal will raise no objection to the annexation by France of the north bank; and, whether Her Majesty's Government is prepared to recognize such a transfer of the assumed rights of Portugal in that region?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, Her Majesty's Government have received no information of any such proposed agreement.

CITY OF LONDON LIVERY COMPANIES COMMISSION.

MR. BROADHURST asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Report of the Royal Commission on the City of London Livery Companies is likely to be presented to Parliament before this Session closes, considering it was appointed nearly three years ago, and the evidence having been closed some time since?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes, Sir; the Report will be presented during the present Session.

MR. BROADHURST asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether his attention has been called to the evidence given before the Royal Commission on the City Livery Companies, by which it appears that property in the City of Westminster of the estimated value of £17,000 per annum belonging to a charity school in the control of which the Corporation of the City of London have an interest has been for the last 25 years and is lying idle and waste; and, whether he would consider if the cost of elementary education in the City of Westminster could not be wholly defrayed out of such property without necessitating any contribution by rate if such charitable property was utilised?

Mr. MUNDELLA: Sir, I have inquired of the Charity Commissioners as to the statement in the first paragraph of my hon. Friend's Question. They report that the Evidence given before the City Liveries Commission is not yet published, and that they have no knowledge of any school or charity in Westminster possessed of unrealized property to anything like the amount stated. The United Westminster Schools, of which some members of the Corporation are Governors, own considerable property in or near Victoria Street, which, under the sanction of the Charity Commissioners, is being gradually disposed of by sales and leases. More than £50,000 worth of land has been sold since 1876, and a portion of 19,800 square feet is about to be leased for 80 years at £600 a-year, and was advertised in *The Times* of the 11th instant. Whatever may be the increased income derivable from these sources, it will not be applicable to the payment of the School Board rates of Westminster, but for the development of the present schools and the higher education of children who ought to be benefited by this endowment.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—DUNFANAGHY UNION—IRREGULARITIES OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can state the decision of the Local Government Board with respect to the charges preferred against officials of the Dunfanaghy Union in connection with the seduction of an imbecile pauper inmate and the birth in the workhouse of her illegitimate child?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, the decision arrived at by the Local Government Board was that there was no evidence worthy of credence to sustain a charge of immorality against any official of the workhouse. It transpired in the course of the inquiry that the classification of the inmates had not been sufficiently strictly maintained, and steps have been taken to remedy that defect.

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACTS—CERTIFICATES.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If positive instructions have been issued by the Home Office to chief constables, forbidding them to charge fees for granting certificates of fitness to persons who require to keep explosives for private use, or to make any charge nominally for the purpose of covering the alleged expense of making the necessary investigation in regard to the applicant's fitness prior to the grant of such certificates?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, he had often had occasion to explain in that House that he had no power to give positive instructions to constables. The Orders in Council did not authorize him to do so. As far as was known to the Chief Inspector of Explosives, no case had arisen which would necessitate that such instructions should be given.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN said, that there were instances in which these charges were really made.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: All I can say is, that there is no authority for making them.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—THE BELFAST POLICE.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it be true that in the recent promotions amongst the police in Belfast, two policemen who had acted as sub-inspector's clerks for five or six years, and who, consequently, have no practical knowledge of the duties required of detectives were selected to the exclusion of experienced officers; if it be correct that the religion of the various officers was urged as a source of fitness for the office?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I have received a telegram from the Town Inspector of Belfast, who states that it is not the case that promotions have recently taken place there, but that men have recently been examined for detective duty. He adds that it is not true that men who had acted as Sub-Inspectors' clerks were selected to the exclusion of more experienced men, or that the religion of any man was urged as a source of fitness for office.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether, in view of the great advantage in making legislation on the subject of Agricultural Compensation clear and intelligible to the public, he will consent to commit the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill pro formâ, in order to insert in the measure all those provisions of the Act of 1875 which it is now proposed to incorporate by way of reference only, and to repeal the remainder of that Act?

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, If he has considered that, as at present arranged, there will be no possibility of amending the county court procedure sections of "The Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1875," about twenty-seven in number, while the new Agricultural Bill, in which they are to be incorporated, is passing through the House; and, if he will act upon the suggestion of the honourable Member for East Gloucestershire to embody in the new Bill those sections of the Act of 1875 which are to form part of the new Act?

Mr. DODSON, in reply, said, that Her Majesty's Government had purposely deferred the Bill to a day on which they hoped and intended to proceed with it; and he should be sorry to lose the time that would be involved by re-committing the Bill *pro formâ*, and re-printing it. All that the right hon. Baronet required could be effected when the Bill was in Committee, or at a subsequent stage; and Notice had been given by the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) to insert in the Bill in Committee the provisions of the Act of 1875, instead of only referring to them. The Government were quite sensible of the advantage of embodying the law in one Act, so that they were not at all averse on principle to the suggestion of the right hon. Baronet; and he might add they were exceedingly desirous, on this as on other matters, to consult as far as possible the wishes of the House; but they must reserve their judgment as to the expediency of adopting this course, or as to the time and mode of giving effect to it, if adopted, until they had made further progress with the Bill. This would also be his Answer to the Question put by the hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon).

LAW AND POLICE—CASE OF FRANCIS REDFERN (UTTOXETER).

Mr. H. T. DAVENPORT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has had his attention called to the case of Francis Redfern, who was on the 16th of this month, at Uttoxeter, committed to prison for one month with hard labour for cruelty to a pony; and, whether he will take any steps in the matter?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that this case had been brought to his notice, and that he had received a Report from the magistrates. On consideration, he did not see his way to interfere in the matter.

Mr. CRAIG asked whether the prisoner's father was not an inmate of a lunatic asylum; and whether it was not feared that the sentence would be attended with serious consequences to the prisoner; and if, in view of that fact, the right hon. and learned Gentleman would not consider whether he could not remit the labour part of the sentence?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he must respectfully beg to enter a protest against being called upon in such cases to enter into details in that House. With regard to what the hon. Member had said, he might say that no application had been made to him on the ground of the prisoner's state of health. Were such an application made, he should, of course, consider it.

ARMY AND NAVY EXPENDITURE—"EXTRA RECEIPTS."

Mr. SALT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he can state what are the amounts of "Extra Receipts" absorbed in the estimated amounts of Army and Navy Expenditure respectively for the year 1883-4?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): Sir, I think that it would be better, instead of stating the aggregate amount of extra receipts which would have been estimated under the former system, to give a Return for 1883-4 under each head. I will lay this on the Table without delay.

Mr. W. H. SMITH asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would consider the desirability of showing in the Finance Accounts and the Statistical Abstract the amount of extra receipts now taken in aid of the Army and Navy Expenditures, so as to allow of a better comparison being made between those expenditures?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): The right hon. Gentleman's suggestion appears to me a very proper one. These amounts will be shown in the Return.

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION—REFORM OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether cases have been reported to Sir Benson Maxwell of prisoners having been recently condemned in Egypt without counsel or witnesses in defence being admitted?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, Her Majesty's Government have not received any information, since the appointment of Sir Benson Maxwell, which would lead them to conclude that the statement in the Question is correct. They have not received a Report of the trials.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: Has no Report been received at all?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir Benson Maxwell does not report to Her Majesty's Government. He is not in the service of Her Majesty's Government, but of the Egyptian Government.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND—THE LORD HIGH COMMISSIONER.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Earl of Aberdeen, now discharging the office of Lord High Commissioner of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, did immediately before the opening of the Assembly cause to be circulated among the Clergy a letter, signed by himself and five others, deploring the recent decision of the House of Commons on the Affirmation Bill, and recommending a perusal of the Prime Minister's speech on the second reading thereof; and, whether he was acting under the advice or approval of Her Majesty's Government in so doing?

MR. GLADSTONE: I confess, Sir, I have some difficulty in answering this Question, which, although quite within the Rules of the House, appears to me to be a Question of a peculiar character. I have not thought it my duty to address any inquiry to Lord Aberdeen on the subject, because it appeared to me that, however wrong Lord Aberdeen might be in thinking a speech delivered by me to be worth perusing, it is not an offence of which this House could well take notice. The Question seems to me to proceed upon the supposition that, by becoming the Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, a Peer of the Realm renounces the performance of any other duties which he may think to appertain to him in the latter capacity. Now, Sir, I could not give any countenance, so far as I am concerned, to any such supposition, because I do not understand that any such consequence is entailed by the acceptance of that high Office. Undoubtedly it is not the fact that Lord Aberdeen was acting under the advice or approval of Her Majesty's Government, who knew nothing of the fact of the signing of the Circular; and it would have been, on my part, an act of impertinence to have pronounced either approval or disapproval of it. But it may be of some comfort to the mind of the hon. Baronet, who appears to think that political disability follows the acceptance of the Office of Lord High Commissioner, if I acquaint him that Lord Aberdeen, at the time when he signed this Circular, was not Lord High Commissioner. He was made Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on the 10th of May, 1883, and he signed the Circular on the 8th of May, 1883.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL: The tenour of the right hon. Gentleman's reply is such that I regret to say that I must ask the indulgence of the House—["Oh, oh!"]—while I make a few remarks for the purpose of explaining what has been regarded as a very serious matter indeed. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Baronet is entitled to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman, arising out of his Answer, if he thinks proper.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL: It is my intention to ask leave to make a few remarks. ["No, no!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Baronet will not be in Order, at the present stage, in making any remarks.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL: I understand the proper course for me to take is to proceed by Motion for the Adjournment of the House after the Questions have been disposed of.

Afterwards,

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL said: I beg, Sir, to ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz. the recent conduct of the Lord High Commissioner of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in circulating a letter among the Clergy deploring the recent decision of the House of Commons on the Affirmation Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER asked whether it was the pleasure of the House that the hon. Member should be heard? [*Cries of* "No!" *and* "Aye!"] Was the hon. Baronet supported by 40 Members?

Mr. SPEAKER called on those hon. Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and less than forty Members rose in their places.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Mr. Speaker, you did not count me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I assure the hon. Member that I counted every Member who was standing up.

The House proceeded to the Orders of the Day.

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX ON FOREIGN INVESTMENTS.

Mr. MACFARLANE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If it is the case that a person residing in England investing money in Indian or other securities, outside of the United Kingdom, and drawing no portion of the income arising from such investment in this Country, is free from liability to Income Tax in respect of such income, and if a person, also residing in this Country, but employing an equal amount of capital in trade or any industry in India or elsewhere, producing an equal income, no portion of which is brought into the United Kingdom, is held to be liable in respect of the whole of such income, if he can state upon what principle the distinction is made in favour of the investor and against the trader?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): Sir, my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has asked me to answer this Question. If by the word "securities" the hon. Gentleman means, as I presume he does, securities falling within Schedule D, they are not, in either of the cases supposed, liable to Income Tax. But a trader living in the United Kingdom is liable to pay Income Tax on all profits arising from his trade wherever those profits accrued; and this principle was embodied in Mr. Pitt's Income Tax Act of 1805, Sir Robert Peel's of 1842, and in that of 1853. I cannot find any discussion on the subject in the reported debates; and I presume that the impolicy of attempting to discriminate between trade profits made in one country or another was universally admitted.

PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION—THE DISFRANCHISED IRISH BOROUGHS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government intend to fill up the vacancies in the representation of Ireland caused by the disfranchisement of the Boroughs of Sligo and Cashel?

Mr. GLADSTONE, in reply, said, that the Government had no such intention at present.

THE SEA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. HENEAGE asked the President of the Board of Trade, When the Bill, which he promised at the commencement of the Session, to carry out the recommendations of the Sea Fisheries Committee, will be ready; and, whether he will undertake that the Government will do their utmost to pass into Law, during the present Session, a measure dealing with this urgent and important subject, which cannot be postponed without considerable loss as well as injurious effect on the fishing trade?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, in reply, said, that this subject had occupied the attention of the Board of Trade for some time past. He had only just obtained the draft of the Bill carrying out practically the recommendations of the Committee; but he hoped that the Bill would in a short time be introduced into the other House of Parliament.

WESTERN ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC—THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES—ANNEXATION OF NEW GUINEA BY QUEENSLAND.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I wish to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies a Question of which I have given him private Notice. The Papers relating to New Guinea, which have recently been distributed, do not include either the Despatch of the Governor of Queensland, which has been referred to in this House, or any decision of Her Majesty's Government on the question of the annexation of New Guinea. I wish to ask whether the Despatch of the Governor of Queensland has been received, and, if so, when it will be presented to the House; and, also, whether Her Majesty's Government have arrived at any decision on the subject?

Mr. LEWIS asked whether the Government had made any communication on the subject since the 14th of April, the date of the last communication from the Colonial Office mentioned in the Papers?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: The Despatch of the Governor of Queensland has not yet arrived; and, therefore, I am unable to say whether it can be laid on the Table, or to state the decision of Her Majesty's Government on the subject. I do not think there have been any communications since the date the hon. Member for Londonderry mentions.

THE JUDICATURE ACTS—THE NEW RULES.

Mr. WHITLEY asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the new Rules and Orders under the Judicature Acts would be laid upon the Table of the House before the Prorogation of Parliament?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James), in reply, said, that the Rules had been prepared, and he hoped they would be laid on the Table of the House during the next few weeks.

PARLIAMENTARY OATH (THE STANDING ORDERS).

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Sir, taking into consideration the present condition of Public Business, it is not my intention to proceed with the Motion that stands in my name for Tuesday next with respect to the amendment of the Standing Order relating to the Parliamentary Oath; so that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be happy to place that Tuesday at the disposal of the Prime Minister.

PRIVILEGE.

PARLIAMENT — PRIVILEGE — MR. M'COAN AND MR. O'KELLY.

Mr. M'COAN: Sir, I wish to ask the leave of the House to address it briefly on a question of Privilege. I regret, for many reasons—some of which will be obvious to the House—the necessity that has been cast upon me; but, acting upon very competent advice, I have reason to believe that I am about to pursue the proper course under the circumstances. It will be in the recollection of the House that during the debate on the Address, in reply to the Queen's Speech, on the 22nd February last, the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) was suspended for an interruption addressed to the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). On that occasion I did not vote either for the suspension or against it, but walked out of the House. My action, however, was misrepresented in certain Irish newspapers, in which I was said to have voted against a Colleague and fellow Member of the Irish Party; and for that I was held up to the reprobation of my constituents. Recently, during the last Recess, I visited the County (Wicklow) of which I have the honour to be one of the Representatives; and in the course of an address to my constituents I was interrupted by a few persons who, I was informed, had been sent by a neighbouring branch of the National Land League to interrupt me on that occasion. One of the chief objections against me was that I had voted against the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly). Thus called upon to explain my action and defend myself, I recounted very briefly the circumstances which had taken place, and said I did not vote on the question at all; and further, to justify my action, or, rather, my inaction, I very briefly, and, as I think the House will agree with me presently in considering it, in moderate and courteous language, told them what had taken place, and what had been my conduct upon that occasion. The report of that meeting appeared, among other papers, in the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, a copy of which, it seems, came under the observation of the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) in Paris, and from Paris he telegraphed to his hon. Friend the Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien) instructing him to ask me if I accepted the responsibility of the statements in that Report, and if I did to call upon me for a very peremptory and complete apology. I probably cannot do better than read the brief correspondence, which embodies really all the facts, and to which I will add but very few personal observations. The first of the short series of letters was dated 24th May, and was from Mr. Wm. O'Brien (the hon. Member for Mallow). It was marked "private" at the top, but I failed to recognize his right or my own to take any exceptional privilege in a matter of this kind, and I did not mark my reply "private;" and, therefore, I consider myself entitled to make this use of the correspondence. It was as follows:—

"May 24, 1883.

"Sir,—On behalf, of Mr. O'Kelly, M.P., I have to ask whether the following extract from *The Freeman's Journal* of May 17 is a correct representation of your words at Tinahely:—'In reference to Mr. O'Kelly's expulsion from the House, Mr. M'Coan narrated the incident, and observed that the House of Commons, at all events, was supposed to be composed of Gentlemen. He would not have responded as Mr. O'Kelly did.' Should you have been correctly reported, I have to request, on his behalf, that you will promptly apologize for the offensive imputation on Mr. O'Kelly's honour which these words convey.

"I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

"WM. O'BRIEN."

I have not a copy of my answer to that letter with me; but it was nearly in these words—"Sir,—Without meaning to be at all discourteous, I must decline to recognize your right to question me on this subject;" and I went on to say that if Mr. O'Kelly applied to me personally for an explanation I would promptly and candidly give it. Some days passed, and I then received from the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) himself the following communication:—

"May 28, 1883.

"Sir,—In a speech made by you at Tinahely, and reported in *The Freeman's Journal*, there is a reference to me of a grossly offensive nature.

"Will you be good enough to inform me whether you accept the published report of this speech as substantially accurate? On seeing *The Freeman's Journal* in Paris in which the report appeared, I immediately telegraphed to my Friend Mr. William O'Brien, requesting him to put himself in communication with you on my behalf; but as you object to indirect communication on this matter, I now apply to you personally, in order that I may be accurately informed as to your responsibility for the offensive references alleged to have been made by you to me at Tinahely.

"I am, Sir, yours obediently,

"JAMES O'KELLY.

"J. C. M'Coan, Esq., M.P."

To that letter I replied on the 30th of May—

"Sir,—I do not accept the report of my speech at Tinahely which appeared in *The Freeman's Journal* as 'substantially accurate.' My recollection of that report is that it was very incomplete, and therefore (perhaps necessarily) garbled. It certainly did not convey a fair impression of much that was said and done on the occasion; but a fuller and more correct report appeared in *The Wicklow News Letter*, from which, for your information, I quote on the enclosed slip a sufficiently accurate version of my remarks in reply to questions as to my vote, or, rather, my abstention from voting, on the occasion of your suspension for giving the lie to Mr. Forster. This said, of course I accept whatever 'responsibility' the remarks quoted may entail."

The extract from *The Wicklow News Letter* is as follows:—

"Reference has been made by a gentleman here to the suspension of Mr. O'Kelly, and to my conduct on that occasion. I was present in the House of Commons during the speech of Mr. Forster, which led to Mr. O'Kelly's expulsion. I heard many things fall from Mr. Forster on that occasion with which I could not agree—much that I should be sorry to believe was true. But, instead of anyone rising to answer Mr. Forster, or to refute the assertions he made by fact or argument, Mr. O'Kelly, obeying what I believe was a generous impulse, roared out in a manner I would not like to imitate—'You lie, you lie, you lie.' (A Voice, 'Like an Irishman,' and cheers for O'Kelly.) Now, the House of Commons is supposed to be an assemblage of Gentlemen, and Members of it are supposed to conduct themselves as such. Well, as I recognize the canons of conduct which are supposed to control the House, the conduct of Mr. O'Kelly certainly did not meet my approval. If Mr. O'Kelly had risen and made a rasping speech against Mr. Forster, if he had done so in language such as gentlemen use, he would have had my sympathy and support; but he chose to act differently, and, the Speaker's attention being called to the language used by him, the inevitable result was that he was suspended. Now, though I confess my own feeling was strongly against Mr. O'Kelly's action, yet, in deference to my position as a Member of the same Party, I declined to vote against him, and took no part in the Division which followed. If the same thing were to happen again, and were Mr. O'Kelly my own brother, I would act as I acted then."

To this I received the following reply, in which, as I am advised, the breach of Privilege is committed:—

"May 30, 1883.

"Sir,—Your letter of to-day aggravates the offensiveness of your Tinahely speech. You repeat, and accept full responsibility for, the reference to me of which I complain. Therefore, the matter passes out of the region of discussion. Mr. O'Brien is authorized to act for me, and I request that you will communicate with him and refer him to some gentleman authorized to act for you.

"Yours obediently,
"JAMES O'KELLY."

To that letter I rejoined, still acting on very competent advice—

"May 30.

"Sir,—As the acceptance of the challenge conveyed in your letter of this date would be a high Parliamentary offence, and as I desire not to violate the law of Parliament, I decline to communicate with Mr. O'Brien with the view suggested by your letter."

Probably I will not get credit from some hon. Gentlemen behind me when I say that I heartily desired to prevent magnifying so trifling a personal incident into what might bear the appearance of a scandal on the Irish Party; and I thought it my duty to make one final effort to prevent its attaining this proportion. I therefore—still on the same day, that is yesterday—late in the afternoon, addressed to the hon. Member for the City of Cork the following note:—

"May 30.

"Dear Mr. Parnell,—Mr. O'Kelly, as you are probably aware, has sent me a challenge—the giving or acceptance of which is, as you also know, a high Parliamentary offence. Under ordinary circumstances I should have no choice but to deal with the matter in one of the two only ways open to me; but, as it is, I am anxious to avoid anything like a scandal to the Irish Parliamentary Party; and, therefore, I address myself to you, as the Leader of the Party, to say that if Mr. O'Kelly, on reflection, desires to withdraw his letter, I will give him an opportunity of doing so up to 3 o'clock to-morrow, when I shall be in the House. If he should not so desire, the responsibility of whatever follows will rest on himself.—Faithfully yours,
"J. C. M'COAN."

This letter was addressed to a Gentleman who has a very legitimate influence over the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly); and I thought I was doing right in applying to him before I appealed to this House. I waited until this moment, and I have received no communication from the hon. Member for Roscommon, nor have I been favoured with any reply from the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). That being so, I am advised, and believe, that the matter has passed out of the region of personal discussion, and that my duty is to submit it to the consideration of the House. The only element of personal feeling in my mind in the matter is a desire to protect myself from misrepresentation elsewhere, and the conviction that without a public statement of this kind I should not fail to be misrepresented. As the matter is one that affects the honour and dignity of this House itself, I hope I am justified in bringing it under its notice.

MR. GLADSTONE: The hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. M'Coan) has laid before the House, with perfect clearness, a statement of facts, as to which I do not understand any exception need be taken on the part of hon. Members sitting near me; and I may therefore take that statement, for the present, as uncontroverted. I do not conceive that it is any part of my duty, or the duty of the House, to accept the correspondence which has been brought before us otherwise than as information. With that correspondence we have nothing else to do; but I have no doubt the conduct and position of the hon. Member for Wexford will be fairly and equitably appreciated by the House. I believe the hon. Member has acted in conformity with Parliamentary rule and precedent in bringing the matter before the House. I think we may understand that the fact of his having so placed it before the House amounts to a pledge given by him to the House, although I do not know that it was stated in express terms, that, so far as he is concerned, this matter will proceed no further in communication with the hon. Member for Roscommon. I apprehend that I am accurate in that interpretation. I think the usual course in cases of this kind is that the House has sought and accepted a pledge of that kind from both of the Members concerned. The hon. Member for Roscommon is not in his place; and, therefore, the regular course will be to move that the hon. Member for Roscommon do attend in his place on a future day. What day that may be would depend upon the possibility of the hon. Member appearing in connection with the distance or place in which he may now be. Probably some of the Gentlemen in the House—perhaps the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien)—may be able to give us that information; and, according as we are so informed, the Motion will be made. If I understand that the hon. Member for Roscommon is within reach, then I believe the proper Motion will be that he do attend in his place to-morrow; but if he be at a distance, so as to make it inconvenient or impossible for him to attend, there would be no difficulty in varying the terms of the Motion. I beg to move—"That Mr. O'Kelly attend in his place to-morrow."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. O'Kelly do attend in his place To-morrow."—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

MR. O'BRIEN: Sir, as the Prime Minister has mentioned my name, I may say that I am not in a position to assure the House whether the hon. Member for Roscommon will be here to-morrow or not. As far as I am concerned, I do not speak for him; but I have always tried to settle private quarrels without invoking or recognizing the interference of the British Parliament.

MR. SHEIL: Sir, this Motion is almost unnecessary, because we have the sure pledge of the hon. Member for Wicklow that he will not appear on the field to accept the challenge of the hon. Member for Roscommon. I should have thought one assurance sufficient. The hon. Member for Wicklow has been most anxious to impress upon the House his desire to protect the dignity and interests of the House. It appears to me the hon. Member would have looked after the interests and dignity of the House much more effectually if he had taken this matter, which does not affect the House, before a Police Court, and the two parties might have been bound over to keep the peace. As the hon. Member is so anxious to keep the peace, and has always shown his anxiety so to do, the matter might have been settled in that way, without troubling the House with what does not concern it in the least. I would, however, like to know if this question can be raised as one of Privilege, seeing it has no reference to anything which has taken place within these walls or the precincts of Parliament. Most of the correspondence passed during the Recess, and only a small portion of it since the House resumed its Sittings. At any rate, I venture to suggest that, under the circumstances, the matter should be allowed to drop, and that the hon. Member for Roscommon should not be called upon to appear in his place to-morrow.

MR. PARNELL: Sir, I quite concur in what has just been said by the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Sheil). If the Prime Minister had received some Notice he probably would not have felt himself justified in treating this as a question of Privilege. This matter is one which seems to have arisen entirely out of a private dispute between the hon. Member for Wicklow and the hon. Member for Roscommon; and this dispute was originated in consequence of a passage in a speech of the hon. Member for Wicklow, addressed to a section of his constituents at a place called Tinahely. I would ask the Government whether, by making this matter a question of Privilege, they are prepared to create a precedent by which the House would be bound at any time hereafter to interfere in every case of personal dispute arising outside the House between hon. Members. That is what the claim of the hon. Member for Wicklow amounts to. The hon. Member for Wicklow, in the exercise of his discretion, made use, in the speech to which I have referred, of what I consider were some very offensive words regarding the hon. Member for Roscommon. The hon. Member for Roscommon appears to have addressed a series of letters to the hon. Member for Wicklow in reference to the words so used. I do not know where you are going to stop if you create a question of Privilege out of a matter of this kind. I do not see, as I have said, how you could prevent any Member of this House from dragging any personal dispute which he may have before the House, and claiming the attention of the House to such matter to the obstruction of Public Business. I shall certainly divide the House on the Motion now before it, for I consider that this matter ought to be dealt with by the ordinary law of the land. In my opinion, the hon. Member for Wicklow has not established any right, or title, or claim, to the protection of the House. The position I take on this question is fortified by the authority of Sir Erskine May, who, in his work, with reference to challenge sent by one Member to another, says—

> "The sending of a challenge by one Member to another in consequence of words spoken by him in his place in Parliament is a breach of Privilege, and will be dealt with accordingly,

> unless a full apology be offered to the House. But it does not appear that the Speaker or the House would interfere to prevent a quarrel from being proceeded with, when it had arisen from a private misunderstanding, and not from words spoken in debate, or in any of the proceedings of the House, or in Committee. In such cases, if any interference should be deemed necessary, information would probably be given to the police."

Therefore, I have established my contention that this matter, although a proper one for the Police Court, does not call for the interposition of the House.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 250; Noes 19: Majority 231.—(Div. List, No. 109.)

QUESTIONS.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LEWIS asked whether the House was to understand that the Corrupt Practices Bill would come on on Monday, though fixed for to-night?

Mr. GLADSTONE explained that when he announced the Bill for to-night he was unaware of the fact that it had already been fixed for Monday.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE inquired whether the Bill would be taken on Monday?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, the Corrupt Practices Bill would be taken as the first Order on Monday, and the Scotch Tenants' Compensation Bill as the next, if time permitted.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked what course the Government intended to take with regard to the two Bills making grants to Lords Alcester and Wolseley; and whether they would be re-committed, or a fresh Bill would be brought in?

Mr. COURTNEY said, the House would remember that a Resolution had been passed authorizing the grant of a lump sum in lieu of annuities. The course which the Government proposed to adopt was to re-commit the Bill *pro formâ*, in order that it might be reprinted in its altered shape; and, of course, the Notice of opposition given by the hon. Baronet would apply to the Bill when so re-printed.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked whether it was proposed to take effective Supply to-morrow; and whether it was intended to proceed with the Irish Police Bill to-morrow?

Mr. GLADSTONE, in reply, said, that the Government would proceed regularly with the Estimates on Friday, taking effective Supply. He might now state that, in consequence of the announcement that the Motion of the noble Lord opposite would not be taken on Tuesday next, he should ask for a Morning Sitting on that day, and also on Friday next.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £180,546, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Erection, Repairs, and Maintenance of the several Public Buildings under the Department of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and for the erection of Fishery Piers, and the Maintenance of certain Parks, Harbours, and Navigations."

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR pointed out that this Vote included an item which had appeared on the Estimates for many years, and which item was distinctly against the recommendations of certain Royal Commissioners. He should, therefore, propose to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum which the Royal Commissioners declared to be improper. The item he referred to was that which was charged for the maintenance of the Ulster Canal, and which amounted to £1,289. A Royal Commission reported last year that they did not think there was any probability that the Canal would justify any immediate outlay of public money upon it to put it into repair, and they expressed a decided opinion that no more public money should be spent upon it. They recommended that the Canal, with all the property attached to it, should be offered for sale to the public. Under these circumstances, he desired to move the reduction of the Vote. Then, there was another sum of £6,000 granted in aid of works of navigation. With regard to that navigation, the same Commission reported that the Lough Erne Navigation Commissioners had, under their Act of 1880, certain powers in Lough Erne to improve and clear the channel, and to maintain and repair the locks in the Ulster and Ballyconnel Canal, which communicated with the Ulster Canal by the Lough Erne navigation. If this navigation were likely to be of any use, it would, perhaps, be worth the while of the Government to spend this £6,000 to complete the Lough Erne Navigation Works; but the same Royal Commission to which he had already referred stated that the Ballyconnel Canal, like the Ulster Canal, was quite unworthy of any support. The receipts in 1880 were *nil*, and the annual expenditure on the lock-keeper's account was about £80. Between Belfast on the one hand, and the Shannon River on the other, there were these two links of water communicating with each other—the Ulster Canal, and the Ballyconnel and Ballinmore Canal. Both were useless; and the Royal Commission had advised that both of them should be discontinued, at any rate, so far as any expenditure of public money was concerned. The Lough Erne navigation was a link between the two Canals; and if the Canals on both sides were not worthy of support, it was useless to spend money in maintaining the intermediate link. He therefore proposed to further reduce the Vote by the sum of £6,000, making altogether a reduction of £7,289.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £173,257, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Erection, Repairs, and Maintenance of the several Public Buildings under the Department of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and for the erection of Fishery Piers, and the Maintenance of certain Parks, Harbours, and Navigations."—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

Mr. BIGGAR desired to know whether the Government wished this to go to a division without any explanation at all? Why was all this money to be badly spent, or, worse than badly spent, when the expenditure could be done without altogether? It was of no use to the public; and instead of spending a lot of money in keeping these Canals in navigable order, when there was no profit to be derived from them, it would be very much better to drain the district. If a Canal required to get a subsidy from the British Parliament every year, and did not earn sufficient tolls to pay for keeping itself in order, no more conclusive evidence could be afforded, in his opinion, to show that it was not required, and, indeed, that it was in a worse position than if it were simply not required, because it was really in the way. The Ulster Canal should be exceedingly well situated. It ran into Belfast, and had a very good harbour, and it went to a number of manufacturing towns. But, in spite of that fact, the principal part of the traffic of the district was taken by the railway, and there was no use for the Canal at all. Everybody sent by railway when they could, and, except for coals and other things, which were taken at the very lowest rate of freight, there was no employment for these Canals at all. He was firmly of opinion that the most judicious thing to do would be to sell the land out of which the Canals were formed, and allow of drainage for the benefit of the district.

Mr. BLAKE said, he quite agreed with the two hon. Gentlemen who had spoken, that the work of these two Canals had considerably diminished, and it was not surprising, considering that they had railways in competition with them. But, at the same time, he had been officially connected with the district for 10 years, and he knew that the Canals were of enormous convenience to a large number of the people there. As the hon. Member for Cavan had said, coals and other things were taken by them. But he (Mr. Blake) could add that the people living in small towns and the peasantry in many ways were most greatly benefited by them. The expenditure of this £7,000 was of very considerable benefit in many ways; and to drain the Canals and turn them to agricultural purposes would be a most preposterous idea. One good service that the Canals performed was to check exorbitant railway rates. He had some knowledge on this point, and he believed that the railways in that part of the country would be exceedingly glad if some of these Canals were discontinued, as it would afford them the opportunity which they very much wished to obtain of raising the rates on coals and other articles that could now be carried by canal. In the interests of the people of the North of Ireland who used these

Canals he should feel bound to vote against the Amendment.

Mr. J. N. RICHARDSON said, he had had no idea that the reduction of the Vote was to be moved, or, having taken the trouble to copy out the plans, he would have brought them with him and offered a few words of explanation. But he trusted the Committee would not accept the Amendment, and any information which he had it in his power to give he would defer to another time. However, he might say this much—that he believed there was a very strong feeling in favour of the maintenance and continuance of the Ulster Canal, and so strong was that feeling that a deputation waited on the Lord Lieutenant, not very long ago, in order to obtain His Excellency's consent to improvements upon the Canal. The subject of the Fisheries and of Irish Railways was continually being brought before the House; and one of the great arguments used was that there was not sufficient traffic to cause competitive lines to be made, and that, therefore, those lines which were in existence had an absolute monopoly of the traffic. That monopoly was modified to a certain extent by the old water-ways. He freely admitted that the produce taken over the Canals and Railways was largely agricultural produce; but there was an immense amount of heavy traffic taken over the Canals, and over the Ulster Canal, and he thought the Committee should pause considerably before they consented to reduce the Vote, especially in the face of the recent deputation to Earl Spencer.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the observations of the hon. Member who had spoken would always be listened to by the Government with very great sympathy on these points; but certainly nothing would be more unjustifiable than keeping up means of communication when they did not pay their way. He said that quite apart from the recommendations of the Royal Commission. No doubt, as a matter of principle, such things should not be maintained; but the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) was probably aware that the Government had not allowed the Report of the Royal Commission to lie entirely idle. They had issued advertisements, and wanted to get rid of the Canal as far as possible, if anybody would undertake to relieve them of it; but as yet they had received no response. They were still determined, however, to get rid of the Canal, if possible. He entirely assented to the principle laid down by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), that if a Canal did not pay its way it was not worth keeping up, notwithstanding what had been said by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake) as to the action of the Canal in keeping down the power of the railways to make excessive charges. On that point they must look to the action of the Railway Commissioners for keeping the rates for goods traffic at a proper scale, and they must not trust to the uncertain and costly method suggested for keeping down outrageous charges. Under these circumstances, he thought the hon. Member for King's County would see that the Treasury were so far with him with respect to the Ulster Canal that he need not press his Amendment. As to the other matter to which the hon. Gentleman referred—the Lough Erne navigation—a considerable amout of money had already been expended, and a considerable amount of work done; and the position of affairs now was such that he would ask whether it was advisable to go on, or to leave the works half-finished? He thought it would be better to go on with them, if only for the purpose of improving the value of the Ulster Canal. If they sold it at all they must sell it in something like working order, and the improvement in that link in the navigation would make the property more valuable.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, he did not know in what way hon. Members had arrived at their conclusions as to the proposed expenditure; but it might be possible to tread inadvertedly on very dangerous ground. For his part, far from encouraging the Treasury to give up unfinished works, he would urge them the other way. The fact was, that the Treasury never did complete the works they undertook in the matter of the Canal and River navigation of Ireland, and the consequence was that that navigation was a disgrace to the country. The reason for this was that at a time of enthusiasm the Treasury, through the Board of Works, undertook to make these communications; but they never finished them, and the Canals which had been referred to in this discussion were, without exception, the most ludicrous and discreditable pieces of work ever done by any Government or any private individual. If anybody would read the Evidence as to the Ballinmore Canal taken before a Committee some years ago he would learn the way in which the Board of Works performed its operations. He trusted that his hon. Friends would do what they could to compel the Treasury to complete the works, which had never yet been completed; but as to reducing the means of communication between one part of Ireland and another, it seemed to him perfectly amazing that any Irish Member should propose it. Ireland was unprosperous in a very considerable measure because there was no possibility of getting from one end of it to the other. Nature had endowed Ireland with the most magnificent water communication that could possibly exist; and it was only the folly of man that had not married these rivers to each other. He hoped hon. Gentleman would assist the Secretary to the Treasury in doing what was wanted, and making the system complete.

MR. BIGGAR said, he did not find any fault with what had been said by the hon. Member for County Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) or by the hon. Member for Armagh (Mr. Richardson); but one of these hon. Gentlemen lived in the immediate neighbourhood of Lough Erne, and knew a great deal about it, and, as far as he (Mr. Biggar) could gather, that hon. Gentleman was unprepared to make the smallest defence of the present arrangement. He (Mr. Biggar) knew very well that recently a deputation of busy-bodies, representing the Town Commissioners and so on, went to the Treasury with the modest proposal to ask for a loan of £10,000, on the security of property for which the Government had to pay £100 a-year at present, merely to keep it in working order. That was a sample of the deputations that went about on such matters. There was one thing that he never had done, and never would do, and that was to advocate the expenditure of public money where he thought it would be all thrown away. He did not believe in an expenditure which would be unproductive. No doubt, it was desirable to have communication; but what was communication worth when it could obtain no traffic except coals? Coals formed a very small item in the income of a Railway Company, and would hardly have an appreciable effect in raising or reducing the rates and fares which that Railway Company would receive. But these people were all going in for spending public money. The hon. Member for King's County had referred to the Ballinamore Canal. It had no traffic, because the Government in Ireland had made such a blunder in constructing the bridges that it was impossible for any boat to go under them. As Ballinamore was in County Leitrim, and Ballyconnel was in County Cavan, he (Mr. Biggar) might be supposed to have an interest in the expenditure of money there; but he had not the conscience to support the expenditure proposed in this case. The Canal had on its line Lisburn, Lurgan, and Portadown—three of the best towns, outside Belfast, in the North of Ireland. But, in spite of that, the Canal could not pay its expenses; and he did not see any justification which entitled hon. Members to come to that House and advocate the expenditure of public money upon Canals which did not get any traffic, and could not pay their expenses. As soon as anyone was willing to take these Canals for a nominal sum, it would be quite right to part with them. As to the Lough Erne navigation, he did not live in the neighbourhood, and did not know the details; but he had a fair idea that there was no amount of traffic to justify the expense proposed. It was a district which had no manufactures, and really he did not see what was to be done there at all. There was a little traffic in coal; but after Portadown it would be a worse job than the Ulster Canal, because if a Canal did not pay where there was a large seaport at one end and three manufacturing towns connected within 20 miles, he did not see how it could be got to pay where there were no towns at all.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he was opposed to unproductive expenditure, and he did not see any justification for a Member, of the Government, or for a private Irish Member to advocate a useless and wanton waste of public money, such as was proposed in this case. They were absolutely asked to give away £7,000 for a purpose which they knew was of no use. These Canals were part of a system running between

Lough Neah and the River Shannon, and the object was to establish communication between Belfast at the one end and Limerick and the Shannon at the other. He went the other day to see the worth of the traffic in that direction. On Wednesday in the week before last he went from Athlone to Lough Erne, and in that 45 miles he saw one small boat going in one direction, and nothing at all in the other; and that small boat contained a number of empty beer barrels, a few sacks of bobbins going to some mills, two or three coils of iron wire, and half-a-dozen carboys of liquor. Was it not preposterous that the navigation for such traffic should be regarded as justifying such an enormous expenditure? In order to maintain the navigation on that level, 10,000 acres were flooded, and the damage done in a single week by floods would cost a great deal more than all these Canals would realize. The low-lying lands of Northern Tipperary were flooded by the Shannon, and the poor had their crops carried away. Only last winter he was afraid to say how many thousands of persons between Lough Erne and Athlone were obliged to leave their houses altogether. Much of the property was ruined, and the whole country was one vast sheet of water, because the River Shannon was not allowed to do the proper duty of a river, which consisted in carrying certain waters off to the sea, but the navigation level was kept up in the interests of these wretched Canals. Sir John MacNeil reported, in 1861, that the only plan he could suggest by which any return could be obtained at all was to take off the lock-gates and drain the Canal, converting the slopes into grass land that could be let for grazing, and the rest into tillage. On the Ballyconnel Canal there was no traffic whatsoever; it never was navigable at all—never put into working order. It was alleged that the bridges were badly designed and badly made; but nothing was done to improve them, or even to keep them in repair. When it was proposed to support such a system by public money—he did not care whether in Ireland, England, or Scotland—such an expenditure should be put a stop to. One of the strongest Commissions ever appointed—every Member a competent man—had unanimously reported against the Ulster Canal, Lieutenant General Dickens only dissenting from some part of the Report; and he (Mr. O'Connor) would ask the Government how long they proposed to go on with this expenditure, and what they hoped to gain by voting this £7,000? They would certainly not add to the market value of the Canal, for every single pound they spent now could be equally well spent by private adventurers, or private persons, if they chose to buy the property. The Government could not think of establishing any internal navigation which would pay; and if the money were laid out at all, it should come out of the pockets of the private persons, whom the Government fancied were disposed to take the property off their hands.

Mr. CALLAN said, he had some knowledge of the Ulster Canal. He was a Director of a Company which, for 10 or 12 years, was obliged to pay the Government £1,000 a-year rent, and spent close on £400 or £500 a-year in repairs; and when the lease fortunately expired—for they had desired the Treasury for half-a-dozen years to accept the surrender of their lease—they were obliged to put the Canal in proper order at an expense of £700 or £800. During the experience they had, working in connection with the Dundalk Steam Packet Company, their receipts were absolutely *nil*—they did not cover the expenses of the lock-keepers. He was on the Committee of Investigation, and for five days in wet weather he trudged along the Canal from one end to the other; and he must say that a more hopeless undertaking to put into proper order, or to endeavour to get money back from, he never went over. He had always had a high respect for Sir John MacNeil's capabilities as an engineer and his high acquirements, and Sir John never gave a sounder opinion than that which had just been read, that the only way to make the Canal pay would be drain it and sell it to the neighbouring proprietors; then there would be some chance of making something out of it. He (Mr. Callan) did not know the Ballyconnel and Ballinamore Canal; but he did know something of Limerick, and anyone who knew anything of the River Shannon must be aware that there was not a week in autumn in the best year that passed that more injury was not done to the crops by the sudden floodings of the Shannon than could ever be recovered in a century by the maintenance of the navigation of the Shannon. He therefore trusted the Committee would accept this Amendment, and thus impress on the Treasury the necessity of giving up the navigation of the Shannon, so far as it interfered with the proper drainage of the Suck and the other tributary rivers which flowed into the Shannon from King's County, County Galway, and Rosscommon.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, he had heard many discussions in that House on these subjects; but this was the first time he had ever heard such a discussion as the present. The navigation of these Canals and Rivers in Ireland was intended to form a water-way from Belfast and the North of Ireland to Limerick. The hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) had spoken of the navigation of the Shannon; but that had nothing whatever to do with this Canal, except in that way. The reason why this magnificent water-way—as it would be if the works were properly finished—had been of no use was that the Canals had never been finished. The Ulster Canal had had much money spent on it, but it was never made navigable; and, consequently, there was a hiatus between the navigation of one district and another. The Treasury had, within the last two years, after an enormous amount of abuse had been lavished upon them, spent a large sum of money in putting sluices into the weirs which used to cause the floods, and those sluices would prevent the floods for the future; and such floods as did occur used to take place upon lands that formerly were never cultivated at all. For years endeavours had been made to get the Treasury to put sluices into the solid stone walls, so as to allow the surplus waters to run off and prevent the extensive floods; and now the works were near completion, he believed.

MR. COURTNEY said, they were practically finished now.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, it remained, then, to be seen whether the sluices would produce the good effect expected. As to the proposal to drain the Canals and let out the land for grazing, that was the most astonishing proposal he had ever heard in that House. He hoped that, far from abandoning these works, the Government would make up their minds to complete the navigation from one end of Ireland to the other throughout the magnificent rivers which Providence had endowed Ireland with.

MR. MOLLOY asked upon what terms the Canal was to be offered for sale, and what inducements had been given to make an offer for it? It was connected with another sheet of water by certain works, and he should certainly like to know on what terms it had been offered, and whether it had been offered as a growing concern, or simply as property to be cultivated—that was to say, that it was not to be used as a Canal again, but converted into land for the purpose of cultivating and growing crops? In regard to what his hon. Friend the Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) said, his hon. Friend seemed to forget that these demands he spoke of were made when there were no railways, and that as soon as railways were constructed the Canals became useless. There were no boats running upon them at all now, and the Canals themselves were of very little service to anybody. They were simply a means of providing for the swamping of the surrounding district. Whatever value there might be, according to the statement of the hon. Member for Galway, in these Canals as regarded the means of transit, it was far more than counterbalanced by the annual injury occasioned by the flooding of the Canal.

MR. TOMLINSON said, he thought the time was particularly ill-chosen for proposing to sell these Canals, which might possibly be made ultimately a useful means of communication, when the House had had before it for some time the Report of the Committee on Railway Rates and Fares making special recommendations in regard to the Railways and Canals of Ireland. He understood that the Report of that Committee was to be dealt with by legislation next Session; and he was of opinion that Members representing Irish constituencies would do much better to press upon the Government the importance of carrying out the recommendations of that Committee, leaving the inland navigation of Ireland, until next Session at all events, in its present condition, than to urge the Committee to effect an apparent economy at present which might destroy the hope for ever afterwards of making a complete system of inland navigation. Apart from that consideration, of course hon. Members on this side of the Channel could have no interest in continuing any expenditure that was supposed to be unnecessary. In reference to what the Secretary to the Treasury said about offering these Canals for sale, he thought it was most desirable, if possible, to prevent any of the Canals from falling into the hands of the Railway Companies. Recommendations to that effect had been made by the Committee on Railway Rates and Fares, and by the Royal Commission which sat some time ago, and whose attention was specially directed to that question. He hoped, considering the nature of these recommendations, to receive some assurance from the Government that, whatever was done in regard to selling these Canals, precautions would be taken to prevent the water communications in Ireland from falling into the hands of the Railway Companies.

Sir ANDREW LUSK said, he was much obliged to hon. Members for having told the Committee the truth about these matters. The Committee had been informed that there was no trade upon these Canals; and, in that case, what was the use of insisting upon the Government spending money upon them? They knew the reason why there was no trade. Railways were coming into operation, and, of course, they tended to throw Canals out, in the same manner as the introduction of steam displaced the old stage-coaches. Then, why insist upon the Government spending money upon Canals, and express astonishment because they felt it their duty to tell the truth? If the matter went to a division, he should certainly vote against the grant.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, he knew something about this Canal question in the North of Ireland. The Royal Commission which inquired into the whole subject of the Canals reported last year. Their Report was to the effect that the Ulster Canal should be offered for sale, and should be no longer a charge upon the taxes of the country. It also recommended that the navigation of the Lower Bann should be abandoned as useless in the interests of trade and commerce. The taxpayers of the Three Kingdoms were paying £1,200 a-year for keeping open the Ulster navigation, and the entire sum derived from the tolls amounted to some £60 or £70 a-year. In regard to the Lower Bann navigation, matters were still worse. The maintenance of the navigation cost £1,400 a-year, and it was paid by the taxpayers of a few baronies in Counties Derry and Antrim. But the unfortunate farmers of these counties, in addition to the expenditure they were called upon to bear, had their land submerged for three or four months every year, owing to the useless navigation works that were kept up. He was very much surprised that this Vote was proposed again. It was at the instigation of the Treasury that the Royal Commission was appointed; they had presented their Report; and he could not understand the proposal to vote this sum of money in keeping open the navigation, especially as it was destroying very valuable land, and sweeping away the crops in harvest time. He hoped the Treasury would consider again the propriety of imposing this large tax upon the country; and if the matter were carried to a division, he should vote against it.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he was much astonished at the language used by the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson). The hon. Member knew perfectly well that the Government intended to carry out the Report of the Commission, of which the hon. Gentleman was a Member. They had not shown any backwardness whatever; but they had put advertisements in the papers offering the Ulster Canal for sale. They did not shrink in the slightest degree from carrying out the Report of the Commission.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he was glad to hear the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson) manfully come forward to corroborate what he (Mr. Biggar) believed to be the real facts of the case. So far as the remarks of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) were concerned, he would never suspect the hon. Gentleman of stating anything but what he believed really to be correct. At the same time, he could not imagine how any man who knew anything of Ireland could say that these Canals in connection with the Shannon, even if in navigable order, would be of any value to the people of Limerick and the West of Ireland. At present the railroads carried all the traffic to the seaport towns in the West of Ireland. All the butter, live stock, and so on, was unsuited altogether for Canal traffic, and probably it was only such articles as coals and other heavy materials that found their way upon the Canals. Certainly the entire traffic was very small in amount altogether, So far as the Ulster Canal was concerned, it was of no service whatever, except to a few linen factories, and some flax-spinning mills. It appeared, from the Report which he held in his hand, that for five years, ending March 1880, the total amount of tolls received from the Ulster Canal only averaged £55 per annum. Well, for the purpose of keeping the Canal open, the Committee was called upon to pay a sum of £1,200 a-year. He strongly objected to the waste of public money involved in this Vote. Before the railway was constructed an old gentleman was in possession of the Canal, and managed to make a good living out of it; but he got very old and died, and railways having been established the Canal had to be supported by public money. Of course, before the railways were constructed there was some kind of traffic upon the Canal; but now the cultivation of the slopes of the Canal was of far more importance than the Canal itself, and brought in an income of about £180 a-year, while the Canal only produced £55 a-year, although for keeping it in order the Committee were asked to vote £1,200. He strongly protested against the Vote, and he thought that the Government ought to withdraw it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 25; Noes 74: Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 110.)

Original Question again proposed.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he should like to ask for some information from his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury in relation to the expenditure upon Kingstown and other Harbours. He saw that the amount expended upon harbours was £9,361, of which £7,170 was expended on the pay of the staff. The amount of materials used by the workmen in connection with the staff was only £1,400, which seemed considerably out of proportion to the cost of the staff itself. He found that the staff consisted of as many as 120 permanent officials, 42 of them being permanent labourers; but, nevertheless, there was a sum charged of £1,038 for labour hired by the job as well. He should like to know if there was any means of ascertaining what the earnings of these harbours were, because the total extra receipts from all the harbours, including Donnaghadee, amounted to £2,300? The expenditure of £9,361 was the expenditure of the harbour staff of 102 persons, and in addition to the sum paid for hired labour amounted to £1,038, while the extra receipts only reached £2,300. He should be glad if the Secretary to the Treasury could give the Committee any explanation of the necessity for this large amount of expenditure in these harbours, which, so far as he was aware, was considerably out of proportion to the commercial results of maintaining other harbours. He would suggest to his hon. Friend that it might be more convenient, in future, if the extra receipts of each of these harbours was published as against the cost of the harbour, so as to show what each had really earned.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he thought that the whole of the Vote should undergo re-arrangement and careful supervision before it was again presented to the House. He strongly objected to the manner in which so many different things were lumped together in the Vote, so as to make it impossible for any Member to analyze the component parts of the Estimate. The current annual expenditure should be divided into that which provided for salaries, for repairs, and for new works. He hoped that the request which the hon. Baronet opposite had made, and which he (Sir George Balfour) repeated, would be attended to in future.

MR. MOLLOY pointed out that the Vote of £180,546 included a variety of items, such as the Erection, Repairs, and Maintenance of Public Buildings connected with the Private Secretary's Department, the Chief Secretary's Lodge and Gardens, the Under Secretary's Lodge, and other items. By way of entering a protest against the Vote he would move that it be reduced by the sum of £16,000, Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £164,546, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Erection, Repairs, and Maintenance of the several Public Buildings under the Department of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, and for the erection of Fishery Piers, and the Maintenance of certain Parks, Harbours, and Navigations."—(*Mr. Molloy.*)

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked what items the reduction represented?

Mr. MOLLOY said, that in order to save trouble he had moved the reduction of the Vote by a specific sum—namely, £16,000. He had taken that course in order to save the Chairman the trouble of calculating what particular items the reduction would cover.

Mr. COURTNEY said, the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) had kindly explained that in moving the reduction of the Vote he did so as a matter of principle, and not for financial grounds. He understood the hon. Gentleman to object to the expenditure proposed in the Estimate upon the repairs of certain Public Offices in Ireland. The hon. Member could not expect him to enter into that question at that moment; but his attention having been called to the financial aspect of the question, he was bound to say that the charge for maintaining Official Residences and State Departments did appear to be too excessive, and he would promise to make an inquiry into the matter, in order to see whether some more economical system might not be introduced. The amount, certainly, did appear to trench upon the excessive. The hon. Gentleman opposite the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had called his attention to the expenditure upon certain harbours in Ireland. He thought it would be a decided improvement that the extra receipts on account of each harbour should be given. The staff at Kingstown Harbour appeared very large, and he would inquire into the matter.

Mr. BIGGAR asked if the Secretary to the Treasury could give any information as to the items included in this Vote? Of course, he did not wish the hon. Gentleman to tell the Committee exactly what each item was; but could he give an estimate or guess upon the matter?

Mr. COURTNEY said, he was afraid that any estimate would be fallacious; and it would be only deluding the Committee and the hon. Member if he attempted to enter into details.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he was obliged to the hon. Gentleman for the explanation he had given in regard to the Vote. He was very anxious to reduce the expenditure, and he did not think that anything less than a total reduction would have any effect.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he was glad that the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury had now got himself well under weigh in the work of his new Office, and had found time to investigate some of the charges in the Estimates for services in Ireland. He felt persuaded that if the hon. Gentleman extended his investigations he would find a very considerable number of things connected with the Public Offices in Ireland which might be similarly reduced. He would not push the inquiry in regard to the reduction which the hon. Gentleman proposed to make in the State and Official Residences in Ireland; but he would ask him, when he supplied information in regard to Kingstown Harbour, to furnish similar information in regard to the other harbours—not only those mentioned in this Vote, but also the harbours of England mentioned in the earlier Votes, such as Holyhead and other harbours, in connection with which there were any Votes of public money.

Mr. ARCHDALE remarked, that it was an extraordinary thing that hon. Members from Ireland, who complained that their country did not get sufficient grants from Parliament, should now oppose a Vote for spending money in Ireland.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, he happened to know, having sat on the Committee which took into consideration the expenses of the Irish Official Departments, the position in which this question stood. The Lord Lieutenant had to reside in Dublin Castle during a portion of the year, and he had also a house in the country, in which he resided for another part of the year. He knew very well what had been the practice for a long time past when the Lord Lieutenant changed his residence from one house to the other. The furniture was always removed from the one residence to the other; and what greater economy could there be than the removal of the furniture in carts from one place to the other when a change of residence took place? He thought that afforded good evidence that the Vote for Furniture put down in the Estimates was not an excessive one; and he felt convinced that, if the matter were looked into, it would be found that if they desired to keep up an Imperial Establishment in Dublin at all, the Vote proposed to the Committee was not by any means excessive. He understood the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) to object to the keeping up of any Imperial Establishment in Ireland at all.

MR. MOLLOY said, he objected to the retention of the Lord Lieutenant.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, he thought the Lord Lieutenant would be kept up, and the Imperial Establishments which now existed in Ireland would be retained, in spite of the opposition of hon. Members opposite.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he thought that hon. Members were justified in calling attention to the expenditure incurred in the removal of the furniture. He remembered, when he was at the Treasury, that an application was made to him to sanction the expenditure of a sum of money in new furniture on the ground that the expense of removing it was a very costly operation, and justified additional expenditure in new furniture.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, he had no wish to prolong the discussion; but he objected to the lumping of sums for the Lord Lieutenant and the Secretary's Lodge, the Harbours, State Apartments, Public Buildings, and Fishery Piers in one Vote. All these sums in the present instance were put together in the most unintelligible manner.

MR. COURTNEY remarked, that they were included in one Vote.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, no doubt, they were in one Vote; but it would be better for the public to know clearly and distinctly what they were spending; and, unless each item was given in detail, they would never be able to know where they were. He believed that formerly these items were given in separate Votes. [MR. COURTNEY: No; never.] He thought the Committee ought not to be called upon to discuss these separate questions in the same Vote without having fuller information than they now possessed.

MR. BIGGAR said, the hon. Member for Fermanagh (Mr. Archdale) had commented upon the fact that Irish Members were opposing a Vote for spending money in Ireland. He (Mr. Biggar) strongly objected to the useless and senseless outlay of money in Ireland, and believed that such expenditure was calculated to do great mischief. He had often heard applications made for expenditure upon reproductive works, which he considered to be perfectly legitimate and desirable, and complaints were frequently made of the stinginess of the Government in not acceding to such applications. There was a great difference in being stingy in regard to things that were desirable and in incurring expenditure for things that were unreasonable and uncalled for. He thought they had had an illustration of that in the discussion which had just taken place upon the Canals. The hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) supported an unnecessary expenditure in that direction, although it was proved to demonstration that the Canals would never pay for the outlay incurred upon them. It was because money was so spent in Ireland to gratify the cormorants who wished to limit the Public Expenditure, that Irish Members were told no money was available when they asked for it for really useful and reproductive works, such as grants in aid of the Irish Fisheries. He, for one, never grudged the expenditure of money for reproductive purposes; but it was a very different thing to throw it away upon useless expenditure.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 9; Noes 59: Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 111.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. BIGGAR said, he wished to put a question to the Postmaster General in reference to the new post office at Belfast. It was proposed to spend £3,000 next year upon the new post office. He did not wish to criticize the proposal, but he asked for information in regard to it. Some time ago the right hon. Gentleman told them that the post office which at present existed was supposed to be very insufficient. He could quite imagine that, because since the office was originally built the work of the post office had been very much increased. He was afraid the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that the post office and the Customs-house were in the same block of buildings, and stood in an open square, to which there was easy excess from all sides. Whether that was the best way of providing public buildings of this kind he did not know; but the present building was a long way from any other building, and there was, consequently, very little danger or risk from fire. He believed that the new post office would not, from that point of view, be as favourably situated; but it would be, he believed, bounded, at least on one side, by other buildings, or immediately adjoining other buildings, with only a very narrow street between, and if a fire took place in that street the post office would be placed in very considerable danger. In addition, the present building had a wide open space around it, which was very convenient for those who had to pass to and fro, and for the reception and delivery of the mail bags. He did not know whether the front of the new building would be in a wide street or not, or what sort of provision would be made for the mail carts and the removal of the mails? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Postmaster General would be able to give some information to the Committee.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he would gladly accede to the request of the hon. Member. The subject had been carefully looked into, and he need scarcely say that neither the Post Office nor the Treasury ever showed any undue inclination to move a post office, unless such a course was shown to be absolutely necessary. It had been reported to the Government that the present post office at Belfast was insufficient for the remarkable growth of business in that, town. It had also been represented to the Government that the commercial centre of the town had shifted, and that, although the present site might have been advantageous some years ago, it was not so well suited to the commercial requirements of Belfast as the site of the new post office. It was further away from what was now regarded as the commercial centre of the town. Now the post office was to be erected in a new street which had lately been made in Belfast. Pains had been taken to ascertain the wishes of the commercial community in Belfast. Although it was not possible to satisfy everyone, as far as he could judge the new office would afford far greater accommodation than the old office, and to the majority of the people of Belfast it would be far more convenient.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the right hon. Gentleman had said nothing in regard to the risk from fire. Would the new building stand in an open space, or would it adjoin other buildings?

Mr. FAWCETT replied, that that point had also been carefully considered, and he did not think there would be any risk from fire. He could not say confidently whether the new building would be separated on all sides; but he knew that it was on some sides. That objection had been carefully considered, and what they had in view was the comparative advantages and disadvantages. After careful consideration of all the sites that were suggested, the Post Office authorities came to the conclusion that this was the most convenient situation that could be found, and, so far as they knew, there had been no complaint as to their decision.

Mr. KENNY said, he wished to put a question to the Postmaster General as to the post office at Ennis. He should feel glad if the right hon. Gentleman would institute an inquiry in regard to the adequacy of the accommodation afforded by the post office in that town, and either take steps to have a new post office constructed or the present one enlarged. He found in the present Vote that there were a number of post offices enlarged on account of the increase of business expected from the Parcels Post, and he was of opinion that the post office at Ennis ought to be included in the list. The present office was entirely inadequate for the amount of work required to be done there. He therefore wished to ask the Postmaster General whether any steps had been taken to enlarge the post office at Ennis; because, in the first place, there was not adequate accommodation for the work performed; and, in the second place, the increase of business, consequent upon the introduction of the Parcels Post, would render it impossible for the people of Ennis to do their work there satisfactorily?

Mr. FAWCETT said, the Government had had to enlarge a considerable number of post offices, in consequence of the coming introduction of the Parcels Post. He did not know whether Ennis would be enlarged or not; but he felt certain that if the post office in that town was inadequate before, improvements would now be carried out. He asked the hon. Member to put the question again, and in the meantime he would make inquiry into the matter.

Mr. KENNY said he would put a further question to the right hon. Gentleman upon the subject in the course of a few days.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Secretary to the Treasury for some information in regard to an item of £690 for the Maintenance and Repairs of the Royal Hospital at Kilmainham. A sum of £245 was asked for last year for new buildings and alterations in connection with that hospital. Could the hon. Gentleman inform the Committee whether any Report had been received on the subject, and whether such Report recommended the discontinuance or abandonment of that hospital? Would the House be afforded an opportunity of seeing the Report?

Mr. COURTNEY said, that was a subject which would not come before him, but before the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The only question which would come before him would be one that involved any alterations before they were made.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked if it was intended at an early date to apply Kilmainham Hospital building to any other purpose, or whether it was intended to close Kilmainham Hospital as at present used?

Mr. COURTNEY said, that he was not aware.

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

(2.) £21,000, Royal University, Ireland, Buildings.

Mr. KENNY wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in regard to this Vote, whether the Report of the Inspectors of the Senate of the Royal University of Dublin had yet been printed and circulated, and whether it contained any statement as to the utter inadequacy of the present buildings? A considerable amount of interest had been excited upon this point among those who were connected with the University.

Mr. COURTNEY said, no Report had been received from the Senate of the University. Moreover, if any such Report had been made, it would be sent to the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant.

Mr. KENNY reminded the hon. Gentleman that this was a question of building.

Mr. COURTNEY said, if the University had made a special Report it would be given, but at present he had not seen one.

Mr. DILLWYN said, this was a new item of expenditure, and he should like to know if the Vote included the whole of the work?

Mr. COURTNEY said, the whole expenditure contemplated appeared on the Paper; but the Vote, as there shown, did not include the whole.

Vote *agreed to*.

(3.) £10,000, Science and Art Buildings, Dublin.

(4.) £9,253, to complete the sum for Lighthouses Abroad.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the subject of these Lighthouses abroad was one which he had brought before the House last year, and he should like to ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether it was proposed to allow the balance of Cape Race Light dues, &c., to accumulate at the rate at which they were now accumulating? He found that on the 1st of April, 1880, there was a balance in hand of £2,936, and at the end of the year that balance was increased to £5,415. In regard to the Little Bass Light, the balance in hand on the 1st of April, 1880, was £11,500, and it was increased by the end of the year to no less a sum than £15,266, so that there was in the hands of Her Majesty's Paymaster General, and other authorities in connection with the Customs in London and elsewhere, a sum of £20,681 in connection with these Lights, while there were loans outstanding, for which these dues were liable to be appropriated, and in regard to which certain payments were annually made. For instance, he found an item of £3,400 for the repayment of interest consequent upon a loan. He failed to see the advantage of allowing these balances to go on increasing year after year, at a time when a considerable sum of money was being paid away for interest. He thought it would be better to keep smaller balances, and to diminish their outstanding liabilities.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that his attention had not been drawn to the expenditure on Cape Race and other Lighthouses; but he apprehended the time had not yet come for paying off the debt. He would, however, make an inquiry into the matter.

Mr. WARTON wished to put a question as to another item contained in the Vote. He saw that a sum of £252 was asked for, for good conduct pay. He wanted to know whether the item was really on account of pay or not, or whether it formed part of the wages of the persons employed? It was quite evident that the sum was given in equal proportions to the whole of the Hospital assistants, because he found that the same Vote last year amounted to £276, as against £252 asked for this year for 22 assistants, which would be £12 each. If this good conduct pay really formed part of the pay of the assistants, it ought to be clearly stated what their wages really were, and it should not be inserted in the Vote as good conduct pay.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that good conduct pay was not strictly involved in the contract for wages, but was earned by those whose conduct had been good. As a matter of fact, all those men had behaved so well that last year they all of them received good conduct pay.

Mr. SALT asked why the sum voted for an Inspector with ordinary rations last year was only £450, and this year was £800?

Mr. J. HOLMS said, the increase in this Vote arose from a re-casting of the staff at Nassau, and which would not likely occur again in future years.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £22,323, to complete the sum for Diplomatic and Consular Buildings.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, there was one item included in this Vote which he should like the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works to explain. He referred to the increase of £1,850 for the Maintenance of Consular Buildings at Bangkok. Last year the sum asked for was £400, and this year it had been increased to £2,250. An increase amounting to something like 500 per cent, for the mere maintenance and repairs of a building, struck him, at first sight, as rather extraordinary. In regard to the other items, there were heavy charges in connection with last year's Estimates for China and Japan, and he found them repeated this year. In regard to the first item, there appeared to be an increase of £4,600, and in the second an increase of £1,100. Then, in regard to Constantinople, the Vote was much the same as that of last year; and so also with regard to Berlin and St. Petersburgh, the sums they were called upon to pay was almost the same as last year. But would the right hon. Gentleman say what Report was to be obtained from the Travelling Inspector of whom they heard for the first time last year? He could very well imagine that an officer of that kind would have to travel long distances in order to inspect particular works; but when the subject was mentioned last year, they were told that his services would be of great value in keeping down unnecessary expenditure in connection with these buildings. In regard to the works at Constantinople, China, and Japan, there appeared to have been no perceptable diminution of charge; and he thought it was desirable to have some assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that there was a likelihood of effecting some diminution in future years.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, stated that in reference to the Vote for Bangkok, the increase had been rendered necessary by the construction of new buildings. Money had been advanced to provide the Consul there with a proper building. In reference to the Travelling Inspector, he could only say it was not a new appointment. It had been in existence not for one but for several years, and the Travelling Inspector had very heavy work to do. Wherever a demand was made for expenditure, he was sent out to inspect the buildings, and ascertain what was really necessary; and, as a matter of fact, his appointment, and the services he had rendered, had led already to a great saving of expenditure. In point of fact, he believed that the country had been saved many thousands of pounds by the employment of this officer.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, he desired to call attention to one very small item included in this Vote. Of course, no Member of the Committee would care about the money actually involved; but he thought the matter required a little explanation on the part of the Government. What he referred to was a charge of £30 for the repair of the walls of cemeteries in the Crimea. He did not know how this had been brought about. They certainly had heard from the public newspapers that the graves of the men who had died in the Crimea were in such a state of ruin that public subscriptions were asked for in order to keep them in repair. He, therefore, thought it was paltry on the part of the British Government not to give more than £30 to keep these cemeteries in order. Surely the Government could afford more than that. He believed that these graves were in a most deplorable state, and a sum had been mentioned the other day as a proper estimate of the expense of repairing them. Notwithstanding that, all the Government proposed to pay was the small amount of £30. He thought the Government ought to inquire a little more fully into the matter, and be prepared to take upon themselves a larger share of the expense.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, this matter had been under the consideration of the Government lately. No doubt, the cemeteries in the Crimea were in very bad order. There was a considerable number of them, and it was extremely difficult to guard and watch them properly. The Government, however, had offered to contribute in a larger proportion, provided that a certain sum of money should be raised by subscription in the first place.

MR. DILLWYN said, he was sorry to hear his hon. Friend the Member for Finsbury (Sir Andrew Lusk) urging the Government to spend the public money. They had always been accustomed in that House to hear his hon. Friend recommend a reduction rather than an increase of Expenditure. He (Mr. Dillwyn) wished to have some explanation with regard to the discrepancies in the sum paid for different Embassy Houses. Was it a fact that one Embassy House was so much more splendid than another that it was necessary to pay much higher rent for it? He saw that the rent for the Embassy House at Berlin was £3,000. He presumed that the Embassy House at St. Petersburgh was not a splendid building, because he saw there was only £1,670 a-year paid for it. There seemed to be an enormous difference between the two items, and he wanted an explanation of what it was that caused the discrepancy.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE stated that the house at Berlin was held under a lease entered into some years ago; but the time had nearly arrived when the lease would come to an end. No doubt, the rent was very high; but property there was exceptionally valuable.

Vote *agreed to.*

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS.

(6.) £37,485, to complete the sum for House of Lords Offices.

(7.) £45,057, to complete the sum for House of Commons Offices.

(8.) £49,017, to complete the sum for Treasury.

(9.) £77,904, to complete the sum for Home Office.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; Committee counted, and 40 Members being found present,

(10.) £57,263, to complete the sum for Foreign Office.

(11.) £34,379, to complete the sum for Colonial Office.

(12.) £26,513, to complete the sum for Privy Council Office.

(13.) £100,233, to complete the sum for Board of Trade.

(14.) £30,434, to complete the sum for Charity Commission.

(15.) £25,347, to complete the sum for Civil Service Commission.

(16.) £48,220, to complete the sum for Exchequer and Audit Department.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; Committee counted, and 40 Members being found present,

(17.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £7,019, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Registry of Friendly Societies."

Dr. CAMERON said, he had to move a reduction of this Vote. He desired to call the attention of the Committee, while this Vote was under consideration, to a very great scandal in connection with the Scottish Legal Friendly Society, which numbered over 400,000 members, 100,000 of whom were in his own constituency. The nature of that scandal would be best explained by quoting the answer given to a Question of his to the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate a short time ago upon the subject. The reply of that right hon. and learned Gentleman was to this effect—

> "Some time ago a criminal charge of falsehood, fraud, and wilful imposition was preferred against certain of the office-bearers of the Scottish Legal Life Assurance Society in Glasgow. I caused a very careful investigation to be made. It appears that at a general meeting held in June, 1881, the salaries of the Secretary and of the Treasurer were raised from £250 to £500 each, that of the President was raised from £100 to £250, and that of each member of Committee from £25 to £125. The charge against the accused office-bearers was that this very large and sudden augmentation of their salaries had been corruptly obtained by means of fictitious votes. Admission to the general meetings is obtained by presentation of the contribution books of the members; and it was alleged, and I believe there is ample evidence to prove, that fabricated contribution books were used for gaining admission by persons who were not members of the Society at all. Unfortunately, it is not possible to ascertain how many fictitious voters were so admitted, nor how far the resolutions to increase the salaries were carried by their votes. This circumstance, as lawyers know, raises a great difficulty in the way of preferring a relevant criminal charge. In the second place, whatever ground of suspicion there may be, it does not appear, from the evidence at our command, that the fabrication or the use of the fictitious books can be brought home to the office-bearers accused. It is only too apparent that there has been gross and culpable mismanagement in this Society, to the great injury of its members, who belong to the working classes; and I do not hesitate to say that I should be glad if I saw my way to the discovery and punishment of the guilty parties by the Criminal Law. But, after consultation with my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Scotland, I have come to the conclusion that there is not sufficient evidence, at least for the present, to sustain a criminal prosecution."

He (Dr. Cameron) had only to add to that statement of the Lord Advocate, that what rendered the practices referred to worse was that, in order to obtain an increase of salaries for the office-bearers of the Society, the benefits to the members had been largely reduced. Now, the Lord Advocate said that it was impossible at present to bring home these charges on evidence; but an independent Investigator had been appointed, and that gentleman distinctly said that the Secretary of the Society had been concerned in the issuing of these fraudulent books. He had no doubt that in making that statement the gentleman in question went upon moral evidence; whereas the Lord Advocate founded his opinion upon a legal view of the case. A number of members of the Society presented a memorial to the Registrar asking him to hold a special meeting for the purpose of considering the advisability of getting rid of the fraudulent Board of Directors. That gentleman appointed and held a special meeting; but, instead of considering this subject, he appointed another for discussion — namely, that of the general government of the Society. The members of the Society did not understand the bearing of the latter point upon their case; and although they were disposed to vote for the expulsion of the officers, they could not lose their day's work in coming from a distance to vote upon a matter the relation of which to the question before them they did not understand. The independent members of the Society had fought at a very great disadvantage, because it was admitted that money had been spent in treating and paying the expenses of those who voted at the meeting. It was admitted that there existed a common fund for the purpose of debauching those persons. Under the circumstances, he thought it was the duty of the Registrar to lean towards the cause of honesty, and do what he could to rescue the Society from the clutches of its officers. But he did not do so. The first resolution for raising the salaries of the Directors, in the illegal manner described by the Lord Advocate, appeared to have been informally passed. That was the allegation. There appeared to be no doubt that a strong representation was made to the Registrar as to the irregularity and illegality of the resolution. It was passed without notice; and although the Secretary had made a statutory declaration that it was passed in a regular manner, he afterwards contradicted himself. There were, at all events, grave reasons for doubting that the first resolution was regularly passed. Reports of its illegality and irregularity were made to the Registrar, but he paid no attention to them. Representations were made to him from the most respectable and influential quarters, asking him to take such steps as would enable the independent members of the Society to come forward and give a voice to their grievances. He was pressed to fix the hour of meeting at 4 instead of 2 o'clock; and he was also pressed to lay before the meeting as the subject of discussion the dismissal of the Board of Directors, instead of the question of the future government of the Society. Whatever difficulty there might have been with regard to obtaining a room sufficiently large in which to hold a meeting of a Society numbering 400,000 members, there was certainly nothing to prevent him laying before the meeting the question of the appointment of an independent Committee to take such steps as would enable the Society to vote upon the question of the dismissal of the managers. That would have been an easy matter, and the subject would have been sufficiently intelligible to engage the attention of all the members of the Society. But, as he had already pointed out, the Registrar brought forward another question for consideration, and the result was that all discussion on the fraudulent conduct of the Directors was prevented, and a Committee, composed of the nominees of the Directors, was appointed to carry out and elaborate the details of the scheme of administration. The effect of this was to place the whole management of the Society in the hands of the Board, who would work out the details of the plan, and give legal and formal sanction to everything that had been done. If there was any question as to the legality of the increase of the salaries of the Directors, they would legalize that increase; they would also legalize the increased duration of office which the Directors had voted themselves. The effect of the procedure of the Registrar had thus so far been to debar the members of the Society from a remedy in the Court of Session, which they might otherwise have had. In a letter which the Registrar sent to the Chairman of the special meeting in Edinburgh, he spoke about disputes between the "ins" and the "outs;" but he appeared to have forgotten that, as the Lord Advocate had stated the other day, these "ins" were a parcel of men against whom he would have been glad to institute criminal proceedings, if possible. The "outs," in this case, were simply those who protested against an act of the Board of Directors which had so flagrantly mismanaged the funds of the Society. He maintained that if the Registrar of Friendly Societies could afford no protection against dishonest practices in such a case as this, the Committee would do well to save the money they were asked to vote for the salary of that gentleman. He had no doubt that the Registrar had work to do in connection with other Societies; but, so far as this Society was concerned, it appeared that his interference had been hurtful rather than beneficial. On two distinct occasions, without any straining of the law, and by simply recognizing the principles of common honesty, his intervention might have been of great practical benefit to the members of the Society; but he had not even taken the trouble to look into the matter; and he (Dr. Cameron) felt it his duty to raise the question of his conduct by moving the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £300. He thought the office of Registrar would appear to the Committee to be perfectly useless, unless some good could be done in cases like this. If the powers of the Registrar were deficient, he thought the Committee were entitled to some declaration from Her Majesty's Government on that point; and, in his opinion, the discovery that they were deficient should be speedily followed by legislation which would put an end to scandals like this, which had no equal since the passing by the late Government of the Friendly Societies Act.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £6,719, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Registry of Friendly Societies."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, his hon. Friend had taken the best means of calling attention to a matter, which, no doubt, had been the subject of a great deal of observation in Scotland, and which affected the constitution and administration of a Society in which the funds of very large numbers of the working classes were invested. He could not, on that occasion, go into the merits of the question now raised. He had previously given an answer to a Question on this subject put to him by his hon. Friend, and he had nothing to add to that answer, in so far as the subject of it came under his official notice. But his hon. Friend had dwelt now with the conduct of the Registrar. He understood that with regard to this matter there were two complaints made against that gentleman, the first being that he had not taken steps to determine whether the original resolution under which the increase of the Directors' salaries took place was irregular and ought to have been set aside. He was not in a position to say what were the grounds of evidence which the Registrar had before him on that matter. His hon. Friend stated that a declaration had been placed before the Registrar, to the effect that the meeting had been duly called and that the resolutions were regular. All he could say upon that point was that he had no doubt that the Registrar proceeded upon statements which he believed to be accurate. As regarded the hour of meeting, he happened to know that this was a point very difficult to determine. The great problem was to fix an hour at which a large number of working men from different parts of the country would have been able to attend. He thought it was originally proposed for 2 o'clock, but that a representation was made that if the meeting were held at that hour, many members of the Society coming from a distance would be obliged to give up a day's pay in order to attend it. There might have been a difference of opinion on that point, and he had no doubt that the Registrar had exercised his judgment, on the information before him, in the best way he could. The last point which his hon. Friend referred to, he understood to be this. He said that the Registrar should have settled the business of the meeting which he summoned in such a way that the question of the dismissal from office of the Directors might have been discussed before the meeting proceeded to consider the scheme of future management. Now, that was certainly a matter on which a difference of opinion might have prevailed. There was no doubt that a good deal might be said in favour of the view that, before the changes suggested were discussed, the purity or the reverse of the action of the Board should have been considered. He did not, however, wish to put on the Committee any view of his own upon that subject which was not material. The Registrar, he had no doubt, considered all the information he had before him, and arrived at the conclusion that, on the whole, it was better to consider the scheme of delegation. He did not suppose his hon. Friend desired anything more than to call the attention of the Committee and the country to the proceedings of the Society in question, in which so many of the humbler classes were interested. With regard to the Registrar, he had no doubt that he had acted in this matter to the best of his judgment, and that no blame attached to him. For his own part, he felt quite sure that any representation laid before the Registrar would receive from him full and fair consideration, although it might be that he would take a different view of the matter from that held by those who laid such representation before him.

Mr. DICK PEDDIE said, that his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow had done good service in bringing the affair of the Society before the Committee. The transactions in connection with it had excited much feeling amongst the thousands of members of the Society in Scotland, and the narrative that his hon. Friend had given of these proceedings would show the Committee what good ground there was for the indignation which had been strongly and widely expressed against the Directors. The Lord Advocate had very distinctly stated his opinion of the action of the Directors; and he had, the other day, in answering a Question put to him by his hon. Friend, expressed his regret that he was not in a position to take criminal proceedings against them. While he (Mr. Dick Peddie) felt as strongly as his hon. Friend the injury which had been done to the Society, he was not prepared to think it was necessary to adopt the cause his hon. Friend proposed, that, namely, of reducing the salary of the Registrar. The Registrar had arrived at a conclusion, on the representations put before him, which they might perhaps think was not a wise one; but still he had arrived at it after full consideration, and with an earnest desire to do what was right in the matter. He was inclined to think that as the adoption of the Motion of his hon. Friend, while it would involve condemnation of the action of the Registrar, would do no good to the persons who had been aggrieved by the conduct of the Directors, nor reach these Directors themselves; the Committee should be contented with the publicity which had been given to the whole transactions in connection with the Society by this discussion. He had no doubt that much good would result from it, not only by guarding the interest of this Society in the future, but by preventing similar scandals from arising in the case of kindred Societies.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, he regretted to hear the course that had been taken by the Registrar of Friendly Societies, because he had looked for a better result from the Act which appointed that gentleman to his office. The Lord Advocate had not felt it incumbent upon him to go into the merits of the case; but there could be no doubt that the statement of the hon. Member for Glasgow had disclosed a very gross piece of mismanagement. He thought the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate ought to have gone more fully into the question, because no good could possibly result from smothering up transactions of this kind. After the statement of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, although he did not wish to blame the Registrar legally for the course he had followed in this matter, he thought he might be permitted to say that he was open to the charge of stupidity. The only remedy that was open to hon. Members who objected to the action of the Registrar was to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum included in the Estimate for his salary, in which case it would rest with those hon. Gentlemen who took an opposite view of the matter to justify the proceeding.

MR. BIGGAR said, he agreed with the hon. Baronet who had just addressed the Committee. He thought gentlemen who were appointed to offices of this kind at large salaries should perform some duties for the monies which they received. Upon the statement that had been made, he considered that there was *primâ facie* evidence of fraud; and that, when the matter was brought before the Registrar, he should have taken it out of the hands of the Directors pending investigation. But what had he done? He had given every liberty to re-constitute another body who would, in point of fact, legalize the misconduct of the Directors. Now, it seemed to him that, unless the Registrar of Friendly Societies had a great deal more power than he appeared to have by what had transpired in this case, it would be much better to have no Registrar at all. The Registrar was supposed to scrutinize and detect the fraud of Directors; and the unfortunate people who put their weekly earnings into these Societies or Clubs imagined that, because his certificate was required to legalize them, everything must be carried on in a straightforward and honest manner. But, in this case, the Registrar having allowed them to double their salaries, then gave the Directors the liberty of holding a public meeting, which was conducted in an irregular manner, and which enabled them to get out of the difficulty they had placed themselves in. For his own part, he considered it a question whether the Registrar was entitled to any salary at all. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Dick-Peddie) said all that it was necessary to do had been done by bringing this subject before the Committee; but he ventured to take an entirely different view of that matter. The statement of the hon. Member who moved the reduction of the Vote had disclosed transactions fraudulent in the highest degree; and that, he submitted, was not a question that could be disposed of by a 10 minutes' conversation in Committee. The effect of the conduct of the Registrar was that these Directors had given themselves a fresh lease of power; and his only wish was that they might so far abuse their position as to place themselves hereafter in the hands of the Procurator Fiscal.

MR. DICK-PEDDIE remarked, that some good might be done if it were possible to bring the Directors there, and cut down their salaries. That would be an efficacious measure; but to cut down the salary of the Registrar would have no such effect.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) said, he did not think it necessary to go into any greater detail on this subject; but he might remark that the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) appeared to have misunderstood the manner in which this increase of salaries was made. It was made at a meeting of the Society. The charge was that that meeting was substantially packed, and that the Directors had made use of persons who were not members of the Society for that purpose. But the case did not seem sufficiently clear to take criminal proceedings upon it. He should be sorry if anything he had said on this subject was supposed to reflect upon the Registrar of Friendly Societies, who, he was perfectly satisfied, had acted in the matter to the best of his judgment.

Dr. CAMERON said, that the grievance complained of amounted to a great public scandal. If he were to carry his Amendment, he did not suppose it would have all the effect he desired; but it would, at least, do this—it would elicit from the Registrar of Friendly Societies, who was thoroughly conversant with the system, some practical suggestions by which the gross frauds and malpractices which had taken place in this Society might be put an end to. There could be no doubt that bogus books had been issued; indeed, it had been stated, as proved by the independent Inspector to whom he had referred, that their issue had been clearly brought home to the Secretary. The Inspector had reported that it was admittedly the universal practice before elections for election committees to meet at public-houses, and be there treated at the expense of the candidates; and there was good reason to suspect that the expenses had been defrayed out of the funds of the Society, and that railway tickets had been paid for in the same way. He did not know what the Registrar's intention might have been in connection with these matters. Probably he had not taken the trouble to look into the merits of the case, and had treated it as a fight between the "ins" and "outs." The Registrar had made a proposal fair enough in itself, but one he would not have made if, as he (Dr. Cameron) said, he had taken the trouble to inquire into the merits of the case. Whatever might be the opinion of the Lord Advocate on the subject, the members of the Society who were interested considered that the Registrar had acted in a manner distinctly adverse to their interests. Under the circumstances, it was his (Dr. Cameron's) duty to emphasize what he had said by taking a division. He did so, not because he attributed any corrupt motives or practices to the Registrar, but because he believed that had he taken the trouble to look into the matter he would have seen that it was something more than a mere fight between "ins" and "outs;" that it was a case of fraud; and that it was his duty to assist those who were struggling for reforms to put an end to the fraud.

Mr. BURT said, there was a very strong feeling amongst the working men of Scotland on this subject, and he had received a great many letters about it. He was glad the hon. Member for Glasgow had brought the subject before the Committee; but, at the same time, he should have preferred dealing with it in some other way than moving a reduction of the salary of the Registrar General. That gentleman was a very capable public servant, and performed the duties of his office very efficiently. However, by way of expressing his approval of the action of his hon. Friend, and of showing full confidence in his judgment, and because this was the only practical way of dealing with the question, he certainly should feel bound to vote with his hon. Friend if he went to a division.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he had listened to the explanation of the Lord Advocate, and perfectly agreed with him in one thing—namely, that the question as to whether the meeting ought to have been held in Edinburgh was one upon which there was some difference of opinion. He did not find fault with the action of the Registrar General in this matter. It was he, however, who should have taken the trouble to see that a *bonâ fide* constituency was collected together at the meeting. The gentleman who investigated the case was warned that the custom had been to get at the meetings large numbers of persons who were not qualified and had no right to be there. Some trouble and expense might well have been incurred to secure a careful examination of the people who came to the meeting. He (Mr. Biggar) had seen a report of the meeting in *The Scotsman*, and it had seemed to him to be a regular bear-garden, undeserving the name of a deliberative assembly. If the allegation of the hon. Member for Glasgow could be proved—namely, that it was the regular custom for the Secretary to supply bogus books at meetings of the Association, it would only be right for the Public Prosecutor to ask the opinion of the jury on the question. If the Secretary, in a case in which his own salary was involved, had acted as he was supposed to have done a more gross case of fraud could not be well imagined.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 29; Noes 57: Majority 28.—(Div. List, No. 112.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. BIGGAR said, he saw there was a charge made for Friendly Societies in Ireland. Well, he sometimes saw in the newspapers reports of legal proceedings taken against local agents of Friendly Societies in cases where those Societies were not registered. The defendants set up, as a defence, the plea that the Societies were not registered, and that defence was found to be exceedingly good. Would the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury tell the Committee whether or not it was the case that, unless a Friendly Society was registered, no money could be recovered from the parties who received the payments from the persons who insured when application for allowance was made in the case of either death or sickness? If that was the case, it appeared to him that instead of the law being as it was it should be reversed, and more severe punishments should be inflicted on the agents of non-registered Societies for non-payment than, under similar circumstances, would be inflicted on the agents of duly registered Societies. There ought to be, at least, some supervision exercised by the Registrar to give safety to the parties insuring; for, as things stood at present, it seemed to be much safer for a Society not to register, for then it was not liable to any legal proceedings.

MR. EARP said, that before the Vote was taken, he should like to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he could inform the Committee what progress had been made with the examination of the Quinquennial Returns of the Friendly Societies? Members of these Societies were anxious for information as to when the results of the examinations would be made known.

MR. COURTNEY was understood to say that he quite believed the last-named subject was of the greatest importance to members of these Societies; but he was, unfortunately, not at present in a position to state when the work would be completed, as it was of a most voluminous character. All the Returns of sickness and death for the past five years had to be re-arranged and classified according to the occupations of the different members of the Society, and then had to be cast again as to the different forms of sickness and death, which obviously involved a great amount of work. The work was being pushed on as quickly as possible; but it would be some time before the results were ready to be made public. As to the subject raised by the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), it was one of vital importance. Primarily, it was not necessary for the Societies to register; and the desire of the State with regard to them had been resisted not only by managers of Societies, but by others, who thought these bodies were best left alone. The protection of registration was held out as a sort of boon, in order to get Societies registered. If persons connected with an unregistered Society were proved to be banded together for the purpose of obtaining money under false pretences, they would be open to a formidable indictment under the Criminal Law.

Vote *agreed to.*

(18.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £20,509, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Land Commissioners for England, and for defraying the repayable Expenses to be incurred in matters of Inclosure and Drainage."

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000, on account of the want of progress in the work of the enfranchisement of copyhold. The Committee would be aware that in 1841 an Act of Parliament was passed with the object of enfranchising the copyhold land in the country, and the hope was entertained that that desirable object would be accomplished in about 10 years. Forty years had elapsed since the passing of the Act; and, so far from there being a sensible decrease in the number of copyholds, they now found that since 1865 there had been a continual decline in the number of copyhold enfranchisements. In 1865 the number of copyhold enfranchisements effected was 1,039; but the number had since dwindled, until, in 1882, the number was only 279. The charge upon the people in regard to this Office was very great; indeed, amounting to a sum nearly approaching £25,000. Of course, he did not wish to mislead any Members of the Committee who were not acquainted with the business of the Office, so as to make them suppose that that large sum was wholly spent in the work of copyhold enfranchisement—probably only one-fifth of the sum might be considered as the charge on the country in respect of this work. The only possible justification for imposing such a charge upon the country was that the work should be carried out with the utmost rapidity. The positive intention of the Legislature, 40 years ago, had been disappointed. He did not wish to attach any blame to the Department itself—indeed, he desired to make known his opinion that it was an admirably managed Department, and that the gentleman in charge of it deserved every credit for the economical conduct of his Office. But the work which the Department was set to perform did not go on; and no one had expressed the opinion more decidedly than Sir James Caird himself that further and immediate legislation for the compulsory enfranchisement of copyhold was needed. It was in order to press the urgent necessity of Land Law Reform upon the Government that he (Mr. Arnold) proposed to reduce the Vote, and to take a division. The decline in the work was great, and the benefit of the people could only be advanced by the suppression—the extinction—of the system of copyhold. He was of opinion that the work could be completed in 10 years; but Sir James Caird said, in a work he had written on the subject, that in the course of 30 years the system ought to be entirely extinguished. In Ireland there were only three cases of copyhold—that injurious tenure had been practically abolished in that country. It ought to be abolished in England, because it had in it that which the House was very much engaged in condemning—the principle of joint ownership. It was desirable, in the public interest, that that tenure should be abolished; and he was confident he would have the sympathy of the Committee when he said that the work ought to be carried on without delay. Before he resumed his seat it would, perhaps, be well for him to call attention to the fact that there was a Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill at present before the House—namely, the Bill of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh). He thought the fact of the Bill having been before Parliament during the past three Sessions had had some result in diminishing the business of the Copyhold Enfranchisement Department. If that were so, they had another and more urgent proof that immediate legislation upon the subject was needed. Personally, he felt deeply disappointed at the want of progress in Land Law Reform in this Parliament; and to press the subject more vigorously and earnestly upon the attention of the Government he now moved to reduce the Vote by £1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £19,509, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Land Commissioners for England, and for defraying the repayable Expenses to be incurred in matters of Inclosure and Drainage."—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold.*)

Mr. COURTNEY said, that before the discussion proceeded further he should like to say a word to the Committee upon the meaning of the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold). The Vote the Committee was discussing was that for the payment of the Salaries and Expenses of the Land Commission; and the hon. Gentleman began by expressing a very high opinion of the services of that Commission, only finding fault with the Legislature for not having done more in the way of making enfranchisement of copyhold compulsory. Because enfranchisement was not proceeding as quickly as he could wish, and because the Legislature had not seen its way to compel enfranchisement, the hon. Gentleman proposed to reduce the Vote in respect of the expenses of the Land Commission. His hon. Friend knew that the Government was strongly in favour of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cockermouth

(Mr. Waugh), by which Bill it was proposed to compel the enfranchisement of copyhold in a limited period; but he must protest in advance against the irregularity of raising a discussion on it on this Vote. The next thing would be that the hon. Member for Cockermouth would rise to urge on the Committee the merits of his measure.

MR. WAUGH said, it was quite clear that unless there was some further legislation the work of copyhold enfranchisement would go on interminably at a cost of £3,000 or £4,000 a-year to the country.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON deprecated the discussion of the principle of a measure which ultimately had to come before the House. Until the law was changed the salaries and expenses of the Office must continue. Certain conditions of law were to be administered; and all agreed that the officers entrusted with the business of the Department were admirably discharging their duty. He understood the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) proposed to reduce the Vote, not because he found fault with the officers of the Department, but because he wished to make a protest against the state of the law, which he himself admitted it was proposed to correct in the present Session. The Committee would see, and his hon. Friend (Mr. Arnold) would himself see, that a protest of this kind, if carried out to the full—that was, if the expenses of an efficient body of men conducting their business well were reduced—was hardly a proper way of meeting the object he had in view. He (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) could quite understand the hon. Member's wish to obtain, as early as possible, a discussion of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh); but he was persuaded the hon. Gentleman's sense of justice would dictate to him that the course he was now pursuing was hardly regular.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, the object of his hon. Friend (Mr. Arnold) was simply to direct attention to the slow progress which was being made in the enfranchisement of copyhold. The contention of his hon. Friend was that the country was not in this respect, getting value for its money. The Department cost the country £24,000. But of that sum only £4,000 or £5,000 was appropriated by the Copyhold Service. Be that as it may, the value of the copyhold enfranchised in 1865 was £112,000, while the value of the copyhold taken up last year was only £30,000. The expense, however, of enfranchising £30,000 worth of copyhold land was as great as that of enfranchising £112,000 worth. He thought the Secretary to the Treasury would admit that the country did not get value for its expenditure on this head. Everyone admitted the unadvisability of having dual ownership of property, and copyhold was practically dual ownership. It was impossible for the owner of copyhold property to deal with it as completely as if it was freehold; and, therefore, the necessity of the proposed change was manifest. Those persons who lived in districts where there was a good deal of copyhold property—such as his (Mr. Cowen's) district—were particularly conscious of the necessity of the change. Complaint was not made against the Commissioners; but if any complaint were made at all it was against the officers engaged in the service. Those officers did not care to complete the work of their Office; they resorted to veiled obstruction. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) realized the necessity for progress, and considered that if the Government could spur on operations by encouraging the enfranchisement of copyhold property in the next nine or ten years they would confer a distinct advantage on the country.

MR. COURTNEY said, the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) had said the cost of the Department to the country was £25,000, one-fifth of which might be put down for copyhold work. If his hon. Friend would look carefully at the Estimates he would find that though the expenditure of the Office was set down at £25,000, £10,783 was re-paid to the Exchequer on account of business transacted in the Office during the year, and two sums of £6,165 and £1,606 were received in fees paid by stamps by the parties interested in the business transacted. There was, therefore, only a comparatively small balance to be set down as the net cost of the Office to the country.

MR. DILLWYN said, that, be the sum large or small, there was a certain amount to be paid for the work. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the Copyhold Enfranchisement Commissioners had work to do in the matter of inclosure. The inclosure work was, no doubt, very important; but he could not help thinking that the staff in the Office was too large for the work to be done. There were in that Office 44 *employés* of one sort or another. Such a number could hardly be required; and, therefore, if his hon. Friend chose to divide he should vote with him, on the ground that the amount of work to be transacted did not justify so large a staff as that employed by the Commissioners. He did not wish to underrate the value of the work done; all he complained of was the employment of so large a staff.

MR. GREGORY said, it appeared to him that the question raised by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) was simply whether the work of the enfranchisement of copyhold would be facilitated by decreasing the salaries of the Inclosure Commissioners by £1,000; and he could not think the adoption of the Amendment would have the effect desired by the hon. Member. No blame was to be attached to the Inclosure Commissioners for the slow progress made. No doubt, in the first few years after the passing of the Act of 1841 there was a good deal of enfranchisement, because all the larger and all the more important cases were brought before the Commissioners. There was, however, an objection to bring the smaller properties before the Commissioners on the ground of expense, as it was the duty of the Commissioners to require that the title of both parties should be produced when enfranchisement was applied for. The hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) seemed to have forgotten one very important function that the Commission exercised, and exercised with great effect, and that was the facilities which it gave for the exchange of property. The Law of Exchange was a very difficult one to work, except through this Commission. Through this Commission, however, property could be easily exchanged, and without all those liabilities which formerly attached to exchanges in respect of the title of property. Further facilities might very well be afforded and greater powers given to Commissioners in respect to exchanges, because at present their powers were limited to exchanges of properties of equal value. It was necessary that the properties should be exactly equal in value; and he failed to see why that limitation should be placed upon the powers of the Commissioners. If greater powers were given, he could not help thinking that a great many difficulties would be removed.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) complained of the slow progress made in the work of copyhold enfranchisement; but he seemed to forget that copyhold could not be enfranchised unless one or other of the parties was prepared to put the Act into force. He (Mr. Fowler) did not see how the Copyhold Commissioners were in any way to blame. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Gregory) had very properly reminded the Committee that the copyhold duties which the Commissioners had to perform were almost the least duties they had to discharge. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman had forgotten another very important duty cast upon the Commissioners by the legislation of last Session—namely, the work of the Settled Land Act. The whole of the working out of that important Act devolved upon the Department in question; and, therefore, he should be sorry to vote for any reduction. It was unwise to discuss questions of general policy under the various Votes before the Committee. He would, however, point out to the Secretary to the Treasury that, so far as the staff of the Office was concerned, there was room for some economy.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, that if the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) would inquire from the Land Commissioners he would find that the work under Lord Cairns' Settled Land Act was of the vaguest description. He was sorry his hon. Friend did not feel the great need he did for pressing forward the enfranchisement of copyhold; he was sorry the hon. Member did not feel with him that the people of the country were not getting value for their money in this respect. As the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had done him the honour to give his attention to the discussion, he hoped the impression had been created in his mind that the amount of progress made was not what it ought to be. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would find himself in a position to give some facilities for the passing of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh).

Mr. WARTON said, he must enter his protest against the farce which was now being enacted in the presence of the Committee. It seemed to him that the Amendment was merely to puff the Bill of the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Mr. Waugh), and to see what support he would get for it from the Treasury Bench. If they were to pass the Votes, it was not for them to enter into a discussion of copyholds, nor to compliment each other on Bills which had been introduced. This mutual admiration was out of place when they were discussing financial questions; and he must protest against the course taken by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), whom he had never known to move an Amendment from a sensible or solid reason.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 22; Noes 100: Majority 78.—(Div. List, No. 113.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

(19.) £381,047, to complete the sum for the Local Government Board.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he should like again this year to call attention to the inspection of workhouse schools. He had called attention to it in Committee in several previous years; and he should really like to know whether any steps had been taken to enable the unfortunate children hitherto educated in workhouse schools to attend the local schools in their own immediate districts? If there was one thing they ought to endeavour more than another to do, it was to bring up these children, so that they would not bear the brand of pauperism on them. The question was one which deserved the attention of the Committee. He was very much afraid that no real steps had been taken in regard to these poor children. He would venture to say that the education they got in the workhouse schools was nothing to be compared with that given in the village schools; and by cooping them up in the former they were preventing them from becoming what hereafter they should become—namely, useful members of society. He desired to know from the right hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who represented the Local Government Board, whether he had considered this question carefully? As some hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench were aware, this question had been considered before in the right hon. Baronet's Office, but very little had been done; and he now appealed to the right hon. Baronet to place these poor children in a better position, so that hereafter they might be able to earn their own livelihood, and become good and useful members of society.

Mr. HIBBERT said, his hon. and gallant Friend said little had been done in the way suggested for these unfortunate children; but he could assure him that a great deal had been done, not only during the past two or three months, but during the past two or three years. At the present time the children from more than 200 workhouses went to the parochial or board schools, and they were an increasing number. The Local Government Board had never, so far as he knew, thrown any difficulty in the way of children being allowed to go to these schools. It, of course, depended on the Guardians where the children went to school. In some instances, where the Guardians had already built schools, and had gone to great expenditure, they were, of course, not very anxious to take the children away; but, in cases where Boards of Guardians desired to make a change, the Local Government Board had made no objection to their doing so. There had never been any obstruction placed in the way of Guardians boarding out children if they wished to do so. There were 600 or 700 now boarded out in different parts of the country; and, so far, the results had been of a most satisfactory character. The Local Government Board would be glad to see the system of boarding out carried out to a greater extent than it was, as they believed that was one of the best means of meeting the difficulty pointed out by the hon. and gallant Baronet—of counteracting the demoralizing effects of pauperism in the minds of the children. Then, again, several Boards of Guardians were adopting the cottage principle. The Chelsea Guardians had made provision for a large number of children on this principle. It was an experiment so far as it went; but he believed, from what he had already seen, that the results might be of a most satisfactory kind. The Birmingham Guardians had also constructed a school on the cottage principle, and there were schools constructed on the same plan in other parts of the country. He might say, therefore, that, so far as the Local Government Board were concerned, they offered no difficulty in the way of the Guardians adopting either the parochial, or board school, or the boarding-out system.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, the Committee was indebted to the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) for having brought this important subject under its notice. He agreed with every word the hon. and gallant Baronet had said; and in large towns he believed it to be not only desirable, but absolutely necessary, that the workhouse schools should be discontinued. The workhouse schools stamped the children from their first days with pauperism, and pauperism in this way became hereditary. He was glad to hear from the hon. Member who had preceded him that the Board of Trade would throw no obstacle in the way of the Guardians making these changes; but he could have wished the hon. Member had gone a step further, and said that not only would they refrain from throwing obstacles in the way of the Guardians, but that they would take active measures to induce them to adopt the changes. He (Mr. Fowler) wished the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board two or three questions affecting the working of this Department. He was aware it was naturally a very expensive Department; but there were two or three items in the expenditure on it which seemed to deserve serious consideration, particularly as they showed a tendency to grow. He referred to the very large items charged for travelling expenses of Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors, District Auditors, and Alkali Inspectors. There were 23 Inspectors, and their expenses came to £4,698. Incidental expenses—such as telegrams, cab hire, parcels, newspapers, and advertisements—came to £1,100. There were only four Inspectors of Workhouse Schools, and there was an item in respect of their expenses of £375, or considerably over £1 a-day, including Sundays. For the District Auditors' expenses the sum of £11,300 was charged, and, as there were 36 of these gentlemen, that made the charge come to £300 per head, and would seem to show that the auditors worked every day in the year, except Sunday, and took no holiday at all; and for the engineers' department £1,900. Then there came the most extraordinary item of all, on page 123, for 12 Inspectors under the Alkali Acts. Their travelling and personal expenses, notwithstanding that most of these gentlemen resided in the neighbourhood of the works they had to inspect, amounted to the enormous sum of £2,000. He did not propose to move a reduction of the Vote, because the Committee were in the dark, to a great extent, as to whether these were or were not unnecessary and extravagant payments. They—especially the last named—appeared to him to be very extravagant; and he should be glad if the President of the Local Government Board would look into the matter, and promise to see whether some reduction could not be effected.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he thought that, on the whole, there had not been an increase in the expenses.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, his statement was that they stood at an extravagant figure.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE replied that, undoubtedly, they stood at a high figure. As to the auditors, the hon. Gentleman went so far as to say that they took no holidays and worked every day in the week. That was something very like the fact. The auditors got no holidays at all—they were perpetually at work. As to the Alkali Inspectors, a portion of their expenses was repaid in fees. Greater attention had been paid to all these expenses than formerly; and in the case of every new appointment it had been insisted on that the Inspector should reside in the district in which he acted. This was insisted upon in the most rigid manner.

MR. S. SMITH said, he was glad that attention had been called to pauper children, for few subjects of more importance could engage the attention of the House. There were upwards of 300,000 pauper children in this country, and their education was a matter of the highest importance. He held that the system of bringing the children up in workhouses was just about the worst they could adopt, as it fixed pauperism on them for life. Hereditary pauperism was very much owing to this system. He was glad they were getting out of it, and were adopting the system of educating the children in large district schools. But even that was a very imperfect system. It provided no home, no domestic training, and did not fit the children for the ordinary duties of common life, besides which it was very expensive. The cost of bringing up each child in this way in the Metropolis was nearly £25, which showed the system to be an enormously expensive one—each child costing double or treble what an ordinary working man would spend on his child. In Scotland they had a much better system. They did not send the children to the workhouse at all, but boarded them out amongst the peasantry; and the effect of that was to depauperize them and restore them to the healthy private life of the community. He thought a better system even than that might be adopted. Some persons had been engaged for years in emigrating these poor children to Canada; and, amongst others, he himself had had considerable experience of the work. They found that they could give the children far better homes in Canada than they could give them in this country. No better career could be discovered for them. There were four systems under which the pauper children could be brought up—firstly, in the workhouse schools—which was the worst system—secondly, in large district or other schools—which was a better system, though still not a very satisfactory one—thirdly, the system of boarding them out in this country—which was far better than either of the other two; but the best system of all was that of boarding them out in the Colonies. Canada and the other Colonies would absorb any number of children if they were properly trained before going out and properly planted. He understood that the Government had issued orders recently that the emigration of a small number of children every year should be permitted; and when they considered that they had 300,000 pauper children in the country, there was room for sending out far more. This was a subject he wished to bring under the notice of the Committee, and he hoped they might have a full discussion of it, bringing it out in all its bearings, and endeavouring to depauperize their destitute children, and so lift from the shoulders of the country some part of the enormous burden under which it groaned.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that as to the point the hon. Member for Liverpool had just raised, which was one of the deepest interest, and on which the hon. Member had every right to address the Committee—namely, that of the emigration of pauper children—the hon. Member had informed them of that which those interested in the question already knew. He had said that the Government had once more taken steps to promote the emigration of pauper children under certain regulations and restrictions. The hon. Member had expressed to the Committee his wish that all checks should be removed. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke), however, thought that those who were responsible for the re-commencing of this system of emigration must necessarily work rather slowly and cautiously in the matter. Some years ago the system broke down. ["No, no!"] At any rate, that was his opinion, and that of a good many others who had looked into the matter. At all events, there was a good deal of discussion as to the working of the system as it then existed—the emigration of pauper children to Canada—and the result was that emigration was superseded for reasons which the Local Government Board at that time thought amply sufficient. It had remained superseded for many years; and at the present time he was very desirous of re-commencing it, and of seeing whether the experiment would succeed once more. He wished the Committee to understand that the proposal to emigrate a number of children for the first year was entirely experimental. The Government had reason to believe that the result would be satisfactory; and if it were, the system would be very much extended. His hon. Friend had spoken of homes to be found in the country as being better for the children and the ratepayers. A certain amount of doubt had existed in the Department as to the merits of that plan; but the matter had been considered, and an inspection of the Homes had been undertaken, which it was hoped would be attended with good results in the future.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS said, he should like to add his testimony with regard to the advisability of developing this system of emigration. He had been for many years Vice Chairman of the Oxford Union Board of Guardians. There existed in that Union a large amount of juvenile pauperism, which the Guardians tried to find out the means of diminishing. They tried a system of emigration, which they placed in the hands of a lady who had the highest possible aptitude and ability for carrying it out. They emigrated the children at comparatively small cost; they had not a single complaint with respect to any child sent out; they did the poor in the place the greatest possible service; and, moreover, they did this good to the ratepayers—that they reduced the rates from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 1*s.* 7*d.* in the pound; in short, they eradicated the hereditary pauperism that had existed in the district; the effect of which had been to increase the rates and break up many homes. But they were stopped in this work by the late Government; and he was glad of having that opportunity of stating that he had never known anything more scandalous than the plea on which the work was put an end to. It was on the ground that it was necessary to secure to the agriculturists in England a constant supply of child labour. He had no doubt that there were reports spread of the difficulty of getting a supply of cheap labour; and it was thought probable, no doubt, that the stoppage of emigration would have the effect either of reducing the charges on farming or of increasing the rent of the landlord. He was, therefore, glad the Government had made a change in this respect. He did not care what kind of guarantees they imposed on emigration, so long as it was carried on at all. With regard to one point of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith), he might mention that they had tried the system of boarding out. They sent the children out, and a number of persons made all sorts of promises that they would look after them; but, in the result, it was found that they were badly fed and clothed, and otherwise improperly treated. They found that people in Scotland would do in this matter what the people in England would not do; and, on the whole, he considered that the Scotch system would not do in this country.

Mr. HIBBERT said, he would like to say a few words with reference to this Vote; because he was afraid, if the observations of the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken were left unchallenged, that a false impression might be conveyed to the Committee. His hon. Friend said that the system of boarding out in his district had failed; but that was not his (Mr. Hibbert's) experience. The Local Government Board had had an inspection last year with regard to the whole of the 600 or 700 children boarded out; and, with the exception of four or five cases, the children were found to be in a most satisfactory state. He thought that no fault could be found with the way in which the boarding-out committees had discharged the duties they had undertaken, nor was any fault found except in the few cases he had mentioned. The other point of his hon. Friend had reference to the mode in which emigration was stopped, as he correctly stated, by the late Government. But he could not believe that the late Government took upon themselves to stop the emigration of pauper children owing to anything connected with the employment of children in agriculture. He was sorry to disagree with his hon. Friend; but he had read the Report on the emigration of pauper children, and he knew that Mr. Doyle had been sent out to Canada, owing to complaints that were made as to the want there of proper inspection of pauper children. From the Report of that gentleman he thought the late Government were justified in drawing the conclusion that, until the Canadian Government had laid down some regulations with regard to emigration, the system should not be continued. He said this, so that any false impression as to the reasons why the system had been stopped might be removed. He did not say there were no complaints from persons interested in agriculture; but he had never heard of any in connection with this question.

Mr. SALT said, he was glad to find the Committee had taken such an interest in this question. It was one of the very greatest importance, and deserved from every class of the community the greatest attention. But whatever system was adopted with regard to pauper children—whether it was the plan of boarding out, or that of emigration to Canada or some other Colony; whether it was the plan of sending the children out of the Union to the elementary schools of the towns or villages, or whether special schools were built for them—difficulties would have to be encountered that demanded and required the greatest and most careful consideration. His hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Thorold Rogers), who spoke just now with so much warmth about the children in agricultural districts, said that the late Government was very much to blame because they kept the children at home for the purposes of agriculture. He did not wish to resent that expression, although it was given with a great amount of unnecessary warmth, because the question was very much above all Party considerations; and he would rather hear the hon. Gentleman speak with great warmth, and even great injustice, than that a Member of the House of such great knowledge and experience should take no interest in the question at all. He (Mr. Salt) had taken great interest, during the whole of the time he occupied the Office now so well or better filled by his hon. Friend opposite, in the mode of treatment of pauper children; and he had never met with the suspicion that pauper children in the agricultural districts were kept at home for the purpose of agriculture. He had heard a suggestion at one time—when there was a question as to what extent the large pauper schools in London could be relieved of children by means of emigration to the Colonies—that there was abundant occupation for them at home, and that it was, therefore, a pity to send them away. He did not wish to complain of what was said then, or of what his hon. Friend said now; but his recollection was that the suggestion of there being abundant occupation was raised not with regard to agricultural, but with regard to town children. As a matter of fact, if inquiries were made in the best-managed pauper schools—he would not name any, but he might indicate one near London—it would be found that the children got places immediately they left school, and that many of them had done well and risen in life. But there was a grave difficulty with regard to these children. Hon. Members were, of course, governed by a feeling of philanthropy and sympathy towards the children; but he thought it desirable that they should not be too much carried away by sentiment. They had to deal with the subject as a matter of business. Those who were at the head of the management of the Local Government Board stood, in fact, *in loco parentis* to the children; and, whatever became of them, from the time of rearing till manhood, they were responsible for the children being well treated. He hoped the difficulty which had arisen would be now overcome, because he himself was a strong advocate for emigration to the Colonies. He remembered well the anxiety he felt on reading the Report of Mr. Doyle, a perfectly impartial Inspector, and a man who would examine these things entirely from the point of view of one endeavouring to ascertain the truth—he remembered the great interest he felt on reading that Report; because he knew that, although emigration was a scheme that it was desirable to carry out on a large scale on behalf of these children, one established case of maltreatment—of children got away to some distant place where they were not looked after, and where, perhaps, they were cruelly abused—would be sufficient to put an end to the system for some years. Therefore, he again expressed his hope that the difficulty that existed was overcome, and that the system would now progress. With regard to the plan of boarding out children, this had, perhaps, done exceedingly well; but there were some districts in which occasionally cases had occurred of children being placed in cottages of an unfortunate character. He had always felt that if one or two cases of improper treatment came before the public, which was extremely sensitive in matters of the kind, great risk would be run of the whole system breaking down. What was most requisite, and, at the same time, most difficult to effect, with regard to the boarding out of children was a system of careful and continuous visitation. He was told that the Whitechapel Union had applied for power to appoint a special visitor, and that the Guardians were rather disappointed that, for some good reason, no doubt, permission was refused at the Office of the Local Government Board. He had no doubt the matter had been well considered; but he would point out that it was most important that children who were boarded out should be regularly visited, in order to see that they were well cared for in the matter of clothing, schooling, and food. That was a work that must be carried on by persons not only of superior position, but of superior tact and qualifications; because if they sent to the cottages where the children were placed persons who were incapable of making themselves pleasant to the *quasi*-parents of the children, they would do the system great harm. He remembered that when he was at the Local Government Office there was a plan for building pauper schools to be attached to large Unions, not in great blocks, but in the form of cottages. The matter was carefully investigated at the time, and many inquiries were made. From the experiments they were able to make, and from information they were able to get, there was no question but that the health of the children in cottages was vastly superior to that of children collected together in great overgrown establishments. Their inquiries went so far as to make it clear that if they had 300 children placed together in a large building they would be almost certain to have amongst them a great deal of illness; whereas, if they were placed, say, 10 or 20 together in separate cottages, the sickness would be almost *nil*. He spoke from experience when he said there was no question as to which was the better system of the two; but the difficulty was in the cost that would be entailed by administering the cottage system, which it appeared would be much greater than in the case of the large establishments, although he was not at the Office of the Local Government Board long enough to work out clearly whether it would be so or not. He would be glad to know whether his hon. Friend (Mr. Hibbert) had had an opportunity of working out this problem to any extent; and whether he had ascertained if the expense of the cottage system could be brought down to something like the expense of the system of large establishments? He would just add, with reference to the cottage system, that there must be personal supervision over each cottage. Therefore, he said that in both systems very careful supervision by qualified persons must be carried out. It was a matter of great satisfaction to him that the Committee and the House generally took so much interest in the question; and he hoped that the various schemes which had been adopted would be carefully worked out, and especially that the difficulties in connection with the plan of emigration to Canada might be overcome, so as to render it permanently beneficial to the children and to the nation at large.

Mr. HENEAGE said, he thought the remarks made by the hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) were exceedingly unfair to the agricultural interest generally. Returning to the subject of the Vote before the Committee, the question was, whether the auditors were performing any duties of advantage to the country? With regard to the highway expenses, he believed their services were utterly futile; and he had heard one of the auditors say that, so far as he was concerned, he was entirely in the dark about them. There was no good in sending the accounts before men who knew nothing about them. Not only were they unable to prevent extravagance, but they actually increased the expense, among other things, by asking the magistrates to send to them the county surveyors of highways, who had, of course, to be paid for their trouble. He hoped, seeing that these expenses were increasing year by year, that the Local Government Board would take care that the auditors did good and not useless work in the future. There was another point he wished to advert to, and that had reference to the Secretary to the Local Government Board. He was sure his hon. Friend below him would not think he was alluding to him personally in these remarks; but there was no Department under Government which required so much the superintendence and control of the Ministers of the Department as the Local Government Board, and he was satisfied that neither the President or Parliamentary Secretary had sufficient time to devote to another Office. He thought it absurd that the Secretary to the Local Government Board should be taken away from his own proper duties to attend to the duties of the Home Office, in order that the Under Secretary to that Office should be transferred to the House of Lords. He believed that this was the first time during the last 50 years that the Office of Under Secretary to the Home Office had been held by a Peer under a Liberal Government, and only once under a Conservative Government. He strongly objected to the present arrangement, because, as it would be seen, they required all the assistance they could get from Members of the Government not only in the House, but on the Grand

and Select Committees. He would conclude his remarks by saying that if the present arrangement continued another year, and the Under Secretaryship to the Home Department was held by a Member of the House of Lords, he should propose a reduction of the Vote for the Department.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was bound to say, with regard to the question raised by the hon. Member for Great Grimsby (Mr. Heneage), that he had been very much astonished of late years that almost every question connected with the Business of the Home Office should be answered by a Representative of the Local Government Board. That seemed to him to be the beginning of the transfer of the Business from one Office to the other. He agreed with the hon. Member for Great Grimsby in saying that the hon. Gentleman who now worthily filled the Office of Secretary to the Local Government Board had important work to do in his own Department, without being called upon by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to perform duties relating to his Office. He quite agreed that the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department ought to be in that House; because he found, when he was at the Home Office, and the Scotch Business was transacted there, that there was ample work to be done both by himself and the Under Secretary. If the present system continued, and the hon. Member for Great Grimsby should move a reduction of the Vote on that ground, he should certainly be inclined to support him, because he thought the system was wrong in principle. He had to ask a question on the subject of the Alkali Acts — had any good resulted from the Act of 1881? Many persons were deeply interested in that subject. He had himself seen in one place the whole of the wheat crop destroyed in a night; he had seen one side of a hedge, which the day or night before was green and flourishing, absolutely killed by the deposit of sulphuric acid from neighbouring alkali works. The question deeply concerned agriculturists in his part of the country; and he was most anxious, for that reason alone, without any Party considerations, to receive some information as to the working of the Act. He also wished to know how many Inspectors had been appointed; what had been the result of the inspections; and whether the Government would state that there had been any practical application of the Act of 1881? Anyone who knew these districts knew that there might be any number of Inspectors to go about in the day time and find nothing at all; but that what did happen was that about 2 o'clock in the morning, when everyone was asleep, a thin white smoke could be seen pouring out of these chimneys. It was that sulphuric acid that did all the mischief. It fell according to the wind either in the neighbourhood or at a distance, and that was the cause of the mischief. He wished to know, also, where the Inspectors resided, and how far the local authorities had come forward to assist the Government in regard to providing for the expense of inspecting? He hoped the Government would be able to give some assurance that the Act of 1881 had done some practical good, and that the Inspectors did really reside in the districts to which they were appointed. The Inspectors were bound to present their Reports in March every year, and he presumed that their Reports had been delivered; if not, why not? If they had not done so the Local Government Board ought to stir them up; and he should certainly ask why the Reports had not been presented and laid on the Table? If the Local Government Board had not called for the Reports they had not paid proper attention to this serious matter.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN said, the district with which he was connected was almost equally involved in this subject with the districts to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred. There was this remarkable circumstance—that the alkali trade in this country was rapidly declining, and in Northumberland there were now no alkali works in existence, although a few years ago there were a considerable number. For some reason the trade had fallen away. He hoped it might recover; but it certainly had been receding. The Committee were now asked to increase the amount of money for alkali works' inspection, although the trade was declining. There might be some explanation; but that was a fact to which the President of the Local Government Board ought to have his attention called. The work of the Inspectors had been reduced. The damage which these works did could not be over-estimated, not by their smoke, but by gases, which, being condensed, fell to the ground; and anyone living in the neighbourhood had painful experiences of that. Therefore, with no desire to reduce the number of Inspectors, he wished to know how, when the alkali works were diminishing, the same amount of inspection was required?

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD observed, that when this Vote was last before the House, the district in which Manchester and Salford were contained extended to the Isle of Wight, and the district contained 250 works subject to inspection. He wished to know what arrangement had been made for the division of that district, and for a better system of inspection?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he and his hon. Friend had gone on the principle of trying to answer each section of questions by themselves, instead of taking the whole at once; and he was afraid now that he must trouble the Committee to listen to him upon the questions of the right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who had last spoken. With regard to Lancashire and the Isle of Wight, that connection had been dissolved, and the district divided. The hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen) seemed to go upon the assumption that the Alkali Inspectors only inspected what were called alkali works, but that was not the case. Alkali works was a general term; and what the Inspectors had to inspect were all works emitting noxious vapours. These works were very numerous throughout the country, and there was a considerable increase in their number, a very large number of new works having been opened last year. That fact was given as the reason for the Reports not having been all sent in at the time fixed; but he would undertake to stir up the Inspectors. The right hon. Gentleman had brought the question of Inspectors before the Committee last year; and he did not know that there was anything new in what the right hon. Gentleman had now said upon that subject, or anything new that had come to his knowledge in the last 12 months. Therefore, his remarks last year applied in the same way on this occasion. Under the Act of 1881 the number of Inspectors had been almost doubled; but in only two cases had the local Inspectors been provided under the provision for dividing the expense. There had, however, been a question of appointing local Inspectors in a considerable number of other cases. There had been a re-distribution of the field of labour of the Inspectors; and as he had on a previous occasion said, in answer to the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), he considered it important that the Inspectors should reside in their districts. The other remarks of hon. Members affected the Home Secretary more than himself. He had been much alarmed by the proposal of the hon. Member that the salary of his hon. Friend should be reduced or struck out altogether, for the hon. Gentleman did a certain amount of valuable work for the Home Office. That seemed to him to be a most remarkable and cruel suggestion. The hon. Member, it appeared, intended to propose that the salary of the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department should be rejected, and the hon. Member had said that the Under Secretaryship had never before been held in the House of Lords; but, as a matter of fact, it had been so held once before. With regard to Scotch Business, he thought he should be out of Order if he followed the hon. Member on that subject; but the Committee had already been informed that special proposals with regard to Scotch Business would be submitted; and, that being so, the remarks of the hon. Member had been already answered by anticipation. With respect to the remarks of the hon. Member for Great Grimsby (Mr. Heneage) upon highways, where grants were given by the State it was necessary that there should be State inspection and State audit of the accounts. It must be borne in mind that very delicate questions of law arose sometimes in connection with these accounts, and that the Auditors were not merely financial officers, but officers who had to examine questions of both finance and law. No less than £28,000 were received in fees upon these audits, which were accounted for in this Vote. [Mr. Heneage: They come from the rates.] The hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt) had asked two questions—first, with regard to the proposal to appoint a special Inspector in the case of certain Unions where children were boarded out. The objection to that was the same as the objection to allowing Guardians to charge expenses for visiting boarded-out children. The expenses might sometimes be small, but they might be very heavy in some cases, as in London, where some Unions sent children to the Lake district. It was difficult to draw a line upon this subject; and the Government were afraid that if they allowed Guardians to charge their expenses, and to appoint Inspectors for this purpose, a very heavy burden would be put upon the rates. That was the sole reason for the attitude which the Government had taken upon this question. As to administrative expenses, the hon. Gentleman was right when he said that when he was at the Local Government Board they were somewhat greater.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, there were three items, amounting to £20,310, for vaccination. Although he was an opponent of compulsory vaccination, he would not raise that question now, or move a reduction. But he should like the right hon. Gentleman to give some information respecting the mode in which lymph was bought. Did the National Vaccine Department at present obtain lymph from calves, or from the human being? It was important to understand this, because there had lately been a considerable number of cases in which great doubt and suspicion — without going further—had been thrown on the quality of the lymph used. There was a strong suspicion among the people that this lymph was not precisely what it should be; and that was supported by the fact that, whereas people who could afford to get the lymph from private medical men never took their children to the national establishments, poor people were supplied altogether. In the interest of compulsory vaccination, and of the Department itself, it was important that the right hon. Gentleman should state whence this lymph came—whether from calves or from children.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the lymph was obtained from both sources; and the Government lymph had been introduced in deference to the views of certain people who preferred it. The result of that preference was the establishment of a Government station in Lamb's Conduit Street, opposite the Foundling Hospital.

MR. W. H. JAMES said, he wished to ask a question with respect to pauper children and schools. Very little had been said in reference to the point which the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had raised; but he believed that the removal of pauper children to national schools would receive the support both of Managers and Boards of Guardians, as well as from the parents of children in the national schools. But there was a difficulty with regard to which he should like to ask whether the Government could do something, for it was the duty of the State, not merely not to create obstacles, but to remove obstacles which existed. The reason why Boards of Guardians were unwilling to carry out this system was that they received no grants for superintendents who were placed in charge of the children when not in school. He hoped the Government would be able to do something to remove this difficulty.

MR. CROPPER asked whether there was any intention to appoint a Lady Inspector for these workhouse schools? Many hon. Members would remember the good work done by Mrs. Senior, some years ago, under a previous Government. That lady was appointed to the post, and for a short time conducted the inspection of female children in many workhouse schools, and especially pursued an investigation into the condition of girls who were boarded out. He hoped another Lady Inspector would be appointed; and would be glad to know whether the Local Government Board contemplated such an appointment? He also wished to know whether calf vaccine could be obtained in the country upon application by writing? As a Guardian he had had a great deal to do with vaccination; and he believed that if people who objected to human lymph could get calf lymph, the feeling against vaccination would be much reduced.

MR. HIBBERT replied, that calf lymph could be obtained by any medical vaccinator in any district by writing to the proper authorities. With respect to the appointment of a Lady Inspector, that matter had been discussed by the Local Government Board; and, knowing the very good results of Mrs. Senior's work, he thought it very probable that the time was not far distant when another Lady Inspector might be appointed. It was at not present definitely intended to make such an appointment; but if the system of boarding out was extended, he thought it would be desirable to have a lady to look after that system. With respect to children sent to parochial schools, if Guardians had the children in their own schools they would, of course, have to pay part of the expense; but he thought it worthy of consideration whether, when these transfers were made, there should be some aid given to provide for persons to take charge of the children to and from school. It was undesirable to leave the children in the hands of paupers; and the Board always recommended that a proper person should be appointed to take care of them outside the schools. He quite felt that it might be desirable to adopt the suggestion.

Mr. STEVENSON quite joined with the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) that the Reports of the Alkali Inspector should be published as soon as possible. As a Member of the Royal Commission on Noxious Vapours, he attached great value to these Reports, as informing manufacturers of the progress of improvement, and raising the standard of efficiency in the works; but, whatever their value, they were generally delayed for a year. As the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) had said, fully half the alkali works on the Tyne had stopped; but an enormous number of other works had been brought under inspection by the recent Act. He wished to remind the Committee that alkali works were the only works that paid for their own inspection; and, that being the case, the inspection ought to be thoroughly carried out.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he thought the question of the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department had not received that attention from the Government which was due to it. He was glad to see that the Home Secretary was now present. The complaint was that with regard to these Votes the Political Secretary to the Local Government Board was acting in that House as Under Secretary of State for the Home Department. It was very objectionable to have the Under Secretary for the Home Office in the House of Lords instead of in this House. He regretted to observe that there had been a disposition on the part of the present Government to throw more Offices into the House of Lords than had been customary hitherto; and it appeared to him that, in this case, there was not the slightest excuse for placing the Under Secretary in the House of Lords. He did not known what reply the Home Secretary might make; but it seemed to him that this arrangement was quite contrary to the traditions of the Liberal Party. The Home Office, being one of the most important Offices in the State, ought to be fully represented in the House of Commons. With regard to the War Office, there were no less than four Gentlemen representing it in this House—the Secretary of State for War, the Financial Secretary, the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, and the Judge Advocate General. He did not object to that, for he thought all the great spending Departments should be represented here; and he should like also to see the First Lord of the Admiralty in this House, rather than in the House of Lords. No doubt, something more would be heard upon this point; but before parting with this Vote he would say that he remembered very well, when the Local Government Board was substituted for the Poor Law Board, when the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) stated that there would be great economy in the arrangement. But anyone looking at this Vote would see how their enormous expenditure was going on increasing; and the House and the country should remember that that was in consequence of centralization. The Government Departments thought they knew better how to manage local affairs than the local authorities; officers were sent down to these localities, and Guardians could not spend 20*s*. without the right hon. Gentleman's approval. The right hon. Gentleman could dismiss men or not as he pleased; and he remembered a case, before the Board of Guardians with which he was connected, in which there was a man whom they all knew to be dishonest; but they could only dismiss him, pending an inquiry by an Inspector of the Local Government Board. The Inspector overruled the Board, and kept the man in his office, until it was found that he had disposed of some £300. He should have liked to make the President of the Local Government Board pay that £300 out of his own pocket. He meant the right hon. Gentleman's Predecessor, who thought he knew so much better than the Board of Guardians. If the House would continue this system of centralization they would have to pay these increasing charges for Inspectors, who, he believed, were often very inefficient, and very often interfered with local management. He hoped the House and the country would see that they had been going on wrong lines in increasing the power of these Departments.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was sorry not to have been present to hear the remarks of the hon. Member for Great Grimsby (Mr. Heneage). He had had several conversations with the hon. Member during the evening; and if the hon. Member had told him he was going to impeach the Home Office, he would certainly have been present. With regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), he very much agreed with him on all the points to which he had referred. No one was more sensible than he himself was that the Home Office was inadequately represented, not only in the House of Lords, but also in the House of Commons. He was aware that the Home Office had a great deal more to do than it could well do; but the greatest of all the evils in that Office was due to the system of centralization. Unfortunately, every effort was made, from day to day, to increase the duties of the Office. The work of the Office had increased in 20 years five times; and that had come about through the House of Commons insisting upon having Inspectors of Mines, Inspectors of Alkali Works, Inspectors of Factories, and of many other things; and then, as if the Home Office had not enough to do, his Predecessor (Sir R. Assheton Cross) gave into its charge all the Prisons in England, and that had caused an increase of the work by one-third. Fresh Inspectors were asked for, and not a day passed when he was not called to account for the conduct of the Police all over the country. And then people came and demanded centralization. Every day the House of Commons tried to make the Department do the whole work of the country. He entirely objected to that. Whether it was in the boroughs or in the counties, the Government were disposed to throw upon them the work which was now cast upon the Government Departments. He therefore had not a word to say against the observations of the hon. Member for Burnley; and he only wished that while the War Office was represented by four Gentlemen in that House, the Home Office could be represented by eight. He wished very much for more assistance to do the work of the Home Office in that House. The arrangement now existing in the House of Lords was never intended to be permanent; it was made to meet the exigencies of the Scotch Members. He should not be doing justice to his own feelings, or, he thought, to the sentiments of the House, if he did not express his great thanks to the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert), who had so much assisted him. The hon. Member had a power of passing Bills through the House which he thought was unequalled. There was not a single point on which he differed from the hon. Member for Burnley upon this matter.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was glad to hear what had fallen from the right hon. and learned Gentleman; but he hoped that the result might be that the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert) would soon not only practically, but absolutely, discharge the duties of Under Secretary to the Home Office. He was quite aware that the work of that Office had increased; but he did not think the effect of the Prisons Act was quite as the right hon. and learned Gentleman had stated. He had always been of opinion that as the work of the Home Office grew it was most important to have an Under Secretary in the House of Commons. Why the arrangement had been made in the House of Lords, he could not imagine; but the result had been to put an enormous amount of work upon the Secretary to the Local Government Board. The hon. Gentleman had done the work most efficiently, and it was a great public advantage to have his services there; but he had ample work in his own Office, and no Government ought to have placed all this extra work upon him. He hoped this matter would seriously engage the attention of the Government, and that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would have that which he needed, and which for the benefit of the country it was absolutely necessary he should have —namely, an Under Secretary in this House.

MR. HENEAGE said, he had not impeached the conduct of the Home Secretary; he had simply said there was sufficient work for the Secretary to the Local Government Board to do, without having to undertake the work of the Home Office. A Cabinet Minister, like the Home Secretary, could not go into details as an Under Secretary could.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, he hoped the speech of the Home Secretary might be taken as a pledge that the efforts of the Government were being directed against the system of centralization, which had too long existed. But, after that speech, he did not know that he was so anxious to see an Under Secretary in this House; for if the right hon. and learned Gentleman had an Under Secretary, he would, no doubt, throw upon him a great deal of the work which he himself now performed so admirably; and after the amusing speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman he should regret anything which would cause him to figure in the House less frequently. He wished to point out how gloomy a tone the Government now habitually adopted with regard to the action of the House of Commons. The Home Secretary said that centralization was forced upon him; and in a similar way, when the other night the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) pointed to the growing Expenditure of the Government, the Secretary of State for War said the House of Commons was responsible for that; the House of Commons was always forcing the Government to spend more money, and forcing them to further extravagance. It seemed to him that that was an attack on the faithful majority of the Government which they hardly deserved; but he only wished now to point out the discrepancy between the tone of the Government now, and their tone two years ago.

Dr. CAMERON said, he wished to draw attention to a matter of some importance in point of principle. He found that there was an item of £15,800 for public vaccination; but he did not know whether that included the grant in aid of vaccination. The public vaccinators were paid salaries for doing the work; and, if they did it particularly well, they received a premium, or an extra grant. That system was exclusively applied to England; but why should it not be extended to Scotland, if money was to be spent in aid of vaccination? Did this include the grant in aid, and why should not a similar amount be given to Scotland? In Glasgow there were places at which the vaccination was conducted by an officer who received no salary and no grant in aid, but whose sole remuneration was what he got for what he sent up to the National Vaccination Office. He could see no reason why a similar sum should not be given to Scotland; and, unless he got a satisfactory answer, he should move the rejection of the whole amount.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE suggested that the hon. Member should raise the point on the Scotch Vote.

Dr. CAMERON said, there was no Scotch Vote, and he protested against this partial grant in aid. If he could not get any better answer he should oppose the Vote.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would take upon himself to promise to reconsider the desirability of making this special grant by itself in England. It was in the nature of a second payment for a thing that was already done, and he had always had considerable doubt as to the wisdom of that system. If the hon. Member would accept that promise, he would undertake to reconsider the grant.

Dr. CAMERON said, all he wanted was that Scotland should be treated equally with England.

Mr. RAMSAY said, he wished to call attention to the grants in respect to the salaries of teachers in Poor Law schools, there being no corresponding grant for the education of the poor in Scotland. He had brought that matter frequently before the House, and several promises had been made that the subject should be considered, but nothing had been done.

Vote *agreed to.*

(20.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a further sum, not exceeding £2,864,950, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charge for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, viz:—

CIVIL SERVICES.

Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Civil Departments.

England:—

	£
Privy Seal Office	500
Lunacy Commission	1,000
Mint (including Coinage)	5,000

	£
National Debt Office	1,500
Patent Office	3,500
Paymaster General's Office	2,500
Public Works Loan Commission ..	1,000
Record Office	2,000
Registrar General's Office	4,000
Stationery Office and Printing ..	45,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of ..	2,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	5,000
Mercantile Marine Fund, Grant in Aid	10,000
Secret Service	5,000

Scotland:—

Exchequer and other Offices ..	1,000
Fishery Board	2,000
Lunacy Commission	500
Registrar General's Office	500
Board of Supervision	1,500

Ireland:—

Lord Lieutenant's Household ..	1,000
Chief Secretary's Office	4,500
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	300
Local Government Board	10,000
Public Works Office	5,000
Record Office	1,000
Registrar General's Office	2,000
Valuation and Boundary Survey ..	2,000

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

England:—

	£
Law Charges	15,000
Public Prosecutor's Office	600
Criminal Prosecutions	45,000
Chancery Division, High Court of Justice	30,000
Central Office of the Supreme Court, &c.	15,000
Probate, &c. Registries, High Court of Justice	14,000
Admiralty Registry, High Court of Justice	1,500
Wreck Commission	2,000
Bankruptcy Court (London) ..	4,000
County Courts	40,000
Land Registry	1,000
Revising Barristers, England ..	- -
Police Courts (London and Sheerness)	3,000
Metropolitan Police	100,000
County and Borough Police, Great Britain	1,000
Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies	30,000
Prisons, England	60,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	60,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	4,000

Scotland:—

Lord Advocate, and Criminal Proceedings	10,000
Courts of Law and Justice	10,000
Register House Departments ..	3,000
Prisons, Scotland	10,000

Ireland:—

	£
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	30,000
Supreme Court of Judicature ..	10,000
Court of Bankruptcy	1,000
Admiralty Court Registry	150
Registry of Deeds	3,000
Registry of Judgments	200
Land Commission	20,000
County Court Officers, &c.	15,000
Dublin Metropolitan Police (including Police Courts)	30,000
Constabulary	300,000
Prisons, Ireland	15,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools ..	20,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum ..	500

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

England:—

	£
Public Education	450,000
Science and Art Department ..	40,000
British Museum	25,000
National Gallery	3,000
National Portrait Gallery	200
Learned Societies, &c.	3,500
London University	2,000
Aberystwith College	- -
Deep Sea Exploring Expedition (Report)	500
Transit of Venus, 1882	- -

Scotland:—

Public Education	100,000
Universities, &c.	1,500
National Gallery	- -

Ireland:—

Public Education	150,000
Teachers' Pension Office	200
Endowed Schools Commissioners ..	- -
National Gallery	500
Queen's Colleges	2,000
Royal Irish Academy	300

CLASS V.—FOREIGN AND COLONIAL SERVICES.

	£
Diplomatic Services	40,000
Consular Services	40,000
Suppression of the Slave Trade ..	1,000
Tonnage Bounties, &c.	2,000
Suez Canal (British Directors) ..	100
Colonies, Grants in Aid	2,000
South Africa and St. Helena ..	1,000
Subsidies to Telegraph Companies ..	9,000
Cyprus, Grant in Aid	- -

CLASS VI.—NON-EFFECTIVE AND CHARITABLE SERVICES.

	£
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	100,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.	11,000
Pauper Lunatics, England	5,000
Pauper Lunatics, Scotland	20,000
Pauper Lunatics, Ireland	15,000
Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland ..	3,000
Friendly Societies Deficiency ..	- -
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Great Britain ..	200
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Ireland	200

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

	£
Temporary Commissions	3,000
Miscellaneous Expenses	500
Total for Civil Services	£2,054,950

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

	£
Customs	60,000
Inland Revenue	100,000
Post Office	400,000
Post Office Packet Service	100,000
Post Office Telegraphs	150,000
Total for Revenue Departments	£810,000
Grand Total ..	£2,864,950

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he thought this was a very convenient moment for eliciting a little further discussion of a subject raised in the afternoon by Questions with respect to the Mission of Mr. Errington at Rome. He believed he was quite in Order in taking this course, because in the Vote on Account there was a distinct sum taken for the Foreign Office.

THE CHAIRMAN: The noble Lord is not in Order, for the Vote for the Foreign Office has been taken this evening, and the Vote on Account does not include anything for the Foreign Office.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked whether the entire Vote for the Irish Office had been passed?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL submitted it did not much matter whether the Vote on Account contained anything for the Foreign Office or the Irish Office. There was the general fact that the Government asked for money on account from the House of Commons, and that afforded a Constitutional opportunity of raising any question. The Diplomatic and Consular Vote had not yet been passed. [SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, it has.] It was very well for Ministers to state that Votes had been passed when they had not been taken. On page 5, Class V., he found £40,000 asked for for Diplomatic and Consular Services. ["Oh, oh!"] The interruptions to which he was being subjected were due to the fact that the Government could not hear with composure the name of Mr. Errington. It completely threw them off their balance.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is nothing in the Vote before the Committee that in any way touches Her Majesty's Ministers abroad; and the Vote for the Foreign Office was taken in the Vote which has been passed. There is nothing now which has any reference to Mr. Errington, or to the Foreign Department.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL wished to argue this out a little further. The Committee was asked to grant a Vote, and there was not a single Member who could state what questions might or might not be taken on this Vote. There was not a Minister, or anyone else, who could state what were the services for which the Vote on Account was asked. Apart from that, he submitted, as a point of Order, that when a Vote on Account was asked for, it was perfectly legitimate to raise any question connected with Supply.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the House were going into Committee, I apprehend the noble Lord would be in Order in raising a question of that character; but the House being in Committee, his observations must have reference to the matters contained in the Vote.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he wished to know what were the Charges now before the Committee, and for which this Vote was asked? In order to give the Ministry an opportunity of explaining the matter, he would move that Progress be reported, as the condition of affairs was most unsatisfactory.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have already answered the noble Lord. The Votes include that for the Lunacy Commission and the subsequent Votes.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that would exactly suit his purpose. He found there a Vote for the Chief Secretary's Office, Ireland, and a Vote for the Lord Lieutenant's Household, and they were sufficient for his purpose. If his information were correct, Mr. Errington had received his instructions from Her Majesty's Government; and he believed that the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary had been active agents in promoting these negotiations with Rome. He would take this opportunity of putting to the Government again the question he had asked earlier in the evening.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have pointed out more than once to the noble Lord that the Foreign Office Vote has been passed, and that he is not in Order in referring in any way to Mr. Errington's Mission.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, a sum of £40,000 for Diplomatic Services was asked for; but the whole Vote was £207,000. Was the £40,000 to be taken; and, if so, could not this question be raised upon that?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Vote to which the hon. Member refers has reference only to Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, and Mr. Errington not being a member of the Diplomatic Service, a discussion on that point would not, in my opinion, be in Order.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, no doubt, included the Diplomatic Services, and the Committee had a right to discuss the question of Diplomatic Services apart from Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad. Suppose that, apart from the Embassies and Missions, they wished to diminish the Vote for Diplomatic Services, were they not to be allowed to do so if they considered that Mr. Errington had been improperly employed at Rome? They were entitled to have an answer to that question, and he would like to move to report Progress, in order that they might consult Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, the Vote for the Foreign Office had been passed by the Committee, but had not been reported to the House. Was it not right to say that the Vote was in suspense? He asked whether this point did not invalidate the Chairman's objection?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Vote is passed so far as this Committee is concerned.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL ventured to think, with all due respect to the parties who had given the Chairman information on the matter, that they had made a slight confusion between the Vote for the Foreign Office, which had been passed, and the Vote for the Diplomatic Services under Class V., for which the Government were now asking a Vote on Account. Might he draw the Chairman's attention to page 5 of the document which was now before the Committee? The Committee of Supply had not reached Class V. In the regular course the Committee of Supply had to-night passed the Vote for the Foreign Office. But was any Vote taken for Diplomatic Services?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Lord. The hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) questioned me on that point, and my ruling is that the Vote in Class V. refers solely to the expenditure for Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad; and it having been stated in this House that Mr. Errington is not a member of any of Her Majesty's Embassies or missions Abroad, reference to Mr. Errington under that Vote would not be in Order.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked if he would be in Order in moving a reduction of Vote 1, Class V., in respect of the salary of the Secretary of Legation to the King of Italy?

THE CHAIRMAN: Such a Motion would be perfectly in Order.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked if he might not move to reduce the Vote by £40,000, that sum representing the whole sum asked for in respect to the Diplomatic Services, because they had not received satisfactory information as to the employment of a gentleman at Rome? He would move to reduce the Vote by £40,000 [*Interruption.*] The Secretary to the Treasury might allow him to speak. There appeared to be on the Treasury Bench what might be called unveiled Obstruction. He moved to reduce the Vote by £40,000, because they were entitled to know, when voting money for the Diplomatic Services, what kind of negotiations were going on at Rome, and whether Mr. Errington was or was not engaged in conducting those negotiations.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, that four times the Chairman had ruled the hon. Members opposite out of Order. Was, he asked, the Chair to be set at naught?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON understood the Chairman to rule that the Diplomatic Service Vote did not give the opportunity the hon. Member (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) sought to raise the question. He imagined that the hon. Member's object was to obtain information in regard to the supposed journey on the Public Service of a particular individual to Rome. Under the head of Diplomatic Services there were several items. For instance, there were charges for Special Missions and Services and for Journeys on the Public Service. On both those points a Vote was now being taken on account. What he wished to ask the Chairman was, whether he had had regard to those points in the ruling he had given?

THE CHAIRMAN: In answer, first of all, to the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), I must say he would be perfectly in Order in moving a reduction of the Vote in Class V. With regard to the Question asked me by the hon. Baronet (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), I have to say that, unquestionably, I had taken the two points he referred to into consideration. The only Diplomatic Service Vote now before the Committee is the one for the expenses of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad. My ruling, consequently, is that Mr. Errington not being a member of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, and no expenditure having been incurred on account of him, as has been stated in this House, it would not be in Order to enter on a discussion with regard to Mr. Errington's alleged Mission.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, it had been stated that Mr. Errington had not as yet—[*Cries of* "Name, name!"]—Mr. Errington had not as yet received money out of the public funds; but the Committee of Supply had no guarantee whatever, at the present moment, that Mr. Errington would not receive money out of the sums now being voted. Hon. Members had no idea——

MR. HENEAGE rose to Order. He wished to know, in the interest of the time of the Committee, whether the noble Lord was or was not in Order? If he was in Order, let him proceed. If he was not in Order, he (Mr. Heneage) hoped the Chairman would keep up the dignity of the Chair.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, on the point of Order, wished to remind the Chairman that, ten minutes ago, he moved to report Progress.

THE CHAIRMAN: Such a Motion by the noble Lord never reached me.

MR. HENEAGE asked for an answer to the question he had put to the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have stated twice or three times that the noble Lord would not be in Order, in my opinion, in entering now on any discussion with regard to Mr. Errington.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that, under the circumstances, he would move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Lord Randolph Churchill.*)

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he was certain the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister knew they were right in what they were doing. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to say whether he did not think so. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) hoped the result of the Motion to report Progress would be that the Speaker would be consulted upon the point. He intended to propose to reduce the Vote by £40,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself to the question of reporting Progress.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he would do so. He wished to submit to Mr. Speaker whether, in moving the reduction of the Vote, he might not assign his reason for so doing, his reason being Mr. Errington's Mission?

MR. JOSEPH COWEN understood the Chairman to rule that they could not raise the question of Mr. Errington's Mission either on the Vote for Diplomatic Services or the Foreign Office. There was a Vote for Secret Service; could they not raise the question of Mr. Errington's services on the Vote for Secret Service?

MR. ILLINGWORTH inquired whether it was in Order to ask such a question until the Motion to report Progress had been disposed of?

MR. BIGGAR submitted that the point raised by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen) had reference to the question at issue. The Government had consistently and persistently refused to give any information.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Question before the Committee now is, "That I do report Progress." The hon. Member must confine himself to that Question.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he should either vote for the Motion to report Progress, or he should not, according to the information which he might be able to elicit. In order to know how to vote, he should like to ascertain exactly what it was the Chairman had ruled? It had been said that Mr. Errington—["Order, order!"] If hon. Members opposite would allow him to speak they would see that their interruptions were quite out of place. He understood the Chairman to rule that because Mr. Errington was not now employed in the Diplomatic Service——

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of Order has been already determined. The Question now before the Committee is, "That I do report Progress," and the hon. Member must confine himself to that Question.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he wished to confine himself to that point. He understood the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) had moved to report Progress, in order that the opinion of the Speaker might be taken with regard to a certain point. ["No!"] That was how he understood it, and he conceived it might be necessary, occasionally, to submit a point such as that raised to Mr. Speaker. It might, perhaps, occur to hon. Members that it would be desirable to do so when the majority of the House were not agreed. He, however, should not be disposed to agree to the Motion to report Progress if he could get the information he now asked. If he understood the Chairman to rule that because Mr. Errington was not now employed in the Diplomatic Service they could not discuss—["Order, order!"] Then he would put his question in other words. He would ask whether it would be in Order to discuss the possible appropriation of the money now asked for in regard to the Diplomatic Service, irrespective of who had been, or who might be hereafter, employed in the Diplomatic Service?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have already explained, in answer to the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), that it was competent for any hon. Member to move any reduction of the Vote he thinks fit. But any proposition to reduce the Vote has been superseded by the Motion of the noble Lord that I should report Progress, and that is the Motion now before the Committee.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he would like to save the Committee the trouble of dividing, if possible. What he would now ask was, whether they would not be in Order if, in moving the reduction of the Vote on Account either by the sum of £5,000 for Secret Service or £40,000 for the Diplomatic Service, they were to refer to the abnormal position of Mr. Errington at Rome, and assign as the reason for the proposition that money—["Order, order!"] He did not know how the Business of Parliament was to be conducted if the interruptions to which he had been subjected were allowed to continue. Really, hon. Members opposite might exercise a little patience. If they moved a reduction of the Vote on the ground that certain money might be given to Mr. Errington, of which the Committee had no guarantee, would not that be in Order under the circumstances?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have said before, and I repeat, that the noble Lord is entitled to move any reduction of the Vote he likes. Until I have heard the noble Lord's arguments upon the point he has just raised, I am not prepared to express any opinion. If the noble Lord were to enter upon the discussion of a question which I have said is not in Order, I should caution him again, having expressed several times my opinion on the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE declined to enter upon a discussion which was clearly not within the proper scope of the question before them. He rose simply on the Question to report Progress, for the purpose of saying that he hoped the Motion would not be persevered with. It was a matter of absolute necessity for the Public Service that they should obtain a Vote on Account.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked leave to withdraw the Motion to report Progress, in place of which he would move another Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL then moved to reduce by £5,000 the Vote for Secret Service, on the ground that the Committee had no guarantee that no part of the money would go towards the payment of the expenses of Mr. Errington's Mission. They would have arrived at this point a quarter of an hour ago if it had not been for the interruptions which came from hon. Members opposite. He had not the slightest objection to Mr. Errington representing Her Majesty abroad; he had not the smallest objection to Mr. Errington making representations upon the state of Ireland at Rome, and getting from the Pope a *pronouncement* upon the state of Ireland; but he maintained that if Mr. Errington had done good in Rome as a recommended Agent—["Order,

order!"] Really he did not know what had been the effect of the recent meeting of the Liberal Party on the Foreign Office; but more unruly and disorderly conduct than that of hon. Members opposite since that meeting it had not been his good fortune, or bad fortune—he knew not which—to witness. In spite of the results of that meeting, he intended, providing he was not interrupted by the Chair, to state his views on this point, even if he were to stay there until 3 o'clock in order to do so. The point he had to raise was a very simple one, and could be very shortly stated if hon. Gentlemen would only restrain their impatience. He was saying that if Mr. Errington had been a recommended Agent of the Government, and if through his recommendations, or through his information, the Pope had been induced to issue a Circular or Pastoral, or whatever it was, which had had a beneficial effect upon public affairs in Ireland, the House of Commons ought to be informed by Her Majesty's Government whether records of those negociations would be left in the Foreign Office, in order that the Successors of Lord Granville, whoever they might be, might have the advantage of knowing exactly the terms on which those negotiations had been conducted, so that, if necessary, they might be pursued. What he and his hon. Friends complained of was, that although Mr. Errington had been a recommended Agent, and had corresponded with Lord Granville, when Lord Granville left the Foreign Office, all record or trace of the Correspondence would disappear, and nothing would be left for the guidance of future Foreign Secretaries. Hon. Members would now see that the point he had all along wished to raise was a very simple and intelligible one. He could not imagine anything more Constitutional than raising such a question on a Vote on Account. He begged to move to reduce the Vote by £5,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a further sum, not exceeding £2,859,950, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charge for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884."—(*Lord Randolph Churchill.*)

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he entirely recognized the wisdom of the Chairman's decision that the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) could not be judged out of Order in speaking on the position of Mr. Errington at Rome, in relation to the Secret Service money, inasmuch as he could not say, in regard to the Secret Service, what he could say in regard to the Diplomatic Service—namely, that the purposes to which the money was applied were specified and laid down. The noble Lord was quite right in saying he was justified in raising this question upon a Vote on Account. It was perfectly obvious that there was no subject of policy or legislation, and no conceivable matter within the whole circle of human action, which might not be discussed on the question of a Vote on Account. Under the circumstances, however, he did not think the course adopted was a convenient one, and he would make a simple suggestion to the noble Lord. As the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen) had pointed out, the Committee only had passed the Foreign Office Vote. The House not having passed the Vote, the Vote must be reported. When it was reported to the House—which he presumed would, in the ordinary course of Business, be to-morrow evening—the noble Lord would have an opportunity of raising the discussion with perfect regularity. He would suggest to the noble Lord that it would be well to take advantage of the opportunity which would thus be afforded, rather than to engage in a long discussion on the present occasion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, he did not rise to prolong the discussion about Mr. Errington, but to ask one question. He understood the Chairman's ruling was that they must not discuss Mr. Errington's Mission on the Diplomatic Vote because he was not a Diplomatic Agent. It was upon that ruling that his noble Friend (Lord Randolph Churchill) was precluded from raising the question of Mr. Errington's Mission; but the Prime Minister now suggested that they should wait until to-morrow evening, and raise the question upon the Report of the Diplomatic Service Vote. ["No!"] Well, upon the Foreign Office, which was the same thing.

Mr. COURTNEY: No; the question would be raised upon Lord Granville's salary.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said, that being so, it would be convenient that the matter should be taken at an early hour to-morrow, so that it could be properly discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member misapprehended my ruling. My ruling was that the opportunity had passed on which a question of that kind could be introduced by questioning the salary of one of the Ministers of State. The Question before the Committee referred to Embassies and Missions Abroad; and inasmuch as Mr. Errington is not a member of Her Majesty's Embassies and Missions Abroad, I ruled that a discussion on the supposed Mission would not be in Order.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, the Diplomatic Vote related to the salaries of their Diplomatic officials. He had wished to reduce the Vote, on the ground that there was a gentleman at Rome who carried on Diplomatic service gratuitously. Was he not in Order in putting that forward as a reason why the Vote should be reduced?

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, in reference to the appeal made to the noble Lord, that it was well known that Report of Supply was taken often as late as 3 o'clock in the morning. The proposal to raise a discussion of this question on Report was, in his opinion, unsatisfactory, because it would prevent the public knowing what was the opinion of Her Majesty's Government upon the subject.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, there was no disposition to harass the Government on this point. If the Prime Minister would make a clear and distinct statement of what had been done, and what it was intended to do, it would be satisfactory to the Committee. There was no objection, at any rate as far as he was concerned, that Mr. Errington should have undertaken this work, and no objection had ever been made on that ground. If the Government would make a clean breast of it, and say openly that Mr. Errington had been employed for certain work, the question would be at an end; if they did not, a certain amount of suspicion rested upon them, and there would be no alternative but to prolong the discussion.

SIR WALTER B. BARTELOTT said, he rose for the purpose of raising a much more serious question than that raised by his noble Friend. He asked the Committee if they were to vote the large sum on account now asked for, after the very considerable sum they had already voted that evening? They had passed Votes amounting to a total of £1,770,404, and he conceived that it was not right to grant the Government this further large sum. He proposed to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £1,377,404, which would leave quite sufficient money for the Government to carry on their business with. The Prime Minister had, on several occasions, spoken against the system of Votes on Account; and, moreover, he called the Liberal Party to witness that they, of all others, were those who said that Votes on Account ought not to be granted. The result of passing the Vote would be to throw over Supply again to the end of the Session, and to that he was strongly opposed. He therefore begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum specified.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a further sum, not exceeding £1,487,546, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charge for the following: Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884."—(*Sir Walter B. Barttelot.*)

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, if this sum were voted the Government would, practically, be in a position to dispense with Supply until the end of July—that was to say, until the very end of the Session. Now, last Session, and at the end of the Session before that, the Prime Minister had expressed his great regret at being compelled to ask the House to pass a Vote on Account. On each occasion the right hon. Gentleman used expressions condemnatory altogether of the practice; and, moreover, when he was in Opposition some years ago, he found fault with the Government of the day for bringing forward Votes on Account. He was not at the moment in a position to quote the actual words of the right hon. Gentleman; but he would endeavour to find them, and if he succeeded they should be brought before him. It was a fact that Ministers had, on many occasions, protested against this system, which made the Government practically independent of the House of Commons. But experience showed that there was really no necessity for taking Votes on Account. They had at one Sitting just passed 20 Votes, which included all those for the Offices of Her Majesty's Secretaries of State. The Votes which remained were scarcely likely to be of such a contentious character as those which had been passed that evening with so much ease. He did not know how far the Vote proposed to be taken by the Government was likely to extend; but, as far as he could make out, it would carry them practically to the end of July. The Committee knew well that when the Estimates were taken late in July the discussion of them was a mere formality; it was perfectly impossible at that time to get serious attention to any of the grievances pointed out, and for that reason he should support the Motion of the hon. and gallant Baronet.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he thought the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had made a mistake in his reference to criticisms made by himself on the proceedings of the late Government. With regard to the Vote now asked for, it was quite true that the Government had obtained a considerable sum of money—that was to say, they had obtained entire provision for the year for certain Services; but that did not enable them to proceed with regard to other Services not voted for. They had reached the 31st of May, and it was absolutely necessary to provide a moderate supply of money for those Services, in respect of which the Committee had not had an opportunity of considering the Votes for the year; and it was therefore a matter of necessity, with a view to the Public Service, that the Government should obtain the Vote now asked for, which was Supply equivalent to their requirements for between one month and six weeks. The hon. and gallant Baronet said he had objected to taking Votes on Account. That was quite true; he wished the system to be kept within the narrowest limits; but it amounted to this. They had always admitted that the House of Commons had a right to expect from the Government a liberal allocation of time for the discussion of Supply in the earlier part of the Session. Had that been the case this Session, or not? The House of Commons had been sitting, practically, for about 12 weeks; 12 weeks represented 24 Government nights. In consequence of the fortnight occupied by the debate on the Address that number was reduced to 20, and out of those 12 nights had been given to the consideration of Supply. Under the circumstances, the Committee would see that they had fully kept up to the engagement into which they entered last year. They had made as fair and liberal an appropriation of their time as they could; and, that being so, he was sure the Committee would not refuse a Vote on Account with reference to those Services which it was absolutely necessary to provide for.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he entirely agreed that some Votes on Account were absolutely necessary, and that, as the Prime Minister had stated, the fact of their having voted that evening more than £1,000,000 for particular Services did not affect the other Services to which the money could not be applied. At the same time, this did not touch the point which his hon. and gallant Friend had in view. What they wanted was an assurance that, as they were asked for Supply for so long a period, Supply should be put down at a time when they could properly discuss it—that was to say, before the end of July. For his own part, he should be content to grant one month's Supply, and he hoped the Government would be satisfied with that amount; otherwise he should vote for the Motion of his hon. and gallant Friend.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, the Vote would be for five weeks, and would bring them up to the 3rd or 4th of July. Surely, having dealt fairly with the House in regard to Supply up to the present time, there was no reason to suppose that the Government would not continue to do so.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he had always joined with his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) in objecting to Votes on Account, and while the late Government were in Office he had on two occasions divided the Committee against them. The point he had always urged was that full advantage had not been taken of the facilities afforded for taking Supply on Mondays, and that those days had been used for the purposes of legislation, the consequence of which was that Supply was driven off to an inconveniently late period of the Session. The present Government, however, had acted fairly in this matter, having used Mondays and

Thursdays for getting on with Supply; and, but for that, he should have joined in opposition to the present Vote on Account. The Government, however, had not progressed with Supply as rapidly as they expected; and he might point out to the Prime Minister that if the right of Members to make speeches on going into Committee of Supply were taken away, they would surely find an outlay for their criticisms in Committee. There had been a large amount of time occupied in discussions upon the Civil Service Votes, and hence the reason why the Government were driven to ask for a second Vote on Account. He thought they had a right to conclude that, as the Government had pressed forward Supply hitherto, they would continue to do so, and that they would not devote Mondays and Thursdays to legislation until they had made further progress with it. He thought that every week there should be an opportunity of proceeding to a greater or less extent with Supply; and as he gathered that this was the intention of the Government, he should certainly vote for the amount now proposed.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, the Estimates for the Army and Navy were voted in such a way that the money first taken could be distributed over the whole of the Votes. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman if that was the case with the Vote before the Committee? Did the Government intend to use the money voted for the Estimates that evening for the purpose of the remaining Estimates? If not, of course, as the Government must have money, he should not press his Motion.

Mr. GLADSTONE: We have no power to do what the hon. and gallant Baronet suggests.

Mr. MOLLOY said, the only opportunity Irish Members had of bringing forward matters relating to Ireland was in Committee of Supply. Up to the present time they had done no more than exercise their right of asking Questions. The discussion of the Estimates which preceded the Irish Votes would occupy a fortnight or three weeks at least, with the result that the latter would be thrown into August, probably just as the House was about to rise. He asked whether the Prime Minister would make arrangements for taking the Vote for the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when Supply should be next put down, so as to avoid it coming on in the last days of the Session?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, without making any promise as to taking the Irish Votes out of order, he could assure the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken that the Government contemplated taking them at a convenient and not at a remote period.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

CONSTABULARY AND POLICE (IRELAND) (PAY AND PENSIONS) BILL.

(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

[BILL 171.] COMMITTEE.

[*Progress 28th May.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Part II.

Dublin Metropolitan Police.

Clause 13 (Pay of Dublin Metropolitan Police).

Mr. BIGGAR said, the paragraph which his Amendment referred to provided—

> "That where any member of the force is at the time of the passing of this Act in receipt of a higher rate of pay than the rate specified in the Schedule in relation to such person, nothing contained in this Act shall be taken to reduce the rate of pay which such person is entitled to receive."

That meant that if any person was receiving a higher rate of pay than was provided in the Act he was not to have his pay cut down. He submitted that the pay was fixed for the Police at an extravagantly high rate. He begged to move the omission of lines 33 to 37 inclusive.

Amendment proposed, in page 7, line 33, to leave out all the words from "provided" to "receive," in line 37.—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the hon. Member for Cavan had hitherto subjected the Bill to a keen and intelligent criticism from the point of view of economy, and had raised with regard to it some interesting questions. The first part of the Bill doubtless required to be carefully watched; with reference to the last part of it he thought the hon. Member might fairly relax his vigilance. The increase of pay to the Dublin Police amounted to something under £2,000 a-year. This Proviso was introduced for the purpose of preventing a number of persons of less than two years' service from being damnified by the passing of the Bill to the extent of 6*d*. a-week. He hoped, after this simple but adequate defence, the hon. Member would not press his Amendment.

Mr. BIGGAR said, as the amount at stake appeared by the statement of the right hon. Gentleman to be small, he did not think it worth while to take a division, and with the permission of the Committee he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Application of provisions as to pension to the Dublin Metropolitan Police).

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he wished to take that opportunity of laying before the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the case of a public servant who had not been provided for by this Bill. He referred to the Surgeon of the Dublin Metropolitan Police Court, and he could see no reason why that officer should not be placed on the same footing as the Surgeon of the London Metropolitan Police. The Surgeon of the latter Force had always an enormous amount of practice, and was one of the leading men in the Profession; the Surgeon of the Dublin Metropolitan Police had no practice, because his practice was destroyed by his taking the appointment, and on that ground he had a far stronger title to a pension than the London Metropolitan Police Surgeon. Moreover, he did not know whether the Chief Secretary was aware of the fact, but he attended every day at the police-station, and saw personally those constables who required medical treatment. The case was entirely different with the Surgeon to the London Metropolitan Police, who attended but rarely; he was present when recruits were brought up for examination, but, except in serious cases, he never attended to the constables at all. So that, on every ground, the Dublin Surgeon had a greater right to a pension than the London Surgeon. Seeing that he could not move an Amendment to include this gentleman, if the Government did not see their way to do it, he sincerely hoped they would give an undertaking that the case would be seriously and equitably considered.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the case of the Doctor referred to was one which deserved a few words. The noble Lord would be perfectly in Order in moving an Amendment in the shape of a new clause to the Bill; but he (Mr. Trevelyan) should certainly deprecate such a course, as it was extremely important, in order to further the progress of the measure, that it should be confined solely to the rank and file of the Constabulary. He quite allowed that the Superintendents of the Dublin Metropolitan Police were affected; but these officers were promoted from the ranks. Therefore the whole body affected by the Bill, whether in the Royal Irish Constabulary or in the Dublin Police, might be said to be the rank and file, and those who had risen from the rank and file. If once the Government allowed the position of officers to be considered in the Bill there would be a delay; and one primary condition with regard to that measure was that there should be no unnecessary delay in passing it into law. There was only one precedent for the payment of a salary to a medical officer to the Police, and that was in the case of the Metropolis. In the case of the Liverpool Police Force, which was as large or larger than that of Dublin, the medical officers who attended on the men obtained no pensions. He could imagine, however, that a case could be made out for the Doctor to whom reference had been made from the point of view that, besides the Metropolitan Police, the only Force that was under the direct control of the Executive was the Dublin Police. It would be quite impossible for him to give a positive answer on that point. It would be necessary for him to carefully consult with his Colleagues in Ireland, and after that to make application to the Treasury. He could only tell the noble Lord that he would give every attention and consideration to the subject; and that if he found, when he had the honour to introduce his re-organization Bill at a later period of the Session—which Bill would deal with one or two of the officers of the Royal Irish Constabulary, although it would not make any difference in the pay and emoluments of the great body of officers—that he could carry out the noble Lord's wish, if the noble Lord then chose to raise the question, he (Mr. Trevelyan) would not only not protest but would feel that the noble Lord was courteous in postponing his action until that occasion.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he was glad to hear what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. He (Colonel King-Harman) had intended to say a few words on the subject; but, after what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, he would refrain from so doing.

Clause *agreed to*.

Clause 15 (Provision as to pensions of men appointed before 12th August 1867, 10 & 11 Vict. c. 100, s. 10).

Mr. BIGGAR said, he had put down on the Paper an Amendment to this clause, and he considered it a perfectly legitimate one in itself; but it was almost the same as the one he had moved at a former part of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman very strongly contested the principle of allowing policemen of 30 years' service to retire from the Service on this boon being granted to them. The principle that ran through the measure was that a policeman should have an opportunity of retiring after 35 years, if he desired it, no matter how good his bodily health might be. Even supposing he moved his Amendment, he did not think he would have much chance of carrying it. Looking at the empty state of the Front Opposition Bench, he should refrain from moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Clause *agreed to*.

Remaining Clauses *agreed to*.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he had a new clause relating to rewards for distinguished services to propose. He wished to provide that a head or other constable, who had served 15 years without an unfavourable mark having been recorded against him, should be entitled to wear a bronze badge as a token of meritorious services, that under similar conditions, a silver badge might be worn after 20 years', and a gold badge after 24 years' meritorious service. He was not certain whether this ought to have been brought up at all in the form of a new clause. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to consider it, and say whether he had any objection to inserting it; and, if so, whether he would not, in some form more satisfactory to himself, make provision for a careful order of merit for this most deserving body of men? The question was one to which much importance had been attached, and he certainly thought the men should have a badge to wear.

New Clause:—

(Rewards for distinguished services.)

"From and after the passing of this Act every head or other constable who shall have completed fifteen years' service, without an unfavourable mark having been recorded against him, shall be entitled to wear a bronze badge as a token of meritorious services; and,

"Every head or other constable who shall have completed twenty years' service, without an unfavourable record, shall be entitled to wear a similar badge in silver; and,

"Every officer who shall have completed twenty-four years in like manner, without an unfavourable record, shall be entitled to the honourable distinction of a gold badge of a similar nature,"—(*Colonel King-Harman*,)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he hoped the Government would not accede to this clause, and that the hon. and gallant Member would not persist in it. No doubt, the hon. and gallant Member had better means of learning the views of policemen than he (Mr. O'Connor) could profess to have; but he should imagine that no proposal could be more objectionable than this to the vast majority of the Police. The clause was brought forward under the plea that it was to satisfy the wishes of the rank and file of the Constabulary and Police; but, so far as he could judge, the proposal would meet with a stronger opposition from this than from any other body of men. He would not subject the clause to anything like verbal criticism, although he thought it was open to it. It was a most objectionable proposal. Although badges, no doubt, were of service in the Army, they were altogether out of place in connection with a Force of a Civil character.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, he recognized the spirit in which the hon. and gallant Member for County Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) had brought forward his proposal; but he believed that, carried out exactly as the hon. and gallant Member wished, it would not quite meet the wishes of the men. He would suggest what he thought a better way of carrying out the intention of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. Unfavourable reports had had the effect of stopping promotion, and the men had felt these reports very much. If they made the giving of these badges depend on a man's not having an unfavourable record, of course when they saw a policeman's shoulder without a badge it would bring to the mind of his superiors that he had an unfavourable record; and whether that did or did not operate in stopping his promotion it would have a bad effect on the minds of the men. Unfavourable records and punishments were things which with increasing zeal and meritorious conduct should be wiped out; and it would be well, therefore, to adopt some plan by which rewards could be given in cases where punishment had been inflicted, on the expiration of a certain period after such punishment; but to have some men stamped with a badge and others without it, showing that they had had unfavourable reports, would be very objectionable. The badges, if used as suggested—which would be amongst the sergeants and head constables, as well as the rank and file—would show that some were not such good members of the Force as others. He would recommend that badges should be given for general ability and good conduct, and should not be made to depend on the absence of unfavourable records. There was many a man who had had an unfavourable record who, by subsequent activity, intelligence, and attention to his duty, had made a much better officer than others who had not had unfavourable records.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he had brought forward the proposal in consequence of representations from a considerable number of constables; but probably they had not considered the matter any more closely than he had. He begged to withdraw the clause.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. LEWIS said, he had a new clause to propose, providing that all persons who, previous to the Constabulary (Ireland) Act, 1874, had retired from the Service should receive the pensions granted under the Act 10 & 11 *Vict.*, entitled "An Act to regulate the superannuation allowances of the Constabulary Force in Ireland, and of the Dublin Metropolitan Police," calculated upon the scale or rate of pay of which they were in receipt at the date of their retirement. This new clause would deal with an old grievance which had been on two or three occasions brought before Parliament. Three Acts of Parliament had been passed—one in 1847, one in 1866, and the other in 1874—dealing with the pay and pensions of the Irish Constabulary. The Act of 1847 fixed the amounts. In 1866 the pay was increased, but not the pensions. By the Act of 1874 men who had served 25 years were entitled to retire upon their actual full pay; but after 1866 they were retired upon the old pay, or the pay they had before the Act of 1866 was passed. That was thought hard and harsh on the constables who had retired before the passing of the Act of 1874. Under the Act of 1874 all who retired after the 1st of August of that year were retired on their actual salaries; but all who retired before—it might be on the 31st of July—had their pensions paid on the salaries fixed prior to 1866. The matter had been brought before Parliament on two occasions, and in 1876 the late Government agreed to take the opinion of the English Law Officers as to whether they had power under the Act of 1874 to give pensions to old retired officers on the same footing as those who retired after the 1st of August, 1874. They did so, and were informed that they could do this if they thought proper; but, in the exercise of their discretion, they did not think proper to put in force the power they possessed under the Act of 1874 in this particular. The Act applied to a body of 250 or 300 persons, whose number were diminishing daily as the men died off, and the old grievance of the surviving men who retired before the 1st of August 1874 still existed. The reason for the Act of 1874 was that the Act of 1866 was deemed a hardship on those who retired under the terms of the Act of 1866. The Committee had now an opportunity of putting the matter right, at a time when it was doing justice to the Constabulary of Ireland as a body. These men were unable to protect themselves; and, though they were old servants no longer serving the Crown or their country, in this particular, at all events, he hoped there were many men in the House, including Members connected with Ireland, who would be anxious to do justice to a deserving body of men by rectifying a mistake and a striking inequality, which was pretty generally admitted. He wished to draw the attention of the Chief Secretary to the fact that the clause he was proposing was not retrospective. He did not ask the Committee or the House, by passing this clause, to pay any of the arrears which might be claimed by pensioned policemen on account of the pension they had lost between their retirement and the present time. It would be observed that he had so framed the clause that the pensioners would not be entitled to any addition to their present pensions except from the time of the passing of this Act. The clause would place the old pensioners *in futuro* on the same footing as those who were lucky enough to resign after the 1st of August, 1874. He desired to press on the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary—whose feelings of propriety and justice they could rely on having fair play—not to pooh-pooh this matter. It had been looked upon as a grievance, not only by the old pensioners who had suffered, but by the members of the existing Force, who were of opinion that their comrades had not been treated fairly. The Government had now an opportunity of making a graceful concession to the Constabulary of Ireland, who as a body were deserving of every praise. They had received much at the hands of these men of late, and the Committee now had an opportunity of remedying an old grievance under circumstances which had never existed before. There were not many hon. Members representing Irish constituencies present; but that fact was owing to this Bill having come on at so late an hour. If it had come on earlier, and Irish Members had been aware that this simple act of justice was about to be sought, he had no doubt it would have been possible to have obtained the attendance of very many more.

New Clause:—

(Calculation of pensions of persons who retired before the passing of the Act of 1874.)

"All persons who, previous to the coming into operation of 'The Constabulary (Ireland) Act, 1874,' retired from service in the Royal Irish Constabulary, are hereby declared to be entitled, as from the date of the passing of this Act, to have the superannuations or pensions granted to them respectively under the provisions of the Act passed in the Session of Parliament held in the ninth and eleventh years of Her present Majesty, entitled 'An Act to regulate the superannuation allowances of the Constabulary Force in Ireland, and of the Dublin Metropolitan Police,' calculated upon the scale or rate of pay of which they were respectively in receipt at the respective dates of their retirement,"—(*Mr. Lewis,*)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. T. A. DICKSON said, that though, as the hon. Member who had preceded him had pointed out, there were not many Irish Members present, he believed that all those who were in attendance would vote for the clause, and he did hope it would receive the favourable consideration of Her Majesty's Government. To his own knowledge, the question had been before the House for the past eight or nine years, and there could be no doubt that these old Constabulary officers had a substantial grievance, an opportunity for redressing which now presented itself. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) had explained the whole circumstances of the case; and, after his explanation, he (Mr. Dickson) hoped the very moderate demand which was made on behalf of the old policemen would be acceded to. He hoped the Government would yield to the representations which had been made to them, and allow the clause to be inserted in the Bill.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he would merely add one word to the statement of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) as to the grievances of these officers. It was charged by some of these officers—and certainly there seemed to be considerable ground for it—that many of them had been kept on previous to the passing of the Act of 1874 beyond their usual time for retiring, while the provisions of the Act were being considered, and that then they had been suddenly shelved within a few days of the passing of the Act. It certainly had seemed as though they were shelved in order to prevent them from obtaining the advantage of the improved scale of pensions. He himself had had two pensioners on his demesne. They had retired within six months of each other; their period of service was the same; and yet, whilst one received £72 a-year, the other, who had retired before the passing of the Act of 1874, only received £40.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that hitherto the men had been refused any redress, and from what he could gather very justly so, seeing that they had no grievance. The alleged grievance of the ex-constables whose case the Committee were considering was that they were in a rather worse position than another class of pensioners. They did not allege that the Government had not kept faith with them, and had not fulfilled their contract so far as they themselves were concerned; but what they complained of was that another class of pensioners were in a better position than they. They had got their contract; and, that being so, he did not think they had any cause for complaint. Because some men got far more than enough, it did not follow that those men who got just enough should have an addition made to their pensions.

Mr. FINDLATER said, there were several pensioners in the county he represented (Monaghan) who were in a position similar to that of the men referred to by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), and he thought they had a substantial grievance. Those constables who retired after the passing of the Act of 1847 had their pensions calculated on an increased scale, whilst those who retired before had theirs calculated on the old scale. This was scarcely fair, as the members of the Metropolitan Police, who were in a similar position, had received more favourable treatment.

Colonel COLTHURST said, he hoped the Government would see their way to making a concession in this matter. The point to Members of the Committee was a very trifling one; but it was a very great one to those whose interests were affected.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he was sorry to be obliged to take an attitude which would destroy, to a certain extent, the harmony which had hitherto existed in regard to this Bill; but he was sorry to say that he had very seldom listened to a debate with more certainty that he was bound to take a particular course, and one adverse to the views of many hon. Members, than he felt on this occasion. It was quite true that the amount involved was not large as compared with some of the enormous sums with which they had been dealing so freely to-night; but the principle was very serious, indeed he believed it was the most serious that had ever been submitted to the House. It was, that when a man had done his service, and had retired under the conditions that were in force at the time, should his position be made a subject of revision by Parliament? The facts of the case had been put before the Committee very clearly. The Act of 1847 created a very liberal scale of pensions. Then came the Act of 1866, which added to the pay of the police; and it was enacted that the men who had been appointed in 1866 should be pensioned under the Act of 1847. That, he might roughly say, was the provision which had been introduced into the present Act with regard to pension as compared with pay. Then came another great rise of pay in 1874, and, unfortunately, as he thought, in that year Parliament was not so vigilant to observe the right principle in dealing with these matters. In a moment of weakness it was decided that all the men then in the Force should be entitled by the Act of Parliament to be pensioned on the scale of pensions according to the pay to which they had become entitled. He must say that men who were pensioned on the full pay of 1874 received a pension very much larger than should have been given in order to attract men of a certain class into the Service of the Crown. The hon. Member for Londonderry, who had advocated the claims of these men with great fidelity, told them there was a mistake in the Act of 1866. No doubt, there was a mistake; but it was one eight years later on, and in accepting the clause of the hon. Member they would be making that mistake greater still. The discontent of these men came not, as he maintained, from their having been badly used themselves, but because a certain number of men who came after them, but who came before the men the Committee were now dealing with, were well used in a most exceptional manner. The men who retired before 1866 did not get the 1866 scale of pay in computing pensions; whereas the men who retired after 1874 got the 1874 scale of pay in the computation. That there was an inequality no one could deny; but he did not see that it constituted an injustice, because the men were not in the Force now. The pensions awarded them were according to the law which was in force when they retired, and it could not be made inequitable; and he did not see that it could be made unjust by any subsequent transaction. If there was any inherent injustice in the Act of 1866, that ought to have been pointed out at the time; and the Act of 1874 should not have been waited for, before it was shown that injustice had been done to the men who came under the operation of the Act of 1866. He would ask hon. Members to reflect on the enormous number of public servants, civil, naval, and military, who were in receipt of pensions under a great variety of Acts, and to consider how wide and large a door they were opening when they began to consider the position of those servants who retired under Acts less favourable than Acts which had since been introduced. It was not a question of 200 or 300 men, but of hundreds of thousands of men; it was not a question of £2,000 or £3,000 a-year, but a question, if this principle was admitted, of millions. If there was any matter in which it was necessary to have a Statute of Limitations, it seemed to him to be the condition of men who left the service of the Crown. It was with great regret that he was obliged to turn a deaf ear to appeals made from both sides of the House; and he asked hon. Members to consider, if this Motion was pressed to a division, that they would be voting not only for a small concession, but for a large and a dangerous principle.

MR. COURTNEY said, he thought that, upon the matter of principle, nothing could be added to the lucid argument of the Chief Secretary; but he wished to submit a point which would probably settle this question. This was a proposal to extend to certain persons, who had retired from the Police Force as far back as 1874, the benefit of certain provisions. The men in question were not in the Force, and he apprehended that an Act of Parliament involving a charge of money could not go beyond the provisions of the Resolution of the Committee upon which that Act was founded, and that the Resolution upon which the Act was founded was one making an increase in the pay and pensions of members of the Constabulary. That limited the scope of the Act founded upon the Resolution; and, therefore, as he took it, this clause was outside the powers of the Committee. It could not be inserted in the Bill under those circumstances.

MR. CALLAN rose to a point of Order. The point he raised was that the title of the Bill was—"A Bill to amend the Laws relating to the Pay and Pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Police Force of Dublin Metropolis; and for other purposes;" and it was upon that title that leave to bring it in was given, and, as he had more than once heard it ruled, that Order for Leave covered the object of a Bill. He, therefore, submitted that the words "and for other purposes" covered the clause proposed by the hon. Member for Londonderry, and disposed of the argument of the economical Secretary to the Treasury.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN held that these men were practically members of the Constabulary, as they received Constabulary pensions.

MR. WARTON said, he thought the objection of the Secretary to the Treasury was a most narrow one. There were no words whatever prescribing men now existing in the Force. That might be in the mind of the Financial Secretary; but, upon that principle, the pensions of any men might be dropped at any moment, because they were no longer in the Force. The question was not whether a man was actually serving in the Force, or had retired from the Service.

MR. PLUNKET, on the point of Order, begged to draw attention to the concluding words of the Resolution referred to—

> "And that it is expedient to amend the Act for regulating the Constabulary and Police in Ireland."

He thought this Amendment was sustainable under those words.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I shall not be able to answer these questions if they are raised at once.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR pointed out, in confirmation of the opinions expressed, that the proposal of the hon. Member did not go beyond the purposes of the Bill. This was pointed out by the Chief Secretary, a few evenings ago, in defence of Section (*c*) of Clause 7, which provided that persons who did anything calculated to disturb the public peace should be deprived of their pensions. These pensioners held their pensions on the condition of assisting in the detection of crime—that was, still fulfilling a portion of the duties of policemen; and their pensions could be withdrawn if they did not fulfil those duties, which were essentially police duties. Therefore, the hon. and gallant Member for the County of Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) was right in saying that these men were still practically in the Police Force. The Chief Secretary had founded upon their having ceased to be in the Force his objection, but they still continued to be police constables; and, therefore, any proposal with regard to them came legally, equitably, and literally under the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the observation of the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) as to the title of a Bill, no doubt that would be correct if it were an ordinary Bill; but in a Money Bill the circumstances are different, and do not apply. So far as I am able to form a judgment, it is this. I do not think that the men who have retired from the Police Force can be considered any longer members of the Force, and I observe that they are described in the clause. The Resolution on which the Bill is founded applies to certain members of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Force; and certainly this clause relates to persons who, in my opinion, are not members of those Forces; and, therefore, I am of opinion that this is a clause which cannot properly be submitted.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, these men were called Constabulary pensioners; and he gave Notice that, on the first opportunity, he should bring the case of these men before the House.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE gave Notice that, on Report, he should, if he had the power, move the insertion of a clause in respect to these pensioners.

Mr. CALLAN rose to move a new clause, which, he said, arose in consequence of what he believed to be a Departmental Rule. If a member of the Police Force was so studious and intelligent as to become fitted to pass a competitive examination, no Departmental Rule which had not the sanction of the House should bar his progress or his promotion to another branch of the Service. It happened that lately, and especially in the last year, the Constabulary authorities in Dublin had absolutely prohibited some of the young and most deserving and intelligent officers from entering examinations for other Departments of the Civil Service, and that had given great offence. In Scotland some young men went to a University for half-a-year, and in the other half they laboured to earn what they could to enable them to do that. In the same way, in Ireland, where there were no Universities of a cheap character, as in Scotland, young men being obliged to enter the Police Force for maintenance, educated themselves and entered for the examinations. The Departmental Rule had, however, forbidden them to do that, and the object of his new clause was to remove that prohibition. He thought that was a clause which would commend itself to the good feeling of the Committee; and he anticipated not only acceptance, but cordial endorsement, from one who had so identified himself with competitive examinations as the Chief Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN: This clause is altogether beyond the title of the Bill, which relates to pay and pensions.

Mr. CALLAN said, he had no wish to delay the Bill; but, in consequence of that ruling, he would move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he hoped the hon. Member would withdraw the Motion, after he had given him an assurance that he would look into this question with considerable interest. He understood that this Departmental Rule had been laid down to discourage members of the Constabulary and Police, who had obtained the advantages of the instruction which could be gained in the schools of the Service, from utilizing that to get into other branches of the Service. He would look into the matter, and he hoped that promise would satisfy the hon. Member.

MR. CALLAN said, he would accept the right hon. Gentleman's assurance, and withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule 1.

MR. BIGGAR said, the next Amendment was in his name, and it had reference to the standard of pay. He thought the rates of pay, on the whole, too high; and he would ask whether the Chief Secretary did not also think so?

Amendment proposed, in page 11, line 5, to leave out "40*s*." and insert "35*s*."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That '40*s*.' stand part of the Schedule."

MR. TREVELYAN said, he did not wish to raise the wrath of the hon. Member by questions of Order; but he must draw attention to the fact that the Resolution declared it to be expedient to authorize the payment of money to increase the pay of certain members of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and he was afraid the hon. Member's Amendment would have a very different effect, because not only did he propose to diminish considerably the amount of pay which the Government proposed, but also to largely reduce the pay which the men at present received. A head constable at present got 38*s*., and the Government proposed to give him 40*s*., while the hon. Member proposed to reduce the amount to 35*s*. A constable at the head of his rank now got 28*s*., the Government proposed to make it 31*s*., but the hon. Member proposed to reduce it to 25*s*.; and while the Government proposed to increase a constable's pay from 24*s*. to 27*s*., the hon. Member proposed to reduce it to 20*s*. The hon. Member wished to raise two points; one, the amount of pay required to attract the right sort of men; and the other, the question whether, in a particular rank, the pay was in proportion to the length of service. As to the first point, the Bill was entirely founded on the theory that a distinct and solid increase of pay was requested. There was a charge brought against the Bill that the men in the lower ranks got no increase of pay; but he did not think that was a serious grievance with the men; but if it was considered a grievance, how much greater grievance would it be to the older men, when they were married and had families, and had given more of their lives to their country's service, if they did not get any substantial increase? As to the equalization of pay throughout the whole of each rank, he thought there was something to be said for it when they came to the upper ranks. He could easily imagine all constables having an average of pay, but that was not at all the case with the other large class which at present went under the name of sub-constables; and here he would call attention to the criticism of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) this evening. The hon. and learned Member said the old nomenclature was still retained in the Schedule, and altered it elsewhere. That alteration only took place on the 1st of October; and as this Bill, he hoped, would be passed on the 1st of June, it was proper to retain the old names. In the class of sub-constables, it was most important that the men of 20 years' service should be decidedly better off than those of 12 years' service, and the men of 12 years' service better off than those of four, three, or two years' service. The former men belonged to the older class; they were not likely to rise to the higher ranks; they were solid, respectable men, and they looked for comfort for themselves and their families. It was important that they should be kept contented by a marked increase of wages, and by pensions, which would give them a hope of increasing prosperity. Under all these circumstances he could not accept the Amendment.

MR. BIGGAR said, he would withdraw this Amendment, and would not move any of the other Amendments in his name.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

Schedule 2.

MR. WARTON said, he proposed an Amendment which he hoped the Government would accept, as it came, he thought, within the scope of the Bill. He did not think the Secretary to the Treasury would object to it on the ground of technicality, with regard to the terms of the Resolution or to the terms of the Bill, which was clearly a Bill for providing pensions for the members of the Constabulary. The matter was partly arithmetical, and partly one of principle. If they had a scale of going up to 50 it was awkward to introduce two-thirds; and if they divided the unit into fiftieth parts, and wanted to take two-thirds of that, two-thirds would be 33 and two-thirds of 50. As to principle, in some cases there might be men who retained their physical vigour for 30 years sufficiently to act well as constables. Some men were stronger than others. Some matured more rapidly than others; but, suppose they considered 25 years as a fair term of service, still there might be men who could go on for five years longer than the average, and he held that 30 years was not a very long time for a man to retain his vigour and activity. He might go into the Force at 20 and be a good man at 50, while another might drop off at 25.

Amendment proposed, in page 12, line 7, to leave out "two-thirds," and insert "seven-tenths."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he could not assent to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member. In a matter of this kind it was absolutely impossible for anyone, even the Member of the Government in charge of the Bill, off-hand to disregard the recommendations which had been made by a Committee which had gone into the matter at very great length, which had taken the opinion of actuaries, and likewise the opinion of the members of the Force. The hon. and learned Member had said that if they were to go up by fiftieths in the last year the men would have a broken fraction. There was, however, one strong reason for sticking to the figure which was named in the Bill; and that was that the maximum pension in all the other branches of the Civil Service was two-thirds of the salary. It was recognized by everybody as the pension which a Civil servant always looked forward to. If a pension was given of any larger amount it was only given in consequence of special services, and the grant of the pension must be specially reported to the House of Commons. He trusted the hon. and learned Member would not press the Amendment.

Mr. WARTON said, the right hon. Gentleman had not met his objection in any way. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of actuaries; but they were all more or less actuaries, and they could perceive the absurdity of the fraction. It was perfectly absurd, when they went up by fiftieths, to have such a fraction as two-thirds. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would agree to insert the words "seven-tenths" as a means of meeting the difficulty.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. BIGGAR proposed to leave out lines 36 and 37 in page 12. Those lines ran as follows:—

"(*c.*) If he has completed more than fifteen years' service, an annual sum not more than his annual pay."

Those lines did not seem to him to agree with other parts of the Bill. If a man had completed nine years' service he was only entitled to 15-50ths of his annual pay; but if he had completed six years more he was entitled to full pay. If he had completed any service under 15 years he was only entitled to two-fifths. According to the sub-section, he now moved to omit, if a man had spent 16 years in the Service he was entitled to his full pay. It appeared to him that the proportion between the two sections was quite out of harmony; and he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that he should either substantially raise the rate of pension given under sub-sections (*a*) and (*b*), or very much lower the pension given under sub-section (*c*).

Amendment proposed, in page 12, to leave out lines 36 and 37.—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY said, a line must be drawn somewhere. Fifteen years did not appear to be a very long service for a man to get a pension which might, under certain circumstances, be equal to his pay; but if a man was wholly incapacitated on account of the amount of service and hardship he had gone through he was entitled to some substantial recognition. The hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Biggar's) attention had not, perhaps, been drawn to the words of the sub-section (*c*) of Section 4 of the Schedule—namely—

> "If he has completed more than fifteen years' service, an annual sum not more than his annual pay."

MR. BIGGAR said, the hon. and learned Gentleman had not made it clear that the two sections were in harmony. A man would only get, under sub-section (*c*) of the 2nd section of the Schedule, 15-50ths of his annual pay; but if he served 15 years, or six years more, he would get full pay.

MR. TREVELYAN said, the question of pension had many sides to it. Fifteen years' service served as a minimum, after which, in ordinary cases, a man could obtain a pension. Up to 15 years' service it might roughly be said that a man, when he retired from the Police Force, only obtained a gratuity; but after 15 years' service he became eligible for a pension. That was the reason why only 20-50ths was given up to the period of 15 years' service. It must not be imagined that after 15 years' service a man who was injured in the Service, either accidentally or in a fight, or when arresting a prisoner, would necessarily receive a sum equal to his annual pay. That was only the maximum which was named in the case of any brilliant service, accompanied by some terrible incapacity. That was proved by the words which followed the sub-section the hon. Member proposed to omit—namely—

> "Provided that if he has completed fifteen years' service the pension shall not be less than the sum to which he is entitled under article one of this Schedule."

Those words clearly showed the intention of the Bill, which was that the pension which was given might, under certain circumstances, fall below that to which a man would be entitled under ordinary conditions, if it were not for the Schedule. Those regulations had been taken from the existing London scale. In the case of London it had been found that the power of giving a very large pension in most exceptional cases had not been abused; and, from what he had observed of the manner in which pensions were awarded in the Royal Irish Constabulary, he did not think such a power would be abused in that body. He did not think there was any serious danger to the public Exchequer in allowing the Irish Constabulary to be put, in regard to pension, upon what was now called the English scale.

MR. BIGGAR asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. WARTON said, that, before the Amendment was withdrawn, he wished to remark that he quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that a man who had done some brilliant action and sustained some terrible incapacity could be granted a pension equal to his full pay. That, however, was a breaking of the cast-iron rule of two-thirds. It was a very proper infringement of the rule, he admitted; but it showed that the rule was not so binding as the right hon. Gentleman had tried to make out.

MR. TREVELYAN said, the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) had studied the Bill so carefully, and had conducted his opposition to it so courteously, that he hoped he might be excused for rising to offer another argument which, when speaking a few moments ago, he forgot, and which, probably, was the most important argument which could be used on this most critical part of the Bill. The man they were now speaking of was a man about whom there were no brilliant or special circumstances which would exempt him from the rule of two-thirds. The man had very likely been a brave young officer, who had every chance of being promoted, serving his full time, and retiring on a full pension. If, by the performance of an act of gallantry, he was incapacitated, it was but right the authorities should have the power of awarding him such a pension as he would have received had he been able to complete his time.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. BIGGAR moved to leave out lines 27 to 32, inclusive, in page 13. The paragraph he wished to omit was as follows:—

> "Where, on account of the infirmity of mind or body of a constable having been brought about or been contributed to by his own default or by his vicious habits, the pension granted to such constable is of less amount than that to which he would otherwise be entitled, the diminution of such pension shall not exceed *five-fiftieths* of the annual pay of such constable."

He could not imagine any argument that the Chief Secretary could advance in favour of such a paragraph. It seemed to him that one-tenth of a constable's pay was so small an amount to allow for pension that he might as well have nothing at all. Personally, he did not think that a man who had misconducted himself, and therefore rendered himself unable to perform his duties, deserved any pension at all.

Amendment proposed, in page 13, to leave out sub-section (7).—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the sub-section."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 70; Noe 1: Majority 69.—(Div. List., No. 114.)

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he had an Amendment to propose to the Schedule, to the effect that—

> "The Lord Lieutenant may grant, out of money voted by Parliament, a sum not exceeding twenty pounds to any head or other constable who, at the time of his discharge on pension, may have completed a service of twenty-five years without an unfavourable record."

He begged to move this Amendment. It might not be acceptable to the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy), owing to the fact that it contained the words "unfavourable record;" but, whether or no, the object in view was a good one.

The CHAIRMAN: I may save the hon. and gallant Member some trouble by at once saying that I cannot put this Amendment, as it goes beyond the terms of the Resolution upon which the Bill is founded, which relates to pay and pensions, and not to gratuities.

Amendment proposed, in page 14, line 4, to leave out from "or" to "and," in line 5, inclusive.—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he could not accept this Amendment, as it would effect a serious reduction in the pensions proposed to be given to the families of these constables—a reduction of £4, £5, or £6 a-year out of the small sum the Bill proposed to grant, and which was one of the advantages in the measure looked to with satisfaction.

Mr. BIGGAR said, his Amendment would make the Bill more consistent. If the right hon. Gentleman would undertake to strike out the earlier part of the sub-section he would withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. WARTON said, the Committee should consider, in the first place, whether the clause came within the terms of the Resolution, the Chairman having stated that that proposed by the hon. and gallant Member for County Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) did not. Let them consider whether widows and children were members of the Police Force.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. BIGGAR said, the next Amendment of which he had given Notice was on the same principle; and, seeing that they had not divided on the former, he did not see any use in moving the next.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he wished to move an Amendment on the question of pensions, to the effect that the Lord Lieutenant have power to make grants for the support of the parents of constables and policemen killed whilst in the execution of their duty. A case occurred only the other day where a constable was killed by the discharge of a double-barrelled gun—a bad weapon supplied by Her Majesty's Government, and the man's parents, who had been depending on him, were left entirely without support.

The CHAIRMAN: This Amendment also will not come within the terms of the Resolution, and cannot, therefore, be put.

Mr. BIGGAR having addressed a further question to the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant,

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the object the hon. Member sought to attain was secured in the Bill as it stood. Under sub-section (*a*), the pensions were calculated on the amount of the annual pay. Presumably, that annual pay had been the same for the last three years. Under sub-section (*c*), the constable whose annual pay had been raised during the past three years had had his pension calculated on the average of three years. Therefore, so far as he (Mr. Trevelyan) could follow the hon. Member's object, it was already secured by the Bill.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that sub-section (*c*) only applied to constables who became members of the Force after the present time. What would be the effect of sub-section (*d*)?

MR. TREVELYAN said, the effect of sub-section (*d*) would be pretty much the same as the effect of sub-section (*c*).

Schedule *agreed to.*

Question put, "That this be the Preamble of the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I wish to ask, Mr. Chairman, where the Preamble will come in, as you have put it before the whole of the Schedules?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was not the Question I intended to put. The Question is, "That Schedule 3 be added to the Bill."

Schedules 3 and 4 *agreed to.*

Question proposed, "That this be the Preamble of the Bill."

MR. CALLAN said, he wished to put a question to the Chief Secretary. This Bill was founded upon the Report of a Royal Commission or Committee of Inquiry; but, unfortunately, it did not deal with one portion of the inquiry. It did not deal with the promotion of discipline in the Force. Many complaints connected with the discipline of the men had been made of late, yet that vexed question was not touched by the Bill. The question had disturbed the Constabulary very much, and had, in no small degree, militated against its efficiency. There were one or two Amendments in connection with this subject which he had placed before the Chairman, but which the hon. Gentleman had declined to accept, although there were clauses in the Bill—notably the 12th clause—which had no more to say to pay and pensions than his Amendments. On Report he would follow the example of the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel King-Harman), who had intimated his intention of raising a question on matters he was not allowed to submit in the form of Amendments to the Committee. Would the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Trevelyan), at an early stage, bring in a Bill to deal with the discipline of the Constabulary, or give some assurance with regard to it? The question of discipline was one which affected the efficiency of the Force more than the question of pay and pensions. The sectarian character of the appointments amongst the officials in Dublin came under this head—the Sub-Inspectors, County Inspectors. The grievance was that Catholics were not promoted in due course. That was one matter to which he wished to call attention, and another was with reference to the Report of the Committee of Inquiry as to promotions to the office of Sub-Inspector. There was not the slightest doubt that all the efficiency of the Dublin Police, and a great portion of that of the Irish Constabulary, was dependent on the officering of the Force.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. Member for Louth is entitled, by the indulgence of the Committee, to ask any question of the right hon. Gentleman on this Bill; but he is not entitled to go into arguments, or develop his observations upon general questions affecting the condition of the Constabulary.

MR. CALLAN said, the question he wished to ask was, whether the right hon Gentleman was prepared to give an assurance to the Committee that, for the future, the promotion would not be a quarter from the ranks, but would be a half?

MR. TREVELYAN said, no; he was not prepared to give an assurance on that point. It would be a change of the greatest importance, and one which, he must own, from reasons he could hardly give at this moment, would be extremely dubious in its nature. Many questions arose on this matter; and he thought that, on the whole, the proportion, as it existed, was a good one.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

LAND IMPROVEMENT AND ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND) BILL.

(*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

[BILL 189.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred till Thursday next."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he wished to ask the Financial Secretary (Mr. Courtney) if he could make any statement as to when the measure was likely to be printed? It was first to have been printed before the Whitsuntide Recess; then it was to have been printed during that Vacation; but it had not yet made its appearance. Many Members were anxious to see it in print.

MR. COURTNEY replied, that no Members were more anxious than he was to see the Bill in circulation. It had been found necessary to consult many authorities in regard to it, and that had caused considerable delay. He thought that most probably it would be in the hands of Members by Thursday.

Motion *agreed to.*

Second Reading *deferred* till *Thursday* next.

LORD ALCESTER'S ANNUITY BILL.

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone.*)

[BILL 145.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BIGGAR said the Amendments now being inserted were only formal—the whole stage appeared to be formal—therefore he did not object.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON wished to know when the next stage of the Bill would be taken? He presumed it would not be taken on Monday.

MR. COURTNEY replied, that it would not be taken on Monday.

Bill *reported;* to be *printed,* as amended [Bill 207]; *re-committed* for *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

FOREST OF DEAN (HIGHWAYS) BILL.

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "To nominate the Select Committee on the Forest of Dean (Highways) Bill—Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, Colonel KINGSCOTE, Lord MORETON, Mr. SOTHERON ESTCOURT, and Mr. COURTNEY, and Four by the Committee of Selection:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum."

MR. CALLAN: I object.

MR. SPEAKER: According to the Standing Order, the hon. Member cannot object to the Motion being made. The Half-Past Twelve Rule does not apply to Motions of this kind.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (NO. 10) (LEEDS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to the Borough of Leeds, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Sir CHARLES DILKE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 206.]

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 1st *June,* 1883.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Lands Clauses (Umpire)* (71); Local Government (Gas) Provisional Order* (72); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3)* (73); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4)* (74).

Committee — Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment (61-70).

Committee—Report—Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders* (60); Poor Law Conferences* (65).

NAVAL DISCIPLINE AND ENLISTMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 61.)

(*The Earl of Northbrook.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

House in Committee accordingly.

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Abolition of corporal punishment and solitary confinement).

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH, in moving, in page 1, lines 15 and 16, to leave out ("corporal punishment or,") and, in line 17, after ("repealed,") insert—

> ("Corporal punishment may be inflicted by sentence of a court-martial for the following offences:—(1.) Striking a superior officer; (2.) Mutiny; (3.) An unnatural offence; (4.) Theft,")

said, all naval officers who had mixed with blue jackets as he had done must be actuated by kindly and almost affectionate sentiments towards them. Therefore, nothing but a strong sense of duty could lead any officer to wish for the retention of corporal punishment. His opinions on the subject were shared by, perhaps, a large majority of the officers who took command of Her Majesty's ships, and who were experienced in the Service. He held that the retention of corporal punishment in certain cases was absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the Service; and he felt sure that in a general war the Admiralty would have to resort to it in extreme cases. Flogging in the Army had been abolished by law; but the Admiralty had assumed the responsibility of causing the punishment to cease in the Navy without having a Parliamentary sanction for so doing. The Articles of War, which were under an Act of Parliament, had never been repealed, and were still in force in the Navy. The noble Earl opposite stated the other night that there had been a considerable increase of such offences as striking superior officers. That was an offence which, when he entered the Service, was regarded with a degree of horror that the expressions of the noble Earl the other night appeared not to support. Such offences were formerly considered to be the most serious that a seaman could commit. Men who committed them were liable to be sentenced to death, and in all cases flogging was immediately inflicted for such offences. He would not say anything with respect to the third class of offences, which every now and then appeared on board ship. But theft, he believed, had, since the abolition of flogging, considerably increased in the Navy. There was a good deal of property on board ship belonging to sailors who had no lock-ups, and no facilities for protecting their goods. He could not understand why a power which was exercised by magistrates on land should not be intrusted to officers on board ship. Still, he admitted that there would be great difficulty to re-establish corporal punishment after it had been done away both in the Navy and in the Army. If naval officers had been consulted, he did not think corporal punishment would have been entirely abolished. Sir William Martin had in a pamphlet urged the authorities not to take a step, by abolishing all corporal punishment, which would materially affect the efficiency of the Navy. What punishment could be substituted? In time of war, was there always to be a vessel in attendance to carry home prisoners to be tried and sentenced? When men were flogged they ceased to think anything about it after a few days, and suffered no degradation like that which was entailed by imprisonment and the society of criminals. He therefore protested against the proposal.

Amendment *moved*,

In page 1, lines 15 and 16, leave out ("corporal punishment or,") and in line 17, after ("repealed,") insert ("corporal punishment may be inflicted by sentence of a court-martial for the following offences:—(1.) Striking a superior officer; (2.) Mutiny; (3.) An unnatural offence; (4.) Theft.")—(*The Viscount Sidmouth.*)

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he was willing to admit that in theory it was desirable to do away with corporal punishment; but they must look at the matter as practical men, and if flogging were abolished in the Navy he asked what punishment the Government would substitute for it, and what they proposed to do with the culprits? If, for instance, a sailor struck an officer in the Pacific, what would be done with the culprit? He should like to know how discipline would be maintained in the Navy? If discipline was not maintained it would be a serious thing for the Service. For his own part, he failed to see what effective punishment short of flogging could be inflicted for the worst class of offences.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK said, he agreed with the noble Viscount (Viscount Sidmouth) that it would hardly be possible now to restore corporal punishment in the Navy. It was no longer a practical question to discuss whether it was wise a few years ago to do away with corporal punishment. It had been done, and now they must deal with the subject as practical men; and, so dealing with it, it would be quite impossible, in his (the Earl of Northbrook's) opinion, after the expression of opinion in the country and in the other House of Parliament, to retain corporal punishment in the Navy. It should be remembered that their Lordships, almost without discussion, agreed to abolish this punishment in the Army; and, looking at that fact, and that it had, by Orders, been practically abolished in the Navy, this Amendment should not be accepted. There could be no doubt that some offences were of a most serious kind, and must be dealt with; but the best mode of dealing with them was to give increased power of inflicting punishment in other forms. He was sorry the noble Viscount had misunderstood some words which he had spoken the other night. He had said nothing to imply that striking a superior officer was a trifling offence. But it should be remembered that the term "superior officer" was used in a different sense on board ship from the usually-accepted meaning. It included petty officers. What he did wish to point out was that striking an officer was a different offence from mutiny, and was treated separately from mutiny in the Naval Discipline Act. If the present Board of Admiralty had erred in making recommendations to courts martial not to award corporal punishment, they had erred in very good company, because a similar course had been adopted by successive Boards of Admiralty. There had been very few cases of corporal punishment in the Navy—two or three at the most—during the last six or seven years. As to the remarks of the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset), he could only say that there had been no substitute so effective, in certain cases, as corporal punishment. There could, he feared, be no question that since the abolition of such punishment certain grave offences had seriously increased in the Navy. The punishment, however, had practically ceased to exist, and it was only right that the law should be assimilated to the practice. On the whole, this was a practical question; and whatever might be said upon the merits, nevertheless, having regard to the state of public opinion and the circumstances in which they were placed, he submitted that the Government had done rightly in bringing the clause before their Lordships in its present shape.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, that he must enter his protest against the line of policy adopted by the First Lord of the Admiralty. The noble Lord himself believed that corporal punishment was the most effective method of maintaining discipline, and yet he was prepared to erase it altogether. The arguments on the other side would be all very well if it were proposed to make it compulsory to use corporal punishment; but it was recommended only as an alternative punishment. His noble Friend behind him proposed, not that they should adopt the practice generally, but that they should leave the power to be used at the discretion of the superior officer in certain grave cases of emergency. Than that proposal nothing could be fairer. The First Lord had said nothing, for example, with reference to the crime of theft, and not one word about unnatural offences. It was argued that corporal punishment ought to be done away with, on the ground that it was degrading to the subject upon whom it was executed; but when they came to such an offence as an unnatural offence, it was absurd to argue on the ground of degradation, the offence itself being the most degrading and bestial that could be conceived.

Lord DENMAN said, he would certainly vote for the Amendment of the noble Viscount; and he wished to add drunkenness as No. 5 to the list of offences for which corporal punishment might be inflicted. No adequate substitute had been found for it, and imprisonment could not safely be carried out on board ship or abroad. There had been in the Army the case of a man who was brought home in a ship to be imprisoned in England; he had been guilty of drunkenness and looting in Egypt. He, with other prisoners, had broken into the spirit receptacle on board, and had been so drunk that even the stomach-pump could not relieve him, and he died; but if that man could have been flogged in Egypt his life would have been saved.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that he quite admitted it was very alarming to ignorant laymen like the noble Earl who spoke last but one and himself, when they heard professional men like the noble and gallant Viscount (Viscount Sidmouth) and the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset), who had had so much experience, say that a step had been taken which would be fatal to the discipline of the Navy; but he owned he was a little hardened to this alarm. He remembered being told a fact by a most distinguished gentleman, whom their Lordships all remembered, the gallant Admiral who was so long Black Rod in this House, and it was one which a good deal exercised him at the time. Admiral Clifford told him that when he was first put in command of a vessel, every time the men were sent up aloft, the last man who came down was flogged. The gallant Admiral was so horrified at this, that he made a representation to the Admiralty, and the proceeding was put an end to. When the change came to be known his brother officers declared that the step would be utterly fatal to the smartness of the British Navy, and the gallant Admiral experienced no little unpopularity for a certain time. That was a fact which was impressive and suggestive. He owned, as an ignorant layman, he had confidence in the post captains of this country; and he believed they would be able to maintain the discipline of their ships without flogging, as much as the French, the Germans, the Italians, and the Russians were able to do under similar circumstances.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH wished to point out that the action of the late Administration had been only to diminish the number of lashes, still leaving the power to inflict corporal punishment.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he would appeal to the noble and galland Viscount to consider what he meant to do. There was no doubt what the House of Commons would do if they inserted this Amendment in the Bill. He was not now discussing the question as a political one, but simply as a matter concerning the proceedings of the House. It did not seem desirable that the House should adopt Amendments, on a question of this gravity, unless they were prepared to go through with them. Was the noble and gallant Viscount prepared to reject the Bill?—because that would be the inevitable result if he adhered to the Amendment. For himself, he was very much of the noble and gallant Viscount's opinion, and, he gathered, the opinion also of the First Lord of the Admiralty, as to the importance and the power of punishment by flogging; but, considering what they had seen with respect to the infliction of that punishment in the other branch of the Service, he could not say, looking at the matter merely as a political spectator, that there seemed the slightest chance, for the present, of retaining the punishment of flogging in the Navy. Whether that was a desirable result he did not know; but the blame must be laid on our political institutions, and on the present aspect of public opinion. The public might get wiser. They might have some sharp reminder of the facts: they might some day be taught that this mealy-mouthed and sentimental legislation was not the way to conduct the great Services of a great Empire. He did not think, however, that it was of very much use for them to make alterations in Bills of this kind. They would merely be prolonging the period of irritation without obtaining any practical result, and thus delay the period when the public might come to a wiser mind.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH said, he should certainly not press the Amendment to a division after the opinion expressed by the noble Marquess, but would content himself with entering his protest against the clause. He, however, could not help thinking the noble Marquess was wrong in the present instance.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH, in supporting the Amendment, said, there was no officer in either Service, unbiassed by political opinion, who personally approved of the entire abolition of corporal punishment, if he had held a command for even a very short period. The noble Earl the Leader of the House might as well have alluded to the time when men were executed for sheep-stealing as the obsolete custom of men being liable to corporal punishment for being the last to come down after being "mast-headed."

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 4 to 6, inclusive, *agreed to,* with Amendments.

Clause 7 (Amendment of s. 58 as to constitution of courts martial).

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH expressed a fear that the clause would have a tendency to restrict the power and exercise of reprimand by junior officers, especially as each case of reprimand would have to be reported to the Admiralty.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK said, that by the present law reprimand was administered by commanding officers only; but this clause of the Bill would give the power to officers of lower rank who might be in command. Instead of restricting the power, the clause extended it.

LORD ALCESTER said, there would be no ground for the fear entertained by the noble Viscount. A record of such cases of reprimand would only appear in the log book of a ship.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to,* with Amendments.

House *resumed.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Tuesday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 70.)

IRELAND—ARTERIAL DRAINAGE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD MONTEAGLE, in rising to call attention to the present state of the law regulating arterial drainage in Ireland, and to ask, Whether Her Majesty's Government would consider the propriety of modifying the existing system to suit the altered circumstances of the country with regard to the ownership and occupation of land? said, that it was unnecessary to remind their Lordships that this was an important question, and that it had been rendered more important still by recent events. One had only to look at the map, and at the peculiar nature of the country, to recognize its importance; and to him it was one of the most practical questions that could engage the attention of Parliament in relation to Ireland. He had endeavoured, on more than one occasion, to urge on the House, when considering remedial measures for the evils of that country, that there were practical questions that might have wide permanent influence on the course of events in the future. They had often discussed the question of emigration; and he had ventured to express the opinion that emigration, though of the greatest possible importance and necessity, could not be regarded as anything approaching the nature of a panacea for the evils of Ireland, or as likely to produce any permanent results, unless it was accompanied and enforced by other measures. This question of arterial drainage appeared to him to be one of those practical measures which were required for the development of the country when all had been done that could be expected from emigration. He was anxious to point out that the question was not brought before the House as a landlord's grievance, nor was it at all a question of a Party character. That being the case, it was the more deserving of the attention of their Lordships. Although the question was a very wide one, he should confine himself chiefly to a consideration of the smaller districts that would be affected. The principle that seemed to govern the whole history of the question was that corporate action was necessary in the public interests. By the Act of 1842 the power of initiating drainage schemes was given to the Board of Works. During the famine years, in order to relieve the distress, extended powers were given, and a number of schemes were carried out hastily. Then complaints arose among proprietors that the works were not properly carried out, and that they had not got value for their money; and by an Act of 1853 remissions were made of the sums that had been expended. In 1863 a new departure was made, and an Act was passed based upon the English Act of 1861, and giving the owners of property the power to form Drainage Boards, with the consent of two-thirds of those affected. In 1874 an alteration was made in the terms upon which money was lent. In 1878 the consents required were reduced to one-half the value, provided one-third of the owners did not dissent. All these changes showed that the subject had engaged a good deal of the attention of Parliament. The result of experience was to show that if individual initiative was to be depended upon in the future, it would no longer be that of the landlords. It might be possible to intrust the initiative to the tenants, in the same way that they could make improvements under the Land Act of 1881. Landlords were not likely to undertake drainage works in the future, or to co-operate with tenants in carrying them out. But occupiers would have a strong motive to do so, supposing they were likely to become owners of the soil. But, again, with a multiplicity of small owners, there might be difficulty in getting anything done, and then the only alternative would be to fall back upon some properly constituted local authority. He did not approve of the power being given to the Boards of Guardians, and he was not prepared with any suggestion; but the matter was sufficiently urgent to occupy the attention of the House, with the view of ascertaining whether the Government intended to consult other countries, in order to obtain information which would enable them to remedy the present deadlock.

The Earl of LONGFORD said, that a few months ago he reminded their Lordships that a recent change in the law would subject landowners to a larger proportion of the cost of drainage works than it had been originally intended they should bear. He had lately attended a meeting of a Drainage Board in Westmeath, formed some years ago. Its works were estimated to cost £42,000, as approved by the Board of Works engineer; and on this basis proprietors concerned had consented to the scheme, but they had cost nearly £100,000; and the result was that the district had been saddled with a charge of £5,000 a-year for 35 years, exclusive of a further charge for maintenance, amounting to nearly £1,000 a-year more. The works were finished, and the awards made, in 1881, when the Land Act came into operation. It was then found impossible to place the proper proportion of the charge upon the tenants, and the landlords had to bear a much heavier burden than they had contemplated. He thought this was a matter which the Government might fairly take into consideration, somewhat on the system on which it was understood that the Government incline to reduce the interest on loans advanced to railways. The noble Lord had mentioned some possible mode of action by a local authority, or by a Government Board, with reference to drainage; but he feared that, under the present tendency of legislation, the noble Lord's hopes would scarcely be realized.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, the question was certainly one of very considerable importance to the interests of Ireland; and he was glad to be able to inform his noble Friend (Lord Monteagle) that the Irish Government, fully recognizing that importance, had had for some time past the draft of a Bill under their consideration for dealing with the subject of arterial drainage in Ireland. The Bill had now nearly reached its complete form; and his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had informed him that he expected very soon to introduce it in the other House of Parliament. Its object was to consolidate and amend the Land Improvements Acts; and its provisions would cover the whole subject of drainage in Ireland—both farm drainage and the general arterial drainage of the country. As to what had been accomplished in the way of arterial drainage, the noble Lord knew that nearly all the great works of arterial drainage had been accomplished; but he (Lord Carlingford) was informed that there still remained a large number of minor, yet very useful and important, works which might be brought about. The hope was that the provisions of the Bill of which he spoke would adapt the law upon the subject more or less to the changed condition of affairs in Ireland consequent upon recent legislation, which had led his noble Friend (Lord Monteagle) to bring this matter before the House, and which also had inspired, as it so often did, his noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Longford). It would not be proper for him to go into any details of the Bill, which was not yet introduced; but the intention was to make certain changes, which, it was hoped, would render the working of the system of arterial drainage in future practicable, under the changed condition of things in Ireland. For instance, there was the question to be considered as to whether the assent of the tenants could not be in some way brought in in deciding these questions, so that the scheme would be binding upon them. There was also the important question of finding a means of charging upon the tenant a fair proportion of the drainage charge, which had hitherto been added to his rent. There was, as the noble Earl had implied, a doubt—and he did not know that it was more than a doubt, because legal opinion was divided upon it—whether, under the provisions of the Land Act of 1881, in any cases where a fair rent had been fixed by the Court, or by way of agreement, and registered in Court, it would be possible to impose a portion of the drainage charge by way of addition to that rent. The matter admitted of doubt; and it was proposed in the Bill to be introduced to clear that matter up. As to obtaining information of the mode of dealing with this question in other countries, he was endeavouring to obtain such information through the Foreign Office; but with respect to the Irish Government and the legislation to be promoted by them on the subject, he hoped that their Lordships would, before the end of the Session, have an opportunity of considering the Bill he had briefly described.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—COMPENSATIONS.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in rising to move for the Minutes of Evidence taken in Court, before the investigators, under the Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, and the Report upon which his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has awarded compensation to persons injured and to the families of persons who have been murdered, said, the Motion which he was about to make was one which he hoped Her Majesty's Government would agree to, because he thought it was all-important that their Lordships and the country should be thoroughly enlightened as to the state to which Ireland had been reduced; with a view, as far as possible, of preventing in the future the terrible crimes which had horrified the whole civilized world from the time the Peace Preservation Act was allowed to drop until the Crimes Act had become law. They had had information furnished to them by the newspapers, they had had debates in their Lordships' House, and in "another place," bearing upon this subject; but much as they knew through these sources of the state of anarchy, bloodshed, and terrorism, which existed in Ireland, from the summer of 1880 until the autumn of 1882, much as they had learnt from the extraordinary revelations made in the late trials which had taken place in Dublin, the evidence taken before the investigators, and their Reports, would throw a light upon the question compared with which every other information they might have received would be thrown into the shade. He was not moving for proceedings of the private inquiries which took place in Dublin Castle, but for the evidence taken in open Court, when the reporters of the newspapers were present. If the Government were satisfied to grant the Papers he required, their Lordships would be able to see the real effect of the Land League conspiracy, subsidized as it had been from America—because, unless it had been supported in America, it could not have existed for any length of time. They would be able to see how that conspiracy was mainly responsible for almost every outrage that had taken place; because, in reading over the evidence which had appeared in the newspapers, he found that nine times out of 10 the crime for which compensation had been claimed could be traced directly to the action of the Land League. The Land League, as Mr. Forster described it, had left its track in letters of blood. Their Lordships would also be able to see —in one respect, at any rate—the operation of the Crimes Act, and how necessary that Act had become, especially as regards the clause for compensation for injury to the person. A fresh light would be thrown upon the effect of this agitation if those Returns were granted, because he should be very much surprised if their Lordships did not find that the landlords who had been murdered were a very small minority of those for whom compensation was now being claimed; and that by far the larger portion of the real sufferers had been the peasantry themselves. He would not now allude to Mr. Forster's Coercion Act, because the powers granted under that measure were perfectly inefficient to cope with the anarchy which prevailed; and although, as Mr. Forster had told them, he had at one time locked up every possible murderer in prison—yet, as he could only keep them there for a time, and the country drifted from bad to worse, it required no words of his to prove that that measure was not framed in a manner calculated to render it efficient in re-asserting the law. One of the great causes of its failure was the fact that there was no clause provided for levying a fine upon a locality for injury to the person. It seemed to him an extraordinary fact that, while in ordinary times there was a law in Ireland enabling a charge to be placed upon a district by the Grand Jury of a county where malicious destruction of property or injury to animals might occur, there was no provision whatsoever, except under such an Act as was now in force—an Act which was only passed for a time, and for an exceptional state of affairs—to levy a fine upon a district where human beings might be murdered or mutilated. He was sorry to say that the history of Ireland showed, beyond doubt, that waves of crime of this description passed over it at stated intervals; and that even when things were in a settled condition outrages of this description occasionally took place. But there was a very great difference in the number of that class of outrage which had taken place during the time a Coercion Act had been in force with a provision in it such as he had referred to, and times when there had been no power of levying a fine for outrages to the person in the hands of the Executive. He thought that if their Lordships were able to read the evidence which he was moving for they would see that it was an absolute necessity that whenever the present Crimes Act came to an end, and things resumed a more settled condition in Ireland, the clause relating to compensation for injury to the person should be embodied in a Bill, and become the permanent law of the land. He could not see any argument which could be brought forward by which it could be proved that we should be able by law to compensate for the destruction or mutilation of animals, and by making people in a district pay, preserve the lives of and prevent cruelty to brute beasts, when we did not at the same time attempt, by carrying the principle a little further, to protect the lives and limbs of, and prevent hideous and ghastly cruelties being perpetrated upon, our own fellow-subjects. There was no doubt that a fine levied upon a district was an immense deterrent to crime of this description. In Ireland, unlike any other country in the world, a great part of the population in times of agitation seemed to unite in defying the law and meting out terrible retribution to those who, by obeying the law, had incurred the odium of the district. Not only were the victims who had been marked out for mutilation or slaughter known for weeks beforehand, as was shown by the fact that people had been reported as murdered—place and time being mentioned—which reports had been afterwards proved to be untrue, but the facts of their having been made in two or three different places, at some distance apart, about the same moment was proof that arrangements had been made, which were well known to the whole district some time before, for a man to be murdered at a certain time and place, and that, owing to some lucky accident, the victim had escaped. But, although the population seemed so well informed beforehand of what was going to be done, when a crime actually took place those who were in the neighbourhood became blind and deaf and dumb, and rendered it almost impossible to trace out and bring the criminal to justice, unless there were powers, such as now existed under the Crimes Act, to enable the Executive to do so. There was only one way of enlisting a locality on the side of the law, and that was by making those who lived in it—many of whom were accessories, both before and after the fact—pay heavily for every crime that was committed. But, instead of the present form of levying the fine upon property, it would be fairer to make it a house tax; and thereby make all in the district pay equally, instead of, by placing it upon property, fining the loyal classes, who needed protection, much more heavily than those who deserved punishment. The advantage of this power of fining had been shown in other ways under the Crimes Act, as the Government had also, under Section 18, the power of charging the extra police upon a district; and he was sure that noble Lords opposite connected with the government of Ireland would admit the enormous advantage that had been derived from both those powers of fining, although the former power would be sufficient in ordinary times. No doubt, there were many other provisions of the Crimes Act which assisted materially in preventing such outrages; but no one would wish to permanently suspend the Constitution in Ireland—no one would wish that a law passed under a most exceptional condition of affairs, giving enormous and necessary powers to the Executive, should be entered on the Statute Book for all time; but the proposal to which he referred could perfectly be rendered permanent without infringing one single liberty which the Irish people had the right to enjoy. From the 4th of April, 1870, to the 1st of June, 1880, there were a series of Coercion Acts in force, in every one of which there were powers for levying fines for injury to the person; and though there were a certain number of those crimes committed in each of those 10 years, and though, in 1879, when the Land League was first inaugurated, this class of crime largely increased—yet, taking all those 10 years, from the 4th of April, 1870, to the 1st of June, 1880, and adding all the outrages together, there were not as many committed as during the short period from June, 1880, to September, 1882, when the Crimes Act, with a clause in it of this description, really came into force. In the 10 years and two months during which there was power to levy a fine upon the locality, there were 511 of those crimes; during the two years and three months, from June, 1880, to September, 1882, there were 554. At that date the Crimes Act came into force; and from September, 1882, to May, 1883, they numbered only 32. No doubt, it was true that during the two years when these crimes were most numerous there was an exceptional condition of affairs. He would not go into the question of how that exceptional condition was brought into existence; but if, during all that terrible time, the Government had possessed one of the powers they should always possess, that of placing a fine upon the locality, instead of allowing matters to drift and using no power at all, many of those outrages would never have been committed. It might be said that it was not fair to compare the number of crimes which had taken place since the passing of the Crimes Act with those which took place during the two years before, because there were other powers under the Crimes Act which had been as potent as that of levying a fine upon the locality in preventing injuries to the person. No doubt that was true; and, thanks to the able and energetic manner in which the present Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary had administered that Act, and to the firm and impartial conduct of the Judges, and the pluck and determination of the juries, who, carrying their lives in their hands, acted up to their oaths, undeterred by outrage or terrorism, there was now some hope that, at any rate on the surface, things were distinctly on the mend. But was it not deplorable that, after all that had been done in answer to agitation, after the thousands and thousands of pounds that had been robbed from the Irish landlords to pacify the Irish tenants, it should require a Crimes Act like the one in force to render things even quiet upon the surface, which, he believed, was all that they were at present? One would imagine, from a speech delivered the other day by the Lord President, that he believed that the Land Act was the greatest boon to the Irish landlords, as it preserved to them the small semblance of property they had left, and placed their lives, to a certain extent, out of peril. The Irish landlords did not thank the Government for that so-called boon. They considered that their properties should have been preserved to them without such a sacrifice, and that neither their lives nor what was left of their properties were one whit more secure by the passage of that measure, because it was not the Land Act which had done anything towards the re-establishment of law in Ireland. That Act, which would be a fertile source of agitation and outrage in the future, would have exaggerated the terrible state of affairs in Ireland, if things had not culminated in the murders in the Phœnix Park and the Crimes Act had not been introduced. Many persons were under the impression that it was the landlords or their agents' lives which were mostly attacked. It was nothing of the kind, and that was one of the reasons why he wished for these Returns. Only a small number, comparatively speaking, of landlords or agents were attacked compared with the number of farmers or labourers, who had nothing to do with the landlords at all, who were murdered or mutilated. He had found great difficulty in getting information bearing on this point; for though by the Government Returns there were 522 outrages against the person committed from June, 1880, up to the present date, compensation had only been demanded by 137, and as the *status* of these persons was not mentioned in the Returns, he could only name, and that possibly not accurately, the *status* of those 187 persons. But there was a letter which appeared in *The Times* some time back by Mr. Arnold Forster, who had every opportunity of arriving at a correct estimate of these outrages, which would throw some light upon the question. From January, 1880, to September, 1882, Mr. Arnold Forster said there were 10,058 agrarian offences reported; and of purely agrarian murders—not including the Dublin crimes — there were 57, 25 of which were farmers or sons of farmers, 10 labourers or herds, 11 persons of various occupations unconnected with the landlords, one a magistrate—and murdered as such—and only six bailiffs, agents, or process-servers, while out of the 57 four only were landlords. Again, there were 145 cases of attempted murder, the majority being more or less dangerously wounded, out of which 62 were farmers, 19 labourers, and 22 bailiffs, agents, or process-servers, 10 only being landlords. And out of 322 cases of firing into dwellings, 33 only were against the landlord class or its dependents. Thus it was not the landlords, as was generally supposed, but the poorest and most defenceless class in Ireland, who suffered by far the most by the impotence of the Government, and the heartless, revolting cruelty of the Land League. He hoped the Government would consent to lay the evidence and Reports upon the Table. He could not understand that there should be any objection to the production of these Papers, because he held in his hand a copy of the directions given to the investigators, by which it would appear that, although there were no shorthand-writers present, yet the fullest Returns were required to be sent in to the Lord Lieutenant, and that the investigations went on in open Court. The noble Marquess concluded by making the Motion of which he had given Notice.

Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Minutes of Evidence taken in Court, before the investigators, under the Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, and the reports upon which His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has awarded compensation to persons injured and to the families of persons who have been murdered."—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, he hoped the noble Marquess would excuse him if he did not discuss the Land Act on the present occasion, or even deal with the Crimes Act, though, as to that Act, he very much agreed with much of what he had said, especially as to the part of it to which his Motion referred—namely, the system of levying compensation for crimes or outrages upon the district in which they occurred. He was entirely at one with his noble Friend as to the necessity of the provision. He also agreed with him that it would form a very fair subject for consideration, when the time came, whether that provision might not be made a permanent one in Ireland. However, that was not the question immediately before the House. The question was whether it was advisable in the public interests to lay before Parliament confidential Reports, accompanied by the notes of the evidence which had been furnished by the investigators under the provisions of the Crimes Act to the Lord Lieutenant, in order that he might administer that part of the law according to his discretion. The noble Lord expressed a strong hope that the Government would accede to this request; but he was bound to express a hope quite as strong that the noble Marquess and the House would not press for the production of those Reports. He would ask the House to remember the nature of these investigations, and the duty of the Lord Lieutenant in connection with them. That duty had been, and was, a very peculiar and very delicate one indeed. He was left absolutely by the Act, after being furnished with the Reports of the investigators, together with the notes of evidence taken by them, with the discretion of forming his judgment upon those materials, and deciding what compensation should be levied on the district. That, undoubtedly, was a matter of no little difficulty. It entailed a variety of considerations, which he had no doubt it was often not very easy to reconcile. The Lord Lieutenant had to consider the nature of the crime itself, the guilty knowledge of the inhabitants of the district, and their connivance in the escape of the criminal, the *status* of the applicant, the amount of injury inflicted upon the family of the murdered man, and so on. All these matters had to be weighed by the Lord Lieutenant, who then came to a decision as to the amount of compensation to be imposed. It was distinctly announced and thoroughly recognized, when the Bill was passing through Parliament, that that duty was to be performed in the only way in which it could be performed — namely, at the absolute discretion and on the sole responsibility of the Lord Lieutenant himself; and it never was contemplated for a moment that means would be taken, such as were now being taken by his noble Friend, to obtain Parliamentary Returns of this character, which might, and probably would, be used to challenge and question the decisions of the Lord Lieutenant. That would obviously be the effect of such Parliamentary Returns being made, and he could hardly conceive anything more mischievous to the public interests. The objections that he took to this proposal were those not only of the Government here, but also of the Government in Dublin. The Reports were really of a confidential nature. He was perfectly sure that if Parliament had any idea that these Reports and notes were to be published as Parliamentary documents, this part of the Act would not have taken the shape it did, and this responsible duty would not have been placed absolutely at the discretion of the Lord Lieutenant. What would the result be of making these Reports Parliamentary documents? It would lead to the challenge of the decisions by anyone in any way affected by them, and would furnish ample materials for mischief to anyone who was inclined to make mischief out of them. He thought there were very strong and evident grounds of public interest and advantage why so unusual a course should not be pursued.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, he could quite understand that some of the evidence and confidential Reports should not be produced; but he was not at all sure whether it would not be for the public advantage, and for the advantage of the Lord Lieutenant, that some daylight should be thrown upon the nature of these Reports. The very secrecy of the proceedings invested these transactions with a large amount of unpopularity. He begged to suggest to Her Majesty's Government that certain extracts from these Reports should be published, sufficient to justify the action of the Lord Lieutenant. He entirely concurred, from his experience in Ireland, with the remarks which had fallen from the noble Marquess. There was no question that in Ireland, if crime was to be repressed, the most successful manner in which that could be effected was by bringing home to the conviction of the people the fact that if they connived at crime they would have to pay for it. He believed this method of dealing with crime in Ireland was far more successful than any other that could be adopted. It was, indeed, with the utmost regret that at the time Her Majesty's Government came into Office he found they were prepared, in such a very light and flippant manner, to abandon the provision of the Peace Preservation Act giving a power of levying compensation for injury to person and property upon disturbed districts; because the very knowledge of the existence of the machinery for levying this compensation had a most wholesome deterrent effect. He thought it would be possible for the Government to agree to a modification of the Return asked for, still giving the various particulars which would be useful to the House and the country. If they could, in addition, furnish extracts from the Reports upon which applications for an increased force of constables for disturbed districts were based, it would be an advantage. Some such Return would probably show that these crimes had been instigated by the emissaries of the Land League—those persons who, from the very outset, had been organizing and inciting to crime in Ireland—and also show that not the landlords only, but the poorest of the population, had been the greatest sufferers by those crimes.

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, he would be able to supply a Return which would probably go a long way to meet the suggestion of the noble Duke. This Return would give, for example, the name of the applicant, with a description of his condition in life, the nature of the crime, the injuries inflicted, the amount of compensation awarded, and the amount of charge on the district. This would supply the information specially desired by the noble Marquess and noble Duke as to the classes which had been the chief sufferers by the outrages in question. As to furnishing extracts from the Reports, however, he felt great doubt whether they could be supplied with advantage to the Public Service.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: Will the noble Lord add to the Return the contents of the warrants now laid before the House, imposing the charge for additional constabulary, and the statement of the particulars in each case?

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, there would be no objection whatever to including these warrants in the tabular statement.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY asked whether it would not be possible to give a statement showing the effect of the grants for compensation upon the rates in the districts?

LORD CARLINGFORD (LORD PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL) said, he quite thought so; but he would consider the point, and see what could be done.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, he would withdraw his Motion, on the understanding that the Government would furnish the Return promised by the Lord President of the Council. He, however, reserved to himself the right to move for these Returns later in the Session.

Motion (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

TREATY OF BERLIN — ARTICLE X.—BULGARIA.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL STANHOPE begged leave to inquire of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he could explain the conduct of the Bulgarian Government in reference to the non-fulfilment by them of the 10th Article of the Treaty of Berlin, with regard to the taking over of the Rustchuk and Varna Railway? The Government of Bulgaria had not complied with the provisions of the Treaty, to pay 3,500,000 francs a-year for the Railway they now owed to the shareholders, whose line they had taken over from Turkey, a sum over £670,000. Mr. Lascelles had been instructed to obtain a payment upon account; but even that the Government of Bulgaria had neglected to do. He thought that more pressure should be exercised by Her Majesty's Government in this matter. He was aware a similar Question had been asked on Monday last in the other House; but he thought the Answer given by the Government on that occasion unsatisfactory, as the 10th Article of the Treaty had remained a dead letter for a space of five years. He (Earl Stanhope) had no personal interest in the matter; but the facts came to his notice last October, when he happened to travel over the Varna Railway.

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, I can assure the noble Earl that the grievance suggested in the Question does not exist. I think the Answer given in the House of Commons was that Her Majesty's Government had been exercising pressure on this point. In the month of March of this year it was proposed that the Bulgarian Government should assent to the interpretation of the clause being referred to the signatory Powers to the Treaty of Berlin, and that the Representatives should decide upon that construction at Constantinople. In the meanwhile, they proposed that some instalment should be paid to the Railway. Now, I am afraid that that would be rather inconsistent with the contention of the noble Earl, for it would hardly be possible to recommend that that position should be taken up by the Ambassadors, and, at the same time, to urge that the whole question be settled at once. There is some excuse for delay in the fact of the changes of Ministry that have taken place; but I can assure the noble Earl that it is not a subject on which we have shown any negligence in pressing what I believe to be a just claim.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
to Monday next, a quarter
before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 1st June, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [May 31] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Ordered—First Reading*—Inclosure Provisional Order (Hildersham) * [209]; Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) (Didcot, &c.) * [210].

First Reading — Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2)* [211]; Pluralities Acts Amendment * [212].

Report—Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [168]; Gas and Water Provisional Orders * [165]; Water Provisional Orders * [166].

Third Reading—Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) [171], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

THE MAGISTRACY (ENGLAND AND WALES)—PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Lord Chancellor, in the selection of new magistrates for the borough of Portsmouth, has declined to appoint an ex-mayor and alderman of the borough, notwithstanding that he has been recommended for appointment by the Town Council; and, whether the Lord Chancellor will give instructions for the Council to be furnished with the reasons for which their recommendation has been disregarded?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that the Lord Chancellor was solely responsible for the nomination of magistrates, and that it was the business of the noble and learned Lord to obtain information before making a selection, in order to satisfy himself that none but fit and proper persons were nominated to the office. Among the sources to which the Lord Chancellor went for information were Corporations and Town Councils; but he was not, and ought not to be, bound by their recommendations. If he were so bound, the responsibility would be shifted from the Lord Chancellor to the Corporations. It was the fact that a gentleman recommended by the Town Council of Portsmouth had not been nominated by the Lord Chancellor; but that official was not bound to state why he had not nominated any particular gentleman so recommended.

In his (Sir William Harcourt's) opinion, if that were understood to be the duty of the Lord Chancellor, it would entirely destroy the principle of nomination by the Crown.

MR. J. LOWTHER: The right hon. and learned Gentleman says the Lord Chancellor applied to the Corporation. If so, that appears to me to be inconsistent with the latter part of the Answer.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The Lord Chancellor received information from all persons in the locality; and, among other sources of that information, of course the Town Council is included.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that in this case, instead of the person recommended for appointment by the Town Council, the noble and learned Lord had selected a gentleman who did not reside in Portsmouth, and who was only known as a gentleman who had taken part in a Liberal demonstration.

THE FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND) AND THE POST OFFICE (TELEGRAPH) DEPARTMENT — EXTENSION OF THE TELEGRAPH TO OUTLYING FISHING STATIONS.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY asked the Lord Advocate, What steps the Fishery Board are taking to aid the extension of telegraphic communication to outlying fishing stations in the North of Scotland; whether it is the case that the Post Office authorities asked, in April, what stations the Board proposed to support; and, if so, whether the Board has yet supplied the information desired?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): Sir, this matter has been engaging the earnest attention of the Fishery Board for a considerable time past. In January last, they forwarded to the Surveyor General of the Post Office a list of stations with which it was considered of the most importance to establish telegraphic communication, and obtained from him information as to the amount of annual guarantee that would be required for each station for seven years. The sum which Parliament has authorized the Board to expend this year upon telegraphic extension, out of the surplus brand fees, is £1,000. The sums required by the Post Office for guarantees far exceeded this sum; and the Board have been endeavouring to ascertain what amount of local assistance may be expected for the various stations. They resolved, in the first instance, to select the station of Castle Bay, in the Island of Barra, as being the most important for the fishing interest; the guarantee required is £1,244 per annum, a sum beyond the means at the disposal of the Board. A certain amount of assistance was promised by the proprietrix of the Island, if the amount of the guarantee was somewhat reduced. The Board accordingly made a representation on the subject; but it has not been found possible to get the amount of the guarantee reduced.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—LURGAN WORKHOUSE.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Irish Local Government Board received, some months ago, certain letters complaining of irregular and grossly immoral conduct on the part of some of the officials of Lurgan Workhouse; if it has been charged that the pauper diet has been greatly curtailed; if it has also been charged that female pauper lunatic inmates have given birth to illegitimate children, the putative fathers being men employed in the Workhouse; and, if so, whether any steps will be taken to institute a searching inquiry with a view to the punishment of the guilty parties?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, no charges of the kind referred to have been received, except such as were contained in two anonymous letters from the same individual, who signs himself "A Heavy Ratepayer," and, therefore, professes to be a person of position. If the charges are true, he ought to come forward and make them publicly. If they are not true, all I can say is that his letters are as foul and atrocious libels as I ever read. If the hon. Member has any authenticated statements on the subject, and will furnish them to me with the authority, I will have inquiry made.

MR. KENNY: The ratepayer referred to in the right hon. Gentleman's Answer is a most respectable man; and I shall communicate with him, in order to endeavour, if possible, to induce him to come forward personally and substantiate his charges.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—CHARGE AGAINST SUB-INSPECTOR SMITH (MOVILLE).

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If, at a sworn inquiry held at Moville, county Donegal, on May 11th 1883, certain grave charges were proved against Sub-Inspector Smith, of Moville, and, amongst others, that Mr. Smith made a false and damaging report against Constable Magill, a man who did not serve under him, and if the said report is filed at county head quarters, Letterkenny, to the prejudice of Constable Magill; if it is a fact that, at an inquiry at Moville, it was alleged that Sub-Inspector Smith endeavoured to induce a member of the police force serving under him to foully insult the Rev. Mr. M'Gluichy, the Roman Catholic curate of the parish; if it is true that evidence sufficient has from time to time been given to establish that the general conduct of Sub-Inspector Smith is disgraceful; and, whether, under these circumstances, he will be at once dismissed the force?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, there was no charge made at the sworn inquiry at Moville against Sub-Inspector Smith in connection with the case of Constable Magill. I have already stated, in reply to a former Question, that the charges which were preferred against the Sub-Inspector and investigated at that inquiry were anonymous, but were inquired into at his request. The judgment of the Court was that they were wholly untrue, or gross distortions of matters which, to their minds, were most satisfactorily explained. I should hope the hon. Member will see the impropriety of giving the publicity afforded by the Notice Paper of the House of Commons to charges against public servants for which there is no *primâ facie* case whatever. Here is the name of an excellent and trustworthy servant of the Crown coupled with the epithets of foul and disgraceful on no authority whatever, except that of some anonymous letters.

MR. KENNY: I would ask the Chief Secretary whether this investigation into the charges made against Sub-Inspector Smith was a public one; and whether it is not a fact that the gentleman who presided at it was Mr. Smith's own County Inspector, assisted by a district Sub-Inspector, who was a friend of the accused official? As the charges against Sub-Inspector Smith involve matters of the utmost gravity, amounting to scandalous and disgraceful conduct, I will move for a Return of the evidence produced at the investigation, in order that it may be laid on the Table of the House.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—THE COMPENSATION CLAUSE—MURDER OF MR. W. M. BOURKE.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to an announcement in the Dublin Gazette of a recent issue, that £1,500 has been awarded to Isadore M'William Bourke in respect of the murder of Walter M. Bourke near Castle Taylor, county Galway, £500 thereof to be paid by Isadore M'William Bourke to the trustees of the marriage settlement of Mrs. Dorinda Coghlan, sister of the late Walter M. Bourke; if he is aware that Isadore M'William Bourke inherits about £2,000 a-year through the death of his brother, and Dorinda Coghlan inherits some personal property; if it is a fact that Isadore M'William Bourke swore, at the investigation at Galway, that his brother's property was to him a damnosa hereditas, as the charges were in excess of rental, and suppressed the fact that the most valuable portion of the property was on his own hands; if it is upon the evidence of Isadore M'William Bourke that the investigator made report on which award was founded; if it is the intention of the Irish Government to reconsider this decision; and, if they intend to proceed against Isadore M'William Bourke for wilful and corrupt perjury?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, the Lord Lieutenant went himself into this case with the greatest care, having before him the Investigator's Report, and the evidence taken at the inquiry; and His Excellency decided on awarding as compensation the amount published in *The Gazette.* His Excellency informs me that he sees no reason for reconsidering his award. Dr. Bourke was cross-examined by able counsel, and his evidence as to the value of his inheritance was in no way impeached or gainsaid, nor was any evidence to the contrary adduced.

I must say that, under these circumstances, it is a strong thing that a gentleman should be described by implication as a wilful and corrupt perjurer in the House of Commons.

Mr. KENNY: Sir, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary whether Dr. Bourke did not swear that this inheritance was *damnosa hereditas*, by saying that the charges on the estate exceeded by £150 the rental, while he suppressed the fact that the greater portion of the land was in his own hands, and managed by an Englishman named Sandes, who is his agent?

[No reply was given.]

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, MALLOW.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it has come to his knowledge that Mr. H. D. Spratt, Chairman of the Mallow Board of Guardians, declined to receive a notice of motion in the following terms, proposed to be handed in by Mr. Thomas Barry, on the ground that it was not within the competence of a Poor Law Board:—

> "I will move, on this day fortnight, that it is most desirable that a measure establishing vote by ballot and abolishing proxy votes at the election of Poor Law Guardians, and substituting triennial for annual elections, should be passed by the Legislature this Session;"

whether it is outside the legitimate province of a Poor Law Board to pronounce upon legislative proposals which have a bearing on the efficacy of the machinery for administering the Poor Laws; and, whether, as President of the Local Government Board, he will cause an instruction to be conveyed to the Chairmen of Poor Law Boards for their guidance in the matter?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have had the Report of this matter before me. The Local Government Board consider that the Chairman of the Mallow Guardians committed an error of judgment, and I think a serious error of judgment, in declining to receive such a resolution. The subject is one in which Boards of Guardians are certainly justified in expressing an opinion. The Local Government Board do not feel called upon to interfere in the matter, as no complaint was made to them. I will communicate with the Local Government Board again, in order to ascertain whether there is any reason to suppose that other Chairmen are under a like misapprehension on the subject.

Mr. CALLAN: Would the Chief Secretary state whether this Chairman is an *ex-officio* Guardian?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I cannot state, Sir.

Mr. CALLAN: Well, I can.

SCOTLAND—THE IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE IN GLASGOW.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Lord Advocate, Whether it is the fact that the meeting place at 8, Watson Street, Glasgow, of a branch of the Irish National League has been, for several weeks past, closely watched by detectives, the persons attending the meetings subjected to an offensive and intimidating scrutiny, and the books temporarily taken from the residence of the secretary, in his absence; and, if so, whether these proceedings have been ordered or approved by the authorities?

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. Balfour): Sir, a hall at No. 8, Watson Street, Glasgow, was hired, under an agreement which has now expired, for the purpose, as described in the missives, of an Irish Debating Society. The meetings of the Society which it appears from the Question is a branch of the Irish National League, were held on Sundays; and, in consequence of information which they received, the police authorities, during the last month or two, have on several occasions directed three or four detective officers to be stationed near the door of the hall, in order to see the persons who attended the meetings. These officers were never within the hall, and did not speak to, or interfere in any way with, the persons attending the meetings; and no complaint of any interference has been made to the police authorities. The persons attending the meetings were not subjected to an offensive and intimidating scrutiny, nor were the books taken from the residence of the secretary by the police or any public authority. I see no reason to disapprove of the action of the police authorities.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION.

Colonel ALEXANDER asked the Lord Advocate, Whether, with a view to place all Her Majesty's subjects upon a footing of equality in cases where their lives and liberties are concerned, he will, during the present Session, move for leave to introduce a Bill constituting a Court of Criminal Appeal for Scotland?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): Sir, I do not propose, during the present Session, to move for leave to introduce a Bill constituting a Court of Criminal Appeal for Scotland. There is every reason to believe that the time of the Grand Committee on Law and Legal Procedure will be fully occupied during the present Session with the Bill now before it. The question whether a Criminal Appeal Bill for Scotland should be introduced during the next Session of Parliament will be carefully considered.

COLONEL ALEXANDER: I beg to give Notice, in consequence of the reply of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, that, on the consideration of the English Criminal Appeal Bill, as amended, I shall move that the Bill be re-committed, and that it be an Instruction to the Committee to extend its provisions to Scotland.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE "BLUE RIBBON" IN BOARD SCHOOLS.

MR. S. MORLEY asked the Vice President of the Council, If his attention has been called to the fact that a girl named Moore, aged nine, has been required by the master of the Board School of Wiveliscombe to leave the school unless she submitted to have the blue ribbon removed from her dress; that, her father objecting, the child has been without schooling during more than three months; and that the managers have sanctioned the conduct of the master; and, whether, considering such cases have occurred before, more stringent measures could be adopted to prevent their recurrence?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, the Education Department has always been unwilling to interfere with managers in respect to regulations which they may deem necessary to secure the discipline of their schools. At the outset of this Blue Ribbon movement there were complaints that the wearing of the badge in school hours was a cause of disturbance among the children; and the managers, in some instances, allowed the masters to forbid it. I have, however, satisfied myself, from personal observation and inquiry, that it is now so commonly worn, both by teachers and children, without injury to discipline, that there is no longer any pretext for objecting to it; and, as it is most desirable that temperance should be inculcated among the rising generation, we have caused the managers of the Wiveliscombe school to be informed that a child must not be excluded from the school on this account.

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART—THE REPUTED "RAPHAEL."

MR. TOMLINSON asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether there is any truth in the statement in the "Times" of Thursday, that a picture by Raphael, which has just been placed in the Salon Carré of the Louvre at Paris, and is said to be one of the purest and loveliest of his works, was purchased in a London auction room for something over £100; whether it is true that the attention of the Keeper of the National Gallery was directed to the sale of the picture; and, whether any attempt was made to secure it for the National Gallery, and why it was not purchased for that collection?

MR. COURTNEY: Sir, this picture, the authenticity of which has been in dispute for a generation, was sold as a Mantegna at Christie's for something like the price named in 1850. It has been ascribed to Francia, Lorenzo Costa, Pinturicchio, Perugino, and Timoteo Della Vite. I am told that for 25 years it has been in Rome, the owner having vainly offered it at several National Museums in Europe; and I believe it has now been bought by the authorities of the Louvre. When it was sold at Christie's there was no such officer as a Keeper of the National Gallery; and I need scarcely add that the present Director and Keeper have both been appointed to their several posts long since the sale in question. I believe the picture is of great merit, whoever painted it; but it will be obvious that the paragraph in *The Times* was misleading in treating what is really a matter of past history as an incident of today.

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART—THE TAPESTRIES AT HAMPTON COURT.

MR. MONTAGUE GUEST asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, considering the deplorable condition of the tapestries in the withdrawing room at Hampton Court Palace, the Lord Chamberlain's Department could be instructed to report to the Treasury the probable cost of having the tapestries cleaned and mended, commencing, if possible, with that one which hangs upon the north side of the withdrawing room?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I am informed, Sir, by the Lord Chamberlain's Department that the state of the tapestry at Hampton Court is now under their consideration, and that such measures as are possible will be taken for their restoration. I may add that several very interesting old pieces of tapestry, not hitherto exhibited, have been recently hung at Hampton Court.

FRANCE AND CHINA.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in view of the serious injury to British commerce which a war between France and China would involve, Her Majesty's Government will interpose their good offices between those Powers?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, with respect to this subject, both in the general interests of peace, which we think to be of high importance to the country, and likewise in the interests of friendship with Foreign Powers, Her Majesty's Government are always on the look-out for opportunities, when any friendly Power is involved in differences with another State, for offering their good offices, if they can do so with advantage. I am not prepared to say that the circumstances of the present case afford any sufficient expectation of advantage; but the subject is one which will remain under the careful consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Prime Minister, What would be the order of Business on Monday; and what Business he proposed to take at the Morning Sitting on Tuesday?

Mr. GLADSTONE: With regard to Monday, what we propose is, that the first Business shall be the second reading of the Corrupt Practices Bill. Immediately after that, we should propose to take the Scottish Agricultural Holdings Bill. I do not entirely abandon the hope that possibly they may be disposed of on Monday next; if not, we shall take them at the next time that offers, or take either of them that remains. We propose to ask for a Morning Sitting on Tuesday next.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: For what purpose?

Mr. GLADSTONE: For disposing of these two subjects.

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS—MR. ERRINGTON.

Mr. GLADSTONE: It may be in the recollection of the House that the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) yesterday put a Question to me with regard to supposed communications between the Irish Government and Mr. Errington. I said that I would make inquiries. Naturally, I have not been able to make inquiries in the interval; but I have no doubt I shall be able, in a short time, to answer the Question. It will probably be convenient to the hon. Member, and also to the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), that all questions relating to this matter should be discussed together. Therefore, I would suggest that we should go on with Supply generally, but reserving the Report upon the particular Vote relating to the Foreign Office. That, if convenient, we shall take on Monday night; at any rate, we shall take care that it is brought on so as to cause no disadvantage to the noble Lord.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he should be happy to agree to this arrangement.

PRIVILEGE.

PARLIAMENT — PRIVILEGE — MR. M'COAN AND MR. O'KELLY.

Mr. O'Kelly, being in his place, according to the Order of the House,

Mr. SPEAKER addressed him as follows:—

Mr. O'Kelly, you have been ordered by the House to attend in your place, this day, in consequence of a complaint of Mr. M'Coan, that he had received a Challenge from you, which appeared to have arisen from causes connected with proceedings in this House.

I have now to acquaint you that Mr. M'Coan, having assured the House that he would not be a party to any hostile measures, the House will expect a similar assurance from yourself; and is prepared to receive from you any explanations which you may desire to offer, and such submission to the pleasure of the House, as the occasion demands.

MR. O'KELLY: I have to say, Sir, in the first place, that this matter was brought before the House without my receiving any notice from the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan). The hon. Member has stated very fairly the cause of dispute between himself and me; and, therefore, I do not consider it necessary for me to enter into the merits of the case. I, however, think the House is travelling outside its proper jurisdiction when it interferes with a matter of this kind, which did not take its rise in anything that occurred in this House. The matter between the junior Member for Wicklow and myself is a purely personal one, and touching my own dignity and my own honour. If I may judge from the vote of this House, this House is prepared to take a view of this question which I am not prepared to take. I do not care much about the opinion of this House, or the opinion of the people of this country; but I do think a great deal of the opinion of men of honour who live outside this country, with many of whom I have, during the better part of my life, had very intimate relations. I believe that men of honour outside this country will justify me in the position that I have taken; but, so far as the junior Member for Wicklow is concerned, I see no reason why he should have thought well to bring this matter before the House, because, before doing so, he had already placed himself beyond any risk that might have arisen through my action by his letter declining to meet me. Now, Sir, my opinion of a man who deliberately offers an insult to another, and then refuses either to apologize or to afford reparation, is that that man, by that act, falls out of the category of honourable men, and is, therefore, no longer worthy of attention from any man.

MR. GLADSTONE: It is not my intention, Sir, on this occasion, to reply to the speech of the hon. Gentleman; but I think I may be permitted to say, in the general interests of good order and of that good feeling and mutual respect which ought to prevail among Members of this House, that I have listened to it with much regret, and that I very deeply lament the part which it appears to me the hon. Member, as at present minded, has alone left to me. For my own part, I should have listened to his speech with the disposition which it would have been my duty to entertain, to construe it, if it had been on any point ambiguous, in as favourable a sense as the words could bear; but I cannot say that I think the speech is ambiguous. The hon. Member has referred to matters of relations between himself and the junior Member for Wicklow. On those matters it is, perhaps, not properly my part to touch. What it is my part to touch upon, acting on behalf of the House, and subject to the judgment of the House, is the relations established between the hon. Gentleman and the House in regard to this rather painful matter. The hon. Gentleman says he cares very little for the opinion of this House. Well, Sir, on that I think I need only say that the question whether the hon. Gentleman cares little or cares much for the opinion of this House is not, perhaps, a question on which the character and dignity of this House will, in the main, ultimately depend. Nor is it the question which is now before us. The question now before us is, What is the duty of the House in such a case as has now arisen? Sir, in addressing the House last night, I said very little upon this subject; but I proceeded upon a conclusion ratified in my own mind, and agreeable, as I understood, to the views entertained by the best authorities, who had had such opportunity as the suddenness of the case afforded of considering the circumstances that were before us. I think now, as the hon. Member has given his opinion—an opinion which he was perfectly competent to give—that this matter lies beyond the proper jurisdiction of the House, it is quite necessary that I should say a few words, and they need not be many, on that subject. Then, Sir, my words will be these. One most important chapter of consideration which the House never disregards in approaching any question of its procedure is that of precedents. Now, it is very difficult indeed to find precedents that are exactly on all fours with the case that is now before us. But I may say confidently, with respect to precedents, that while they do not minutely agree with the circumstances that have now arisen, they unquestionably indicate that the practice of the House has been to carry its rule of interference further than the interference which was proposed yesterday, and which I shall venture to ask the House still to carry forward. I will not go back on particulars. The work of Sir Erskine May gives the opportunity for reference; and I doubt very much whether those who have examined the references there given will contest what I have said, so far as precedents are concerned. But, Sir, I must say that while I might shrink from going the length to which the House has proceeded on some former occasions, there are certain considerations which tend to give an enhanced stringency to the obligations that this House has on previous occasions required. The most important of these considerations is the great change, and I hope, on the whole, beneficial change, that has taken place in the sentiments and habits of society with regard to private encounters between hon. Members. Formerly, as the hon. Gentleman says, the canon to which he adhered was supposed socially to prevail; and a gentleman was supposed to place himself beyond the limits to which the privilege of his rank extended by declining to give what is called "satisfaction" in a matter of this kind. But, Sir, it is a matter of notoriety that the last 30 years have seen a very great change in this respect. A very long time has elapsed—I am aware that the case of high words used has happened within a shorter interval, but it is a very long time—perhaps, speaking roughly, not less than the number of years I have mentioned—since the mere challenge to a personal encounter has passed in this House with reference to any proceedings among its Members. ["Oh!" *from Irish Members.*] I am speaking of what has happened in public, and in the proceedings of this House, and I rather believe I am accurate in what I say. I could easily recall, were it to the purpose, cases which would bear testimony to the great change which has taken place in the habits of society; but, Sir, if that be so, and if the general view of society is, as undoubtedly it is in this country at this moment, as fixed by general practice, adverse to these encounters, then I say, whatever duty there was on the part of the House to interfere before, exists—I do not say over wider limits—that is another matter—but certainly exists with an increased stringency as it now comes before us, because the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan), who 30 or 40 years ago might have been withdrawing himself from the general opinion and practice of society, is, in the course which he has taken, now conforming to the practice; and it is not in dissenting from the prevailing practice, but in conforming to it, that he has invoked the assistance, and, if I may say so, the protection of this House. Well, the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) says we have perfect security against a breach of the peace, and with that we ought to be satisfied. I am not able to accede to that. I do not think that in this case we should take a one-sided engagement from one party. In the first place, it is not accurate to say that a one-sided engagement invariably affords security against breach of the peace. On the contrary, a one-sided engagement is very often introductory to breach of the peace, although not to that particular form of breach of the peace which had been originally contemplated. Therefore, Sir, I think the question really is whether this matter lies within those limits within which it has been the practice, and is the duty, of the House to interfere. We are of opinion, after the best consultations that I have been able to hold, that it does so lie; and, for this reason, it is clearly not a mere personal misunderstanding on a personal matter, but is manifestly a public matter. It is not only a public matter—a political matter—but it grows out of—though the circumstance did not take place within it—what did take place within the limits of the House. It can be looked at, I conceive, from two points of view. The hon. Member for Wicklow says—"I went to Ireland to perform a Constitutional duty, and to explain to my constituents my proceedings in the House, for which they had a right to call me to account. When I was engaged in that duty I was drawn—and perhaps I may say required—to enter into a particular case in which I thought fit to withdraw from the House and not to vote; and my action in this House led me to make explanations of my conduct, which brought the challenge of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Roscommon." Therefore, Sir, from this point of view, it is manifest that this proceeding had its origin in a matter that took place within the walls of this House. If I endeavour to look at it from the point of view of the hon. Member for Roscommon, it is susceptible, perhaps, of being differently stated; but I think we will arrive at exactly the same conclusion. The hon. Member for Roscommon is at liberty to say—"I did not call for any explanation of the conduct of the hon. Member for Wicklow; but what did happen was this. The hon. Member for Wicklow thought fit to make observations upon me for what I had said or done within the walls of this House, and these observations led me to send him the challenge." Well, if that be so, even from the point of view of the hon. Member for Roscommon, as from the opposite point of view of the hon. Member for Wicklow, in either or both cases, the matter has arisen from what has taken place within the limits and in the course of the proceedings of this House. Now, Sir, what I wish the House to bear in mind are these two propositions. In the first place, there is no case known to me, and I cannot learn if there is any case in which a Member of this House has brought forward his receipt of a challenge from another Member of this House, and has invoked the intervention of this House, when the House has refused that intervention. That, if true, is an important proposition bearing on the case; and, assuming that intervention to be invoked, I at once put aside the contention of the hon. Member for Roscommon, that the House in general should be satisfied with a one-sided intervention such as he suggests. The other proposition is that if we were to refuse intervention in this case—and I own I should regard a one-sided intervention as almost worse than a refusal of intervention—we should proceed upon this principle—that no amount, not only of dispute, collision, and argument, but of collision in language beyond the ordinary limits, and leading to the consequence of such language—nay, even if threatening to produce fatal consequences, and growing directly out of proceedings in this House, might induce the House to go forward between hon. Members of the House; that the House might become cognizant of what had taken place, and what was likely to take place, and yet would be bound to shut its eyes and say—"That can be no affair of ours." Those who will calmly contemplate that proposition—though there may be a natural disinclination to mix in personal affairs of this kind, and the duty cannot be agreeable to any of us—will admit, I think, upon the whole, that we have no choice, and that our duty is to impress, and it may be to enforce, upon the hon. Gentleman the Member for Roscommon that he shall take the same course as that taken by the hon. Member for Wicklow, in promising us upon his word that he will proceed no further in the matter. I am not vain enough to suppose that anything I have said can have weighed in the slightest degree with the hon. Member for Roscommon. I would not have interjected these words but for the fact that I am very loth to make the Motion with which, if matters stand as they now stand, it would certainly be my duty to conclude. If I could perceive from the hon. Member the slightest indication that he had more to say, I would very gladly resume my seat, and trust to the future course of proceedings. But I am afraid I am compelled—[*cries of* "No, no!"]—as I——

Mr. O'KELLY: Sir, I have, perhaps, failed to convey my meaning as clearly as was necessary in the remarks which I have addressed to the House. I intended to say that after the receipt of the last letter of the junior Member for Wicklow, I had no longer any intention to proceed any further in the matter. I thought I had explained with sufficient clearness to the House that after the receipt of that letter I considered the matter practically at an end.

Mr. GLADSTONE: It is my duty, Sir, to endeavour to remind the House of what I take to be the exact limits of its province in this matter. Undoubtedly the House would desire, with a disposition to settle the business in a manner satisfactory to all parties, to receive an assurance that no bad blood and no recollection of an angry and hostile character should remain in connection with this matter. That is what I should desire with respect to the form; but I cannot say that the words of the hon. Gentleman give me that assurance. As far, however, as I can perceive my duty on the spur of the moment, I think, though the House would be glad to see this matter come to a completely friendly issue, yet it is not possible for us to force that issue. That is not part of our duty. Our duty is to avert certain consequences. I now understand the hon. Gentleman to say what I did not understand before—that the matter is at an end so far as he is concerned. We have now a double engagement from the two hon. Members; and, under these circumstances, it is not necessary for me to take any further step in the matter.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, I hope, with the right hon. Gentleman, that we may consider what has fallen from the hon. Member for Roscommon as amounting to an assurance given to the House that he will not proceed any further in the matter which has been brought under our attention. If that is the meaning and intention of the hon. Member, of course the House will only be too glad to accept that assurance. There is always in cases of this sort a good deal of delicacy, and there cannot fail to be some pain, in what has to be said. But the question is not so much the relation of the hon. Members who are parties to the matter that is to be considered as their relation to the House. It is the duty of the House, when a circumstance which has arisen in the conduct of its Business has culminated in a challenge, to require from the Members concerned that they shall give to the House the assurance that they will proceed no further in the matter. That assurance was given by the hon. Member for Wicklow yesterday. It has been given, as I hope we may understand, by the hon. Member for Roscommon to-day. If that is so, the matter may be allowed to terminate. The hon. Member for Roscommon will perceive, and the House will perceive, that there was a course open to him, as to any other Member, in similar circumstances who thought he had been offensively spoken of—that is to say, he might have brought such offensive language to the notice of the House. He has not taken that course, but has opened communications of a hostile character with the hon. Member for Wicklow, who, he thought, gave that offence. The question is now in such a position that if an assurance is given to the House that the hon. Members will proceed no further we may allow the matter to drop. If that assurance be not given, it will be necessary, of course, to take such steps as may be necessary to maintain the character and dignity of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk will now proceed to read the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

INLAND REVENUE (CIRCULAR).

RESOLUTION.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, in rising to move—

> "That the General Order of the 3rd January, issued by the Board of Inland Revenue, is an unwarrantable interference on the part of a Public Department in the relations between Members of Parliament and their constituents, and an invasion of the privileges of this House,"

said, the House might judge of the feeling created amongst the officials in the Inland Revenue Department by the issue of this Order by the fact that 298 Petitions had been presented to the House on the subject, signed by 2,559 officers, amounting, he believed, to nearly 95 per cent of the whole Service. The General Order complained of practically prohibited any intercourse or communications whatever between Excise officials, whether individually or collectively, and Gentlemen in that House. He would like to draw attention to the wording of the Order in question, and would quote from documents laid upon the Table by the Treasury. The Order said—

> "The Board regret to find that the spirit, if not the letter, of the existing regulations which forbid officers of the Revenue Service to seek promotion or removal or any alteration of their position by means of external influence has of late been frequently disregarded, more especially by deputations which waited upon Members of Parliament and others with a view to procure their influence to obtain an increase in their salaries and other alterations in their position."

In the first place, that sentence was wholly inaccurate. No deputation had waited upon Members of Parliament, at any rate during this Session, from these Excise officials, for the purpose of soliciting an increase of salary, or obtaining any alteration of position. But there was a movement among Excise officials to bring about a Parliamentary inquiry into their whole *status* as compared with other Civil servants. That was the only object which the Excise officials had in approaching that House. The first Order on which the Treasury relied was that of the 26th of February, 1866, and the second was that issued on the 2nd of May in 1867.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, he had never stated that these were all the Orders on the subject.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that it was quite possible, and, from what they knew of Her Majesty's Government, it was very probable that there might be some secret regulations controlling these relations with the Excise officers; but if the right hon. Gentleman was going to rely on other documents it was not treating the House fairly to keep them from its knowledge. The whole gist of the matter lay in this—that in the year 1868 the position of the Excise officials was entirely altered by the extension to them of the Parliamentary franchise. When that was conferred on them they were placed in the same position as any other voter in the country. One of the most valuable rights that the holder of the franchise possessed was that he was able to approach the Member who represented his constituency; and there was nothing the House was more jealous of than that any obstacle should be interposed between a voter and a Member of Parliament. In 1872 Lord Coleridge, who then was the Law Officer of the present Prime Minister, said that "the Inland Revenue officer's political *status* is free from any political restriction." It should be remembered that, after the passing of the Act which conferred the franchise on these officers, doubts arose as to its true construction. Thereupon, another Statute was passed, which allowed them to canvass and to belong to political organizations. He would not say whether that action on the part of the Legislature was right or wrong; but, having made that change, they must now either reduce the *status*, or else not allow any interference by Departments with the privileges of that *status*. He quite thought that a distinction ought to be drawn between an officer of the Excise who approached Members of Parliament for the purpose of soliciting, for his own private ends, pecuniary advantage, or promotion in his office, and a collective and representative body who approached Members in order to ask for a Parliamentary inquiry. The former would be a grossly improper act on the part of any official, which the Government would have a right to resent, and which no Member would encourage; but the latter was as meritorious and as much entitled to encouragement as the former was the reverse. The terms of the General Order which had been issued were much too wide and sweeping, and were, in fact, inconsistent with the law and the spirit of the law of the land. The Board might pronounce a most unjust, iniquitous, and improper decision in a case or cases affecting the officers of the Excise Department; and yet, according to the second rule, any member of the Excise who ventured to bring the matter before Parliament would be liable to instant dismissal. It must be recollected that these men were public servants upon whom full and entire electoral freedom had been conferred; and yet, by this General Order, they must not ask, through their Members, for any change beneficial to their body in rates, salaries, and allowances, under pain of arbitrary dismissal. Was the House of Commons prepared to sanction that? He would show the impolicy and absurdity of that Order. These Excise officials did him the honour to consult him on the matter; and he had advised them that the best way to challenge the legality of the Order was by petitioning the House of Commons. The result had been that 95 per cent of the officials had signed such Petitions, and nobody had dared to insist on the enforcement of the Order. This Order had denounced public organizations formed for the purpose of sending deputations to wait on Members of Parliament. He was perfectly certain that in the old days—in the days when the Inland Revenue Board was wisely administered by Sir Charles Herries, Mr. A. Montgomerie, and others—there was no need for any organizations such as these, and they had none of these quarrels. Then, again, the Board said that they felt the less reluctance in issuing the Order because it was well known to all the officers that they might at all times approach the Board. But that was exactly what the officers had done; and it was only when the Board refused, as they thought, to give a just and a fair consideration to their case, that, in the exercise of their lawful and Constitutional rights, they solicited the aid and protection of Parliament in the matter. They had, in fact, acted on the advice of the present Prime Minister, who, in 1867, had told the officials, who were agitating for a beneficial alteration in their *status*, first of all to exhaust all their chances with the Board, and then to approach the House of Commons by way of deliberate appeal from the Board. That was exactly the course the officials had adopted. They had approached the Board; they waited upon it by deputation; and, in fact, in the words of the Prime Minister, they exhausted all their chances with the Board, and were about to approach Parliament, when the Board—with, he presumed, the knowledge and consent of the Lords of the Treasury—stopped them by the issuing of this General Order. He wished to tell the House that he was not advocating any claim on the part of the officials for higher salaries, or for any change whatever in their *status*. He confined himself to endeavouring to get the House to censure this General Order, and to give a distinct recognition, not only to the Constitutional rights of the officials of the Board of Inland Revenue, but also of the Privileges of Members of Parliament. All he advocated was that three or four superior clerks should not be able at will to deprive thousands of public servants of their Constitutional rights. Curiously enough, he found that the Marquess of Salisbury, when a Member of that House, had had to encounter the present Lord Sherbrooke, then Mr. Robert Lowe, on this subject; and he had used these words:—

> "The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) has spoken in bitter terms of the subordinates in the Public Offices. . . . I do not believe that in the service of the Crown any loyalty is due to the heads of Departments as against the House of Commons. The heads of Departments and the Departments themselves are alike subject to our jurisdiction; and if the *employés* have any complaints to make they do no wrong in laying them before the Representatives of the people."

After all, Parliament was the employer of these people, although the Inland Revenue Board seemed to be under the impression that they were their employers. He would also advocate the great importance of keeping the Civil servants in a temper of cheerfulness and loyalty; and nothing had done more to destroy that temper of cheerfulness and loyalty than the action of the Board in issuing this General Order. He was simply seeking to restore it. All the immense Revenue of the country depended on these officials, and their work required at their hands the greatest tact and delicacy; and he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, supposing by these organizations, which the failure of the proceedings of the Board had forced the officials to adopt, they were led on to a general strike, would not the Board be put to the greatest inconvenience? Considering the amount of education to the work required by these officers, they could not easily be replaced, and this discontent might bring on a general strike. This General Order, he was informed on the best authority, was the work of Mr. Algernon West, who, curiously enough, had made his career for himself by pursuing those very practices which he forbade his subordinates to pursue—by belonging to political Clubs, hanging on to Members of Parliament, taking a leading part in election matters, and, no doubt, by continually soliciting, in one way or another, personal advancement. He was, in fact, a unique specimen of Whig jobbery. He did not know that the Prime Minister was quite as good a specimen of a Whig as he was; but, undoubtedly, Mr. Algernon West's origin might be traced to the predilection of Whigs for jobs and favourites. He was first discovered by Lord Halifax and then taken up by Lord Northbrook, two Whig Lords, and was finally handed over to the Prime Minister, who made him his Private Secretary, and afterwards gave him one of the best posts in the Civil Service. One of the greatest hardships inflicted on the Civil servants, and one which they most bitterly resented, was the continual practice of Prime Ministers of placing their Private Secretaries in the best posts in the Service; and now, curiously enough, the Prime Minister had placed another Private Secretary on the Board. Such action as this deprived men who had served long and faithfully in different Departments of the prizes of their professions. Unfortunately, too, the Leader of the Opposition was not altogether guiltless in this respect, for he believed the right hon. Gentleman had nominated one of his Private Secretaries to a place on the Inland Revenue Board; but the present Prime Minister had crammed the Board with his Secretaries. He not only appointed Mr. Algernon West, but he had placed Mr. Godley upon it, and there was not the least doubt that he would place Mr. Hamilton there too. Thus they had the extraordinary spectacle of an Inland Revenue Board made up of Private Secretaries, gentlemen who were not acquainted with the routine of the Department or the feeling of the Service; and, as a result, they had the issue of this General Order giving rise to a widespread feeling of discontent. He asked the House to put an end to this last relic of official jobbery, and to let the best posts in the Civil Service be thrown open to the whole body of meritorious officers. It seemed to him quite monstrous that the Prime Minister's Private Secretaries, whose chief experience of official life was gained—he would not say quite among the back-stairs' intrigues and dirty work of office —[" Oh, oh! "]—well, it was very well known what Private Secretaries did—it was monstrous that they should be allowed to draw an immense salary from the public taxes, and tyrannize over and worry hard-working and ill-paid public servants. It was to such an unfortunate instance of Private Secretary jobbery, ignorance, and intolerance as Mr. Algernon West at the head of the Inland Revenue Department at £2,000 a-year that this Circular was due. He believed him to be the sole author of this most ill-advised, foolish, and illegal Circular, which he now asked the House severely to condemn.

MR. MONK, in seconding the Resolution, said, he was anxious that there should be no mistake as to its scope. If the General Order of January 3, 1883, had been confined to the prohibition of Parliamentary influence for any personal advancement, or to any interference with the necessary and salutary discipline of the Board over its officers, no objection could have been taken to it. Such Orders had been in existence for many years, and had been readily acquiesced in by Civil Servants. The principle for which they contended was, that every elector, whether a Civil servant or not, should be entitled to approach his Parliamentary Representative, and to unburden himself of any grievance freely and unreservedly. He was under the impression that that principle had been embodied by legislation, and that it was distinctly settled, so far as the Inland Revenue Department was concerned, by 31 & 32 *Vict.*, c. 73, when the Civil servants of the Crown in that Department were admitted to the franchise. That Bill had on its back the names of the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Buckingham (Sir Harry Verney), the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway), and his own; and he considered it right to the Civil Servants affected by that Bill that one of the Members who brought it in should rise in their defence. The disabilities under which, until lately, Civil servants laboured, originated in Acts passed as far back as the Reigns of William and Mary, and of Anne; and then, no doubt, Civil servants were not unwilling to be relieved of the privilege—if privilege it could be called—of a vote which they were compelled to give under the direction of the Government of the day. Circumstances, however, had now changed, and those disabilities had been removed. He was convinced that Parliament would not allow the Board of Inland Revenue, or any Government, to re-impose those disabilities to which Civil servants had been subjected by the Rockingham Administration in 1782, or by the earlier Acts to which he had referred, under very different circumstances. What, then, was the meaning of this Order of January, 1883? It appeared to be an attempt on the part of the Board to interfere between members of the Service and their Representatives; and, to his mind, it was more censurable than the *brutum fulmen* issued by the same Board in 1868, when it sought to affix a stigma upon its subordinates by raising objections to their enfranchisement, on the ground that they were not considered fit to exercise the electoral franchise. It was quite clear that the experience of the last 15 years had not taught the heads of the Department wisdom. He had no doubt that the whole Board was responsible for the Order; but it was an unwise Order, and had caused much discontent in the Department specially concerned. Nothing could be more unfair than to assume that the use of Parliamentary rights would be turned into an abuse. Believing that it was much better that discontent in a Public Department should be allowed to come to the light than that it should be left to seethe below the surface and so cause demoralization, he begged to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the General Order of the 3rd January, issued by the Board of Inland Revenue, is an unwarrantable interference on the part of a Public Department in the relations between Members of Parliament and their constituents, and an invasion of the privileges of this House,"—(*Lord Randolph Churchill,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Sir, I request permission to offer a few observations to the House before the Government reply, because I have been personally and officially connected with several stages of the transactions of which the noble Lord has given so lively an account. Although I certainly found in his speech one of the characteristics which always distinguishes his speeches in this House, although I found that it was clever and amusing, I failed to find in it, what I have generally found in former speeches, evidence of a careful study of facts, and accuracy in the statement of facts. I do not think I ever heard a speech which, for its length, contained so many mis-statements and mistakes as the speech of the noble Lord; and I think it is right that the House should be made aware of one or two errors into which he has fallen. I will not discuss the meaning which the noble Lord attaches to the General Order. He said that it prohibits all communications between Civil servants and the Members representing them. Now, that is not the bearing or meaning of the General Order; but I will leave it to the Government to explain that that is not its meaning. The noble Lord went on to say that he cannot find what cause there has been for an Order of this sort, and that he cannot find that any deputation representing Civil servants has waited on a Member of Parliament this year for the purpose of getting salaries raised. But, as I understand the case, it was exactly because a deputation had waited upon a Member of Parliament, or a person who afterwards became a Member of Parliament, that the present Order of the Inland Revenue Department was issued.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me to explain? I am informed that all they asked for was a Parliamentary inquiry. They carefully limited themselves to that.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: That may have been so. I cannot say.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Oh, it was so.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: It practically comes to the same thing. At any rate, there is one fact I wish to mention. There is a newspaper called *The Civilian*, which has a large circulation among members of the Civil Service. In an article on the contest at Edinburgh, which appeared in that paper on November 11, 1882, I find the following statements under the heading, "The Inland Revenue Salary Movement"—

"The contest for the representation of Edinburgh in Parliament was decided on Friday, the 3rd inst. There were two Liberals in the field, and Mr. Waddy was returned. Of course, it is not for us to discuss the claims of the rival candidates. What we have to record is that the situation was fully taken advantage of by officers of the Inland Revenue, who wished to have their claims brought before both gentlemen."

The article goes on to say that—

"Mr. Waddy lost no time in granting an interview."

And that—

"Amongst the remarks made by Mr. Waddy, he stated that, in his opinion, the deputation had made out a strong case with regard not only to the inequality, but to the inadequacy of the salaries received."

Now, when the noble Lord says that there was no cause for the Circular, because no deputation had waited on a Member of Parliament to discuss the question of an increase of salary—

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: The gentleman before whom the deputation went was not a Member of Parliament.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Well, he was an inchoate Member of Parliament; and it was with a view to obtain his assistance, as a Member of Parliament, that the deputation waited upon him, and, as *The Civilian* says, full advantage was taken of the opportunity in order to bring the claims of the officials before him. The next point on which the noble Lord made an observation was about the existing regulations. The noble Lord says the gist of his complaint is that in consequence of the Acts of 1868 and 1874 the whole position has been changed, and complete liberty is given to the servants of the various Government Departments to do that which the noble Lord admits it was not competent for them to do before those Acts were passed. The noble Lord went on to say that in the good old times, and until the present injudicious proceedings of the Board of Inland Revenue, there was no organization among Civil servants. Now, I should like to call attention to the circumstances in which the Act of 1868 was passed. I was then a Member of the Government, and I remember what took place. Speaking upon that Bill, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Ward Hunt) said that continual applications were made by Civil servants respecting their position and salaries, and that those applications had, of late years, taken a very peculiar form, not being made through the Heads of Departments, or by Memorials to the Treasury, but being made through the medium of resolutions passed at public meetings. Mr. Ward Hunt contended that the Government of the day would have far greater difficulty than before in ruling the various Public Offices if such measures were persisted in. That proves that at that time there was an organization which caused anxiety to the Government. Nevertheless, the Act of 1868 was passed, though Mr. Disraeli opposed it. It was, however, a very limited Act, which merely gave the power of voting, and did not give the right of taking part in public meetings, and otherwise interfering with elections. In 1874, the first year of the tenure of Office of the late Government, the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) brought forward another Bill. Now, a very remarkable thing occurred in connection with that Bill. There were certain old Statutes which imposed heavy penalties upon persons in the Civil Service for taking part in election matters, and which placed them at the mercy of the common informer. The intention of the hon. Member for Gloucester was to relieve Civil servants from the disability to which these old Statutes referred; but his Bill, as originally drawn, went further, and there was a clause in it to the effect that no person should be subject to any penalty or punishment for taking part in political proceedings at an election. The Government did not oppose the passing of the Bill; but when the Committee stage was reached, I, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, drew attention to the great width and breadth of the provision to which I have alluded, and I then made some observations to which, with the permission of the House, I will call attention.

MR. MONK observed, that that Bill only affected Civil servants in the Post Office and Customs Departments.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: At all events, I will read what took place. What I said was this—

> "Although he quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman that the law should be altered, and that old, obsolete, and inconvenient restrictions should be removed, he thought the House should do nothing to restrain the Executive Government from taking such steps as they might find necessary for preventing any unseemly or inconvenient interference of their own officials in electioneering contests. Now, the 1st clause might cause some difficulty. It provided that no person engaged in the Revenue Departments should be liable to any pains or penalties by reason of his having solicited the vote of any elector, or addressed any assembly of electors in reference to the choice of any person to serve as a Member of Parliament. If they passed so broad an enactment as that, it seemed to him they would inconveniently impair the action of the Executive Government, and the Board of Inland Revenue, or of the Customs might be held to have violated the Act, if they issued any order whatever with regard to the officers taking part in elections. Therefore, what he proposed was that the Bill should be amended by striking out that section; that they should limit themselves to a repeal of the enactments which now prevented officers from taking part in elections; and that they should explain in the Preamble that the reason for passing the Bill was, that the officers of the Revenue Department were still subject to severe penalties with reference to electioneering matters to which the officers in other branches of the Public Service were not subject, that it was desirable to abolish such penalties, and that then they should leave the matter to be dealt with at the discretion of the Government. He thought it very probable that the Board of Customs and of the Inland Revenue might think it necessary to issue some Orders on the subject."—(3 *Hansard*, [219] 799.)

To that the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) replied that he cordially agreed with almost every word that had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. These Orders were issued shortly afterwards, and there have been other Orders. There was an Order on December 2, 1878, sent out by the Board of Inland Revenue, much to the same effect as the present Order. It was subsequent to the alteration of 1868 and 1874, and it was ordered to remain in force until a new edition of the old Order was put forth. That entirely upsets the case of noble Lord. When he tells us that the old positions of these officers have been altered, and that what was right before became wrong after, I say that he does not take into account what were the circumstances of the alteration made in 1868 and 1874. The noble Lord has told us that the position of the Inland Revenue officers is free from any political restriction, and has endeavoured to raise a distinction between an individual wishing to get his salary raised, and that of a number of persons having a common object in view.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: The case of any grievance.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Of any grievance not connected with salary. I believe there ought to be nothing to prevent Civil servants bringing under the notice of Parliament a general statement of grievance. But it is a different thing for them to attempt to get their salaries raised. I think Parliament would be doing a most dangerous thing if it permitted Civil servants to appeal from the decisions of their own immediate superiors to Parliament in order to get improvements in their salaries. The House cannot do this unless it is prepared to take upon itself the responsibility for the administration of the Civil Service. If it should do this it would be a most dangerous thing, not only to the interests of the Service, but to the character of the House of Commons and Parliament. I can assure the noble Lord from my experience, which is not inconsiderable, of the work of Public Departments, that there is no indisposition, and never has been, to carefully and fully consider all the claims put forward by Civil servants for improvements in their position. No one is so interested in the maintenance of contentment in the Civil Service as the Government at the head of it. The late Government were at the trouble to make a most careful inquiry — culminating in the arrangements of 1876— into the stations, salaries, position, and employment, the number, the classification, and the work of the Customs and Inland Revenue officials, and a large and liberal settlement was subsequently made. To permit the members of the Civil Service afterwards to come to the House would be a most dangerous thing. I trust nothing will be done which will in any way weaken the hands or reduce the responsibility of the Government in the matter. The Government must bear the responsibility. If the Inland Revenue authorities acted without the authority of the Executive Government, the Government would take them to task for what they had done. The House itself has nothing to do with the position of the Civil Service; it can only look to the Government and hold them responsible. I maintain that the House of Commons must resolutely refrain from interfering with administration of this kind. When we consider that there are about 100,000 members of the Civil Service in various positions in different parts of the country, it is clear that anything relating to them is a matter of great delicacy and importance. It is almost impossible to benefit one member without doing an injustice to another. If the House were to take upon itself to interfere in this matter, elections would take place in which Civil servants would obtain pledges from candidates on the representation that they were not receiving so much as they ought, having regard to other employments. Encouragement would thus be given to corruption of all kinds, which would utterly destroy the character of the House. It would lead not only to cases of individual corruption, but the House would have placed itself in a position which would very much affect and weaken its character, and might lead us to consequences we have reason to dread. Our warmest thanks are due to the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) for the great service he did in going into the whole subject and introducing an improved system of organization. We have to guard against the evils I have mentioned, and the Circular seems to be directed against them. Therefore I hope Her Majesty's Government will absolutely decline to accept the Motion made by the noble Lord. It is impossible that such a Motion can be accepted, and placed on the Books of the House, without greatly weakening the hands of those who have the administration of the Public Service; and were the House to accept such a proposal it would not be very long before it would have reason to regret it.

MR. WHITBREAD said, he had listened with very great pain to the almost offensive attack made by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstook (Lord Randolph Churchill) upon Mr. Algernon West, the Head of the Inland Revenue Department. In his opinion, it was both ungenerous and uncalled for. The noble Lord had spoken of Mr. West as some Private Secretary brought in from the outside, and thrust over other servants until he got to the head of a Department. He (Mr. Whitbread) remembered Mr. West's first introduction into the Civil Service. He first served as a young clerk in the Inland Revenue Department; he afterwards went to the Admiralty, and then to the Treasury, and thence to the Inland Revenue Board. He had also been Private Secretary to different Ministers. He did not think the noble Lord had had experience in that rank of life. Private Secretaries were not generally called upon to do the dirty work of their superiors; and the first duty a Private Secretary learnt was to be accurate and moderate in his statements. It was the fact that Ministers who had once employed Mr. West as their Private Secretary subsequenly endeavoured again to obtain his services, and often recommended him to their Successors. The noble Lord had said that Mr. West owed his position to two jobbing Whigs, Lord Northbrook and Lord Halifax; but he believed Mr. West really owed at least one step of his promotion to the Party opposite, and in particular to Lord Beaconsfield. His talents and industry which were recognized on the one side of the House were recognized also on the other, and he had steadily worked his way up after 33 years' service. The duties which the Civil servants of the Crown had to perform were of a very important and delicate character, and were spread over every part of the United Kingdom, and therefore nothing could be more foolish than the advice tendered to them by the noble Lord when he suggested to them to strike.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I never recommended them to strike.

MR. WHITBREAD said, he could only compare the noble Lord to the gentleman who said to the people in stormy election times—"There are stones, and there are windows; do not say that I recommended you to break them." He must tell the noble Lord that words such as he had used caused pain. If Her Majesty's Government resisted the Motion of the noble Lord they should have his hearty support, for he was convinced that it was absolutely necessary to stand up against organized demands for increase of salaries. No one valued more than himself the services of the Civil servants; but he felt bound to say that bringing Parliamentary pressure to bear on their part ought to be discouraged. If the House were to follow that course, as recommended by the noble Lord, it would be one of the worst steps in the interests of the Civil servants themselves, because there would arise a reaction against such pressure, and the Civil servants, instead of standing well, would lose their position very considerably.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that although much of what he had intended to say had been already anticipated by the admirable speech of the right hon. Baronet opposite and by his hon. Friend behind him, still he felt it his duty to state, on the part of the Government, the view that they took of the Motion of the noble Lord; and in doing so he would state his regret that the Motion came on as an Amendment to Supply, so that it could only be met by what was virtually the Previous Question, instead of by a direct negative. There was one personal matter which the noble Lord had introduced into his statement. The noble Lord had asked him whether he held himself responsible for this General Order. He would reply most distinctly that he was responsible.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he understood that the right hon. Gentleman was absent from London at the time.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, that was so; but he should be sorry to rely on his absence from London as releasing him from responsibility. On the contrary, he considered himself responsible for the General Order. It was an excellent General Order, and he was prepared to stand by it. Without some such Order it would be practically impossible for any Government to carry on the discipline of the Civil Service or any part of the Civil Service with efficiency and economy. The noble Lord's Motion implied, and in his speech he had stated in effect, that Civil servants had a right to apply to Members of Parliament collectively or individually, in order to obtain increase of salaries, promotion, and other advantages, this being what was prohibited in the General Order.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, that all he stated was that they had a right to ask for a Parliamentary Inquiry into their grievances.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, the noble Lord's speech and the speech of the hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Monk) most distinctly covered the ground he had stated.

MR. MONK: I entirely and most distinctly repudiate any such intention.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF rose to Order, and asked whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer was right in continuing to impute expressions to his noble Friend which his noble Friend disavowed?

MR. SPEAKER: If the noble Lord has disavowed the expression attributed to him, that disavowal ought to be accepted.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, if the language the noble Lord used was not intended to convey what the words meant, he would accept the disavowal. In the case of his hon. Friend the Member for Gloucester he took the words down. The hon. Member said that every elector, whether in the Civil Service or not, might approach his Parliamentary Representative and unburden his grievances, whatever they might be. But the foundation for the Motion was that, whatever might have been the case formerly, Civil servants, being now electors, had the right to approach Members of Parliament; and in this connection, another argument of the noble Lord was that the rights in this respect of members of the Civil Service were derived from the circumstance that Parliament was their employer. That doctrine seemed to him fraught with the gravest consequences. It was not Parliament which employed Civil servants, but the Crown, acting through the Ministers, who were responsible to Parliament. The noble Lord's proposition was, therefore, based upon a fallacy, and ought not to be assented to by the House. But, putting aside this argument as really beside the question, what he wished to point out was that the doctrine put before them by the noble Lord did not only concern Revenue officers, but every branch of the Service—soldiers, sailors, and the whole body of civilians, whether employed under the Admiralty and War Office, or in the Civil Service proper. The noble Lord's contention was that something had been done with respect to Revenue officers, some privilege had been conferred on them which did not apply to other officers. But he would remind the House that soldiers and sailors and members of the ordinary Civil Service had always enjoyed the franchise. As to soldiers, George III. once blamed Lord North and Lord Barrington for not bringing up the Guardsmen to vote at an election. The present state of the law was remarkable as to soldiers. It was quite true that in Great Britain regiments were not allowed to be in a constituency at the time of polling for an election; but from that was expressly excepted the right of soldiers having votes to exercise the elective franchise, and even to go to their polling places without asking leave. So that the House would see that this Motion not only affected the Inland Revenue officials, but the whole of the Army, Navy, and Civil servants; in fact, every person who was paid by the Crown, with some limited exceptions. The effect of the Enfranchisement Act of 1868 was simply to put the Revenue officers on a footing with all the other officers of the Crown in regard to these privileges. Therefore, the whole foundation on which the noble Lord and his hon. Friend built their superstructure fell to the ground. He had taken some pains to place the facts as to the Public Service in this respect before the House; and the Treasury and Admiralty Minutes which were circulated utterly disposed of this supposed right to approach Members on questions of pay and promotion. All the different classes of the Service were governed by the same rules and subjected to the same restrictions. He would point out one absurdity which would follow from the noble Lord's proposition. It would follow that those public servants who were electors might approach Members of Parliament on these questions, while those who were not so would be debarred from that privilege. Indeed, it would almost follow that they could only approach their own Members. This would make it necessary for

Heads of Departments to keep registers, so as to be able to tell which of their subordinates were voters and which were not, and to what constituency each voter belonged. But he would also point out what was far more serious, and that was, that if public servants were to canvass Members for this purpose, offering their support to those who would help them, they would naturally select those who had the greatest influence with the Government—that was to say, supporters of the Government. The effect of that would be that, in the long run, the whole body of public servants would be on the side of the Minister in power. In other words, whoever was the Minister in power would be able to wield the whole influence of the Public Service. The result would be that they would gradually arrive at the state of things which prevailed in the United States; and, as the inevitable result, at every change of Government a large number of Civil servants would be deprived of their offices. He would turn for a moment to what had been said in the debate with regard to Mr. Algernon West. He wished to say, in regard to that gentleman, that he knew no public servant who discharged his duty with so much fidelity, and he believed he should be borne out in that statement by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. But, in his attack on the Circular for which Mr. West was responsible, the noble Lord was guilty of a strange omission. He read through two of its sentences, but he carefully omitted the words relating to salary, the express subject of the Circular.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I especially avoided dwelling upon the question of salaries.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS) said, it was true that the noble Lord had guarded himself against advocating any increase of salaries; but he omitted from the Circular the words about salary, which were its essence. They had heard a great deal about the right of Petition; but neither the Treasury nor the Inland Revenue had ever questioned the right to address a proper Petition to that House. He certainly had refused to discuss this question of the right of Petition except in debate and when they had the exact words of the Petition before them. The whole of this controversy was a question of salary and promotion. He had laid on the Table of the House the Correspondence between the Board and the Treasury, and between the Board and its officers; and, from beginning to end, anyone who perused it would see that it was entirely a question of salaries. Those salaries had been settled in 1876, on fair and just terms, and the whole of this agitation was aimed at re-opening the settlement through the assistance of Members of Parliament. He would say again that it would be impossible, in his opinion, to exercise due control in the direction of economy, over the expensive Public Services of the country if the principle advocated by the noble Lord in his Motion were for a moment admitted. Already the salaries of the Civil servants in this country—although he did not think them excessive—were probably about twice as high as they were in France, and still higher than in any other country in Europe. There was always going on a constant struggle between the Treasury and the different Departments of the Public Service to maintain the economy which, in the opinion of the Government, was absolutely necessary to be maintained. But whether prices were high or low, the Treasury poor or wealthy, the country prosperous or otherwise, the agitation for more salary went on in the Public Departments. Under these circumstances, therefore, and considering how difficult it was for the Government to secure support from the House in dealing with questions of this class, however the House might endorse economy in the abstract, he was bound to say that if they added to the weight against the Treasury — that was, against the taxpayer — this facility for every public servant to go to a Member of Parliament and to get his assistance in redressing his so-called grievances, it would be impossible to act upon the Resolution lately moved by his hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) with reference to the Public Expenditure, a Resolution which had received the support of both sides of the House. Such a Motion as that of the noble Lord was simply in the teeth of that economy to which the Government were pledged, and he did hope the House would not accept it.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, that the right hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote) had accused his noble Friend the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph

Churchill) of mis-statements and mistakes. It was most remarkable that both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the right hon. Baronet had entirely ignored one circumstance, How were these Papers laid on the Table? His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had asked for the Circular itself, on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer offered, not only to lay it upon the Table, but also some Papers which he volunteered as necessary to this subject. And the whole of this discussion turned upon Papers volunteered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Therefore, his noble Friend had been perfectly justified in adverting to those Papers. The right hon. Gentleman had said that Members of Parliament ought not to press on the Government for an increase of salary for public servants. He (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) perfectly agreed with him, and so did they all. All they had a right to do was to bring particular cases before the Government, and ask for a discussion upon them. But in the very Treasury Minute the right hon. Gentleman had laid on the Table the question of an increase of salary was included as one within the rights of Members of Parliament to press the Government upon. That Minute, however, had been issued by a much wiser Treasury than they had at present. He would ask the House to consider one question. The Treasury Minute of 1866 had been published by the Treasury as a great Public Department. If Ministers of State chose to bring forward on their responsibility any regulations they were at liberty to do so, facing, of course, any opposition. But he maintained that it was a different case where permanent servants made regulations. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the Treasury Minute of 1866, which prohibited Civil servants from appealing to Members of Parliament on questions of salary, applied to members of the Inland Revenue Board, or whether a Commissioner might approach his own father, if a Member of Parliament, on this subject, and whether the General Order under discussion applied to the Commissioners? In the year 1867, the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister advised certain Civil servants who applied to him in the matter in these terms—"Exhaust your chances with your Board first, and then come to the House of Commons." Did the right hon. Gentleman recognize those words as his own? [Mr. Gladstone: No.] He inquired whether they represented the substance of what was said, and had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman would say something on the subject when he addressed the House? How were Civil servants to present Petitions to Parliament unless they were permitted to have access to their Members? He only wished to say one more word about the constitution of the Board of Inland Revenue. He was not going to attack the members of that Body; but he maintained, as a principle, that they had no right to issue the Circular; it could only be issued by a responsible Minister of the Crown, directed to every rank of officer under his control. With regard to the question of the appointment of Private Secretaries to these posts, he would maintain that, whatever might be the merits or the virtues of this gentleman, the Inland Revenue Commissioners had no right to issue this Circular without distinct instructions from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I need not detain the House very long on this subject; but it is impossible for me, both on account of the reference which has been made to myself, and also considering my position in the Government and the view I take of the importance of the question, to pass it over altogether in silence. I am extremely sorry that personal matter of this character should have been introduced into the debate, and I cannot conceive why it should have been introduced. The hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) has said that the right hon. Gentleman the Baronet opposite has been influenced by family affection in procuring an appointment for his son, and that expression going forth to the world might make it appear that the right hon. Gentleman has deviated from the path of perfect justice by placing his son upon the Board of Inland Revenue. That being so, I wish to take this opportunity of doing that which justice absolutely demands. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman did or did not have anything to do with the appointment of his son by the late Prime Minister on that Board, but whoever made the appointment deserves great credit and honour for it. No better appointment could have been made, and all I can say is that I wish there may always be forthcoming a series of men as well fitted to discharge the important duties of that Office as is the son of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. But why did the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) attack Mr. Algernon West in this extraordinary manner, and why did he profess to know that it was by Mr. West's authority that this Circular was issued? From the noble Lord's account Mr. West would appear to be a gentleman bad beyond reclamation; and not only so, there are two other gentleman as bad as Mr. West—Lord Halifax and Lord Northbrook—through one of whom Mr. West was in part promoted. But there is another individual who, it seems to me, is worse than either of them, and that is the Prime Minister himself, for if he employs his Secretaries in back stairs intrigue and dirty work, which appears to be the staple commodity in which Private Secretaries, according to the noble Lord, are engaged to deal, it appears to me, according to the principle, that the briber is worse than he who takes the bribe, that if Mr. West has been employed in this guilty occupation, the man who employed him is still more deserving of reprobation than that gentleman himself. I am extremely sorry that the noble Lord, with his capabilities for applying himself to Public Business, should, I might almost say, debase, certainly disparage, his own abilities by the introduction of such worthless trash. That expression may seem a strong one, but it is really justified by the facts of this case. Mr. West is a gentleman who has risen step by step to a high position in the Public Service, and every one of these steps has been achieved by honourable and able exertion, and by no other means. The duties of a Private Secretary are most arduous, and those of a Private Secretary to the Prime Minister are certainly arduous far beyond all others, and it was Mr. West's merit and nothing else which led to his appointment, an appointment subsequently recognized by our political opponents, so that he stands in the position of a gentleman whose ability has been acknowledged by both sides of the House. We know from the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread) that the expression of the noble Lord will give pain; but on the whole I am really inclined to think that it will not give pain, and that the testimony borne to that gentleman's character and services is such that he may safely dismiss from his mind all that has fallen from the noble Lord. I wish to say one word as to the statement I am reported to have made in 1867 in connection with a Memorial or document prepared by Civil servants of that day. That quotation cannot be verified by reference to any document or authority.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: It appears in the Report of the Committee of the Civil Servants drawn up at that time, when the negotiations were in progress. That, I admit, is the only record of the statement.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes; it appears in the Report which I hold in my hand, though I was entirely unaware until quite lately that that passage was in circulation, and was being used to give my authority to a certain course of proceeding. I was unable to obtain a copy of the letter to which my communication was an answer; but on referring to my journal, which I keep of all the letters I write, I find that that letter is mentioned in my journal, and there are words corresponding to the words quoted in the Memorial, but they do not amount to a recommendation to try the Board first, and then Parliament. There is, however, this expression in the letter—

> "I should have expected that any representations proceeding from members of the Civil Service in such a matter would have come through the Heads of the Departments, or else by way of deliberate appeal from them."

Unfortunately, as I have said, these officers have not been able to produce their letter to which this was a reply; in that case, however, the question was that of the amalgamation of certain Departments of the Service, and I said they might be justified in appealing to Parliament on that subject—in my opinion, they would be perfectly entitled to appeal freely against any grievance—and, under such circumstances, a grievance might arise. I have no assistance in the matter from recollection, or from any other documents; but I can see a great distinction between the right of Civil servants to petition freely against grievances and the pretended right to come to Parliament to use their influence with their constituents, for the purpose of altering their contract which they had entered into with the public to the disadvantage of the public, when that contract has always been liberally fulfilled on the side of the public. I think the proposed access to Members of Parliament is a most dangerous claim, and I am glad to find the hon. Member who has just sat down does not think it advisable, at any rate where their salary is concerned.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I admit that too.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am glad to hear, Sir, that that admission has now been made by the noble Lord also. If it be admitted, with regard to salary, that the attempt to influence Parliament is intolerable, I cannot help saying that the effect of the debate has been considerably to narrow the difference between us; for it is now recorded, I hope, as the unanimous sentiment of the House, that applications to Parliament for increase of salary, or, *à fortiori*, for promotion in the Service, ought not to be made by the Civil servants of the Crown. I think the House understands pretty well the grounds on which we say it is impossible to attach any blame whatever to the issue of this Circular to anyone apart from the Government. The whole responsibility rests upon the Government, and the House of Commons ought not to arraign permanent officers of the State who are not here to defend themselves, and the whole responsibility for whose acts passes over to the Government of the day. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and I are responsible for this Circular; the Secretary to the Treasury will not be disinclined to take his share of the responsibility; and we ask the House to support us in maintaining the principle declared in that Circular. We do not propose to shut out a multitude of cases that are conceivably, it may be, cases of grievance. There may be demands of intolerable labour or circumstances of intolerable inconvenience in the performance of labour. It is not necessary to sketch the contingencies in which real causes of grievance may exist; but any approach to the House for the purpose of altering the contract into which these gentlemen have entered with the State will, I trust, remain upon record after this debate as unequivocally opposed to the wishes of the House. The noble Lord says he has heard me bear testimony to the efficiency of Civil servants in these Departments. It is true I have done so again and again, and it was only common justice that I should do it. While I have commended gentlemen with whom I have had confidential intercourse, my action never stopped there. It is my belief that efficiency, skill, and zeal go down through all the ranks of the Departments. Therefore, I hope it will not be supposed I intend to pronounce any severe censure on those whose action I think the House should discourage. It is no wonder that they are tempted by the facilities which I am afraid Members of Parliament sometimes offer—facilities the extension of which would inevitably lead to reaction—and it is far better that the intention of the House should clearly be ascertained and declared. The question is not confined to the Revenue Department; the privilege might be extended to soldiers and sailors; and it is for Members to consider what the effects of such extension would be. When the hon. Gentleman proposes to censure the appointments of Private Secretaries, I shall contend that such appointments, although in some cases they may be extremely bad, have in many cases been the best that could be made. From the days of Mr. Huskisson there have been many men eminent in the Public Service who have first entered it as Private Secretaries. There is no possible relation in political life which gives such knowledge of the qualities and capacities of a man's mind as knowing him in the character of a Private Secretary. I shall not hesitate to affirm, especially in regard to such offices as have been held by my own principal Private Secretaries, that they have required qualifications that would often suffice for the very respectable and creditable discharge of many political offices. It is suggested that on the occurrence of vacancies Private Secretaries are first thought of; but my first question always is whether the office can be abolished. In three instances I have abolished offices altogether; in two I have appointed Private Secretaries. One of them was Mr. West, whose capacity has been attested by those who differed from him in politics. The other was Mr. Godley, with regard to whom I may say it was my good fortune to introduce his father into the Public Service in 1853, and not less my good fortune to obtain the son as Private Secretary; and no two men have more worthily distinguished themselves in the Civil Service. We have not neglected the consideration of the claims of those who have risen in the Service itself. I have had the pleasure and satisfaction of appointing to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue Mr. Young, who had risen from the ranks, and had passed a long life in the service of the country—an able and honourable a man as is to be found in the Civil Service or out of it. I hope the House will come to the vote with the full understanding that this is a question of the greatest importance and of wide application, and one with respect to which they will discharge their duty best to the Civil servants as well as to the State by unequivocally discountenancing attempts to procure increase of salary or interference with promotion through action and influence brought to bear upon Members of Parliament.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that if the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), had proposed to disfranchise the Civil servants of the Inland Revenue Department, he was not sure that he should not have voted for that Motion; but as the noble Lord had proposed that the franchise of these Civil servants should be respected and held inviolable from any interference on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers with the free exercise of it, he should vote for the Motion before the House, in case the noble Lord should decide to divide the House. These Civil servants were competent to judge for themselves of the limits imposed upon their actions by their position, and if they were not, they were unfit both for the franchise and for employment under the Crown. He (Mr. Newdegate) clearly understood the difficulty which had arisen. According to the Constitution of the United States, the whole of the Civil servants vacated their situations on every change in the Presidency, and were re-appointed or discarded by the new Administration. That was one method of preventing the difficulty which had now arisen in this country; he (Mr. Newdegate) did not say that this American system would exactly suit England, but it solved this difficulty in the United States. Of one circumstance there could be no doubt, and this was that an imperfect franchise invariably engendered political corruption. Nothing would induce him to vote for the continuance of an imperfect franchise. He should therefore vote with the noble Lord, if he went to a division, on the ground that these men ought to be wholly disfranchised, or else that they ought to be entitled to the free use of the whole political influence which attached to the franchise.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 120; Noes 37: Majority 83.—(Div. List, No. 115.)

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY (RECRUITING)—"WASTE" OF THE ARMY.—OBSERVATIONS.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT rose to call attention to the present position of recruiting for the Army, the waste and crime of the Army, and their effects upon the efficiency of the Army and of the Reserves.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he hoped the "Count out" which had been attempted was not an ominous sign of the present condition of the Army. But there could be no more important question at the present moment than that which he wished to bring under the consideration of the House. He would admit that this was rather an unfortunate time to bring forward an important question of this kind. But in that House they were not their own masters, and they must take any and every opportunity they could get when they thought that an important public duty demanded that they should ask the consideration of the House to a most important subject. He would venture to invite the attention of Members to this question, and also the attention of those organs of the Press which conveyed to those outside all the important discussions in that House. On Army questions, especially, the technicality of the details was such that many did not care to weary themselves by going through them; but, at the same time, it was of very great importance that a true and accurate statement of the facts should be fairly given to the country. No one would deny that the public Press had now taken a different view of the subject. *The Times* had recently had two remarkable articles on the crime and present condition of the Army, and had, in fact, admitted that there were two sides to the question. Matters in the Army had come to such a pass that it was necessary to look them in the face, and the country should know its real position, for then it would not be backward in finding the means required for placing the Army in an efficient condition. He could assure the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War that he did not wish to treat this as in any way a Party question, and he hoped that the question of the Army might never be made a Party question; but he would ask the noble Lord, first, with regard to the Indian Army, whether the 50 battalions of Infantry had been made up to their full complement, or whether they were not, looking to their present numbers, five battalions short; and whether the nine Cavalry regiments in India were only equal to eight regiments in numbers? The Artillery and Engineers were also short of their full complement. With regard to the Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers, the short-service system had come for the first time into actual play, with the result of a serious falling off in numbers. He had been informed that the Artillery were between 1,500 and 2,000 men short; and there was also a great falling off in the Engineers. The short-service system had a serious effect upon the Cavalry. Cavalry could not be made in a day, and they certainly were never anxious that short service should be introduced into their ranks. It was most unwise to cut down the length of service of a Cavalry soldier, because it took a long time to make him efficient. If long service was necessary for the Cavalry, it was still more necessary for the Artillery, especially having regard to the progress of science in that branch of the Service. If short service were to prevail, what sort of Artillery would they be likely to have, considering how long it took to make a man an efficient gunner? If, then, in India they had five Infantry battalions short, and one Cavalry regiment short, what was the condition of things at home? It was said that recruiting was now proceeding more briskly; but that did not alter the case at all. At home they had no less than 9,000 men short; and certainly neither the men nor the regiments were efficient. It was difficult, owing to the manner in which the Returns were made up, to ascertain the real condition and state of efficiency of the several regiments; and he would ask the noble Lord in future to make the Returns in such a manner as to show the absolute strength of the regiments each year, and the percentage of crime in each regiment. He held in his hand a Return for a district, not far from London, from which it appeared that four Infantry regiments had a total of 511 men short. He had also been informed, on good authority, that there were two regiments which had only 30 men between them fit for duty. He had further been informed by an officer of the Guards, who was at Aldershot at the time, that a regiment there was so absolutely inefficient that, whilst it found the non-commissioned officers, it had to borrow men from another regiment to do the necessary guards—the non-commissioned officers being in green, and the men in red. It was difficult to believe that such a thing could exist in an Army at home of 100,000 men. Then, going to the Western part of the country, there was a regimental depôt, or depôt centre of two regiments, of which one was at home and the other was in India. In the regiment at home 1,400 recruits had passed through its ranks in a little over two years What sort of discipline could be expected under such circumstances? But these 1,400 men did not come from the Western county, but 30 per month were sent from London, and 30 from Ireland, simply because recruits could not be obtained in the neighbourhood. That was the result of the territorial system, which, in some instances, had turned out such a complete failure. Then these men, after having been three weeks or a month in a regimental district, were transferred to their regiment. What happened then? The regiment was anxious to perform its duties; accordingly the men were forced on point by point, and then put into the ranks before they had been properly drilled. They were placed under young non-commissioned officers, with the result that the discipline of the present day was exceedingly lax as compared with that of the old days, for men were hurried into the ranks before they knew their duties. A General Officer, whom they all respected—but he could not mention names—had said that the greatest evil they had to contend with was the young and inexperienced non-commissioned officer. Cases of insubordination occurred from want of tact. Sergeants who had re-engaged, if offered a good situation elsewhere, absented themselves in order to get tried by court martial and reduced, which involved being discharged. The fact was, that the question of non-commissioned officers was a most serious one, which deserved the fullest consideration from the noble Lord. If they went a little further as regarded crime, they would find the offences of a very curious character. They consisted chiefly of violence to superiors and insubordination. In the olden days he was sure that that sort of offence did not exist to the same extent. In 1872 there were 1,153 cases; in 1877, 1,377; in 1881, 1,862; and in 1882, 1810. Those were at home. The increase was 57 per cent over 1872. Abroad, in 1872, 898; in 1877, 900; in 1881, 1,502, or 67 per cent increase. The reductions of non-commissioned officers were—in 1872, 1,001; in 1877, 1,171; in 1881, 1,830; and in 1882, 1,337, or 34 per cent over 1872. Abroad, in 1872, 1131; in 1877, 915; in 1881, 1,582, an increase of 40 per cent over 1872. The reductions with imprisonment were, in 1872, 81; in 1877, 169; in 1881, 293; and in 1882, 219, or 170 per cent over 1872. Abroad, in 1872, 98; in 1877, 125; in 1881, 293, or 199 per cent increase. He took an average of 100,000 men. He would then refer to the short-service system. In the first eight years of that system 184,110 were enlisted. Of these 123 per 1,000 disappeared before the end of the year; 240 per 1,000 before the end of the second year; and 290 before the end of the third year. He thought those facts very serious. The Return showed that 13 per 1,000 died; 39 were invalided; and 50 per 1,000 purchased their discharge. Those figures showed, he believed, that the Service was for some reason or other unpopular. The noble Lord said the other day that things were looking more hopeful, but he did not think that these figures showed that to be the case. The fact was, they had destroyed the old regimental system, which was, by the whole of Europe, considered the most perfect, efficient, and effective in the world. Under that system the officers knew every man under them. The men liked their officers, and matters worked satisfactorily. But now the old regimental system was gone, and the *esprit de corps* which it was so necessary to maintain had been seriously impaired. Of the long-service men enlisted only 28,800 were serving in January, 1882, and at present only 7,811 were still serving. He regarded that as a most serious matter. As to the strength of the Reserves, on the 1st of January, 1882, there were 24,085. The transfers to the Reserves in that year were 6,910, making a total of 30,995. The number that joined the Army from the Reserves during 1882 was 10,840, less those who rejoined the Reserves on demobilization — namely, 1,460. The actual strength of the Reserves on the 1st of January, 1883, was 16,479, the loss during the year being 5,136. He should like to ask what had become of these men, and whether they were still serving? If they were to have a Reserve they ought to have a sufficient and contented Reserve, and the men ought to know what they had to expect. That brought him to the question of the enlistment of the men, and the great fault of that was that the men did not know, or said they did not know, for what period they were enlisted. It might be for seven, eight, or nine years; seven years with the Colours, eight if going abroad, and nine if there was a war. But there was something more than that; for sometimes they only served for five years, which was considered by them the greatest hardship of all. It happened in this way—at the end of five years' service their regiment might be ordered abroad, and because they had only two years more to serve they were sent into the Reserve, whether they liked it or not. If it was found, that by giving all these different times they did not get either the class or the number of recruits they desired, then they must look and see how they could manage the enlistment better; and that brought him to another point. Each time-expired man in India was offered 50 rupees to go on with his service, and to re-engage for the rest of his 12 years; and the number that had responded to that call was only 411, showing that, even with the bounty proposed to be given, they were not willing to carry on their service. Everyone knew that the Guards were one battalion short, and he was told that the Government were prepared to give £2 10*s*. per man to those men now coming home from India if they would go into the Guards. He would like to know if that was the case, and whether that did not show the unpopularity of the Service, that they should have to offer bribes to the men? No doubt, the great amount of sentry duty now required of the Guards in London might have something to do with the question; but he believed that at the present moment they could not get the men for what they were offered. He had seen a letter written to *The Times* by a Major General, giving an account of time-expired men, whose only object, it said, was to go on in the Service. It was quite clear that the soldier was a man out of whom they would take everything they could get, and whom they would then throw over, simply that he might not come to the State for a pension. When one considered that the Army had to be in every clime, it was high time that they should consider under certain conditions whether, when they had men adapted for the Service and willing to continue, they should not give them the right to continue for five years longer. He thought they might serve 10 years with the Colours and five in the Reserve, and after a service of 15 years, he said, a man was entitled to have some pension. But, as they were at present, the soldier, though he fought our battles abroad, was treated with less consideration than the police at home in the matter of pension. Looking at all these considerations, he thought the noble Lord would do well if he would consider these cases, because they all knew that the great object ought to be to have an efficient and effective Army. It was a startling fact that, in order to send out an Army of 18,882 men to Egypt, it was necessary to call out 11,649 Reserve men, of whom 10,593 were taken on the strength of corps, 4,363 going to Egypt with their corps. That, surely, condemned the whole system from beginning to end. They all recollected the Crimea, and the condemnation of everything then; but the country had been at peace then for many years; and surely the country ought at this time to have been able to send out a sufficient Force, without calling out the Reserve. They had also had to take 7,558 men from the Mediterranean garrisons, and had also to take 5,863 men from India; and that showed the position the country would have been in if it had had a strong and resolute enemy to deal with. That was a very serious question, and deserved the attention of the House. But yet they were told it was a triumph of the short service. The average age of the men at Tel-el-Kebir was 25 years and four months, and the average service five years and eight months. In more than one regiment they were obliged to leave behind as many as 500 men as being absolutely unfit to fight against even Arabi and his Army. He knew one regiment in the First Army Corps which could not sail till nearly the last, because it had been denuded of all its men in the Zulu War, and their places, of course, had to be filled up with large drafts. He should like to read an extract showing the opinion of Sir Frederick Roberts on the question. Sir Frederick Roberts protested against the system of having regiments of which the men were unknown to each other and to their officers. The following contained that gallant Officer's opinion:—

"The testimony of Sir Frederick Roberts has also been given to the world since Lord Airey's Committee reported. In speaking of the 2nd Battalion of the 8th Foot, which bears a name second to none, and has distinguished itself on many a hard-fought field, he says that it had been stationed in one of the healthiest cantonments in India during the two years it had been in the country, and had every opportunity given it of recovering from the effects of a system, which, two years previously, had collected together in the battalion a number of untrained boys, unknown to each other and to their officers. The result proved that two years were not sufficient to remedy the evils of the system; and he adds, 'that, except under very unusual circumstances, no regiment of Infantry with less than three years in India should be ordered to the field.' Before the regiment had marched 100 miles, his attention was drawn to the youthful appearance of the men, to a listlessness in the performance of their daily duty, and to their frequent admissions into hospital, so that, after repeated and careful examination, he was forced to represent to the Commander-in-Chief that he did not think the battalion was in a fit state for a campaign; without any forced marches or exceptional difficulties, the regiment had dwindled down to a weak half-battalion when it had only advanced 70 miles from our own territory. On the day when he advanced to attack the Peiwar Kotal, the whole battalion mustered only 366 men fit for duty. Fortunately, the other troops with him were older soldiers; but Sir Frederick Roberts asks—'What would have been the fate of the Kuram Field Force, if it had been called upon to storm and capture the

Peiwar Kotal with the troops originally allotted to it?' His answer should be well pondered by everyone who has the interest of his country at heart. He replies—'I have no hesitation in stating my firm belief that the Force would have been annihilated.'"

In olden times, it was exactly the reverse—officers knew their men; and, as a matter of fighting power and *esprit de corps*, the new system would not bear comparison with the old. The age of recruits also demanded their most serious attention. It was useless to have men who had not filled out, and who, as regarded weight and chest measurement, were not men, but boys. In time of war they would only die, as Lord Raglan said, "like flies." Last year the Government got only 23,802 recruits, instead of 32,302; and he should like to ask how many recruits they wanted this year? It was useless to answer that recruits were joining the Army at a satisfactory rate, without, at the same time, describing the class of men the Government were getting—whether they were men who would make soldiers, and not men who never could. What was it that took place on the march to Ulundi, when a body of Engineers were constructing an outwork—they were supported by Infantry, under the command of a field officer? Why, a scare took place, and the men were ordered to fall back upon the laager. The Infantry did so; but before the Engineers could retire they were fired upon from the laager. They might again be placed in a similar position, and, unless they had an Army which would stand fire, they could not expect to carry on operations successfully. The number of men who were so small in frame as to be useless as soldiers was on the increase, he regretted to say; and last year there were 174 per 1,000 who only weighed 8 st. 8 lbs. What was 8 st. 8 lbs. for a soldier? It was the weight of a Derby jockey, and not of a man fit for a campaign. Some of the statements he had made he had taken from a letter of Sir Lintorn Simmons, which appeared in *The Morning Post,* and which deserved the attention of the Secretary of State for War. It was therein declared that more than one-third of the recruits were under 5 feet 6 inches; and the extraordinary result followed, contrary to what might have been expected, that with an increase of one year in age they got men of less breadth, weight, and size generally. Was this the class of men we wished to have in the Service? It would be all very well if we could afford to feed them well for three or four years, and then send them abroad; but we did not do that, and by passing such recruits quickly through the Army we destroyed its efficiency. We had about 30,000 non-commissioned officers, and it was the great ambition of many to serve on, and get a pension. We ought to allow such officers of good character to remain in the Army for 12, or even 21 years; and if a man who had been in for 14 or 15 years happened to offend, and be reduced to the ranks, he ought to be allowed an opportunity to recover his position, or to retire as a private at the end of his term on a reduced position. Such changes would go a long way towards securing the non-commissioned officers we required in lieu of those we had who were not fit to look after the interests of their men on the field of battle. Similarly, private soldiers ought to be allowed to go on for 21 years and pensions, or 15 years and pensions if they then entered the Reserve. Men who had served all over the world deserved no less, and if they were treated well they would respond to the calls made upon them. In this way they might hope to improve the condition of the Army, to make it more attractive to a better class of men, to render it worthy of the country, and to place it in a position to maintain the unbroken traditions of a glorious past. We could not have conscription, and we must bear the alternative burden if we would have an efficient Army to secure our food supply and protect our trade. But we could not expect efficiency if we simply kept men as long as it suited us and then turned them out upon the world, or if we ruined their prospects by harsh punishments for trifling offences. Treat the men well, give them such indulgences as were possible, and you would find they would faithfully perform those duties they had undertaken. He had made these remarks, because he was quite certain that the noble Lord would do his best to ameliorate the condition of the soldiers and to place the Army in that state of efficiency which they had a right to expect.

MR. CAINE: Mr. Speaker, I desire to show that the waste and crime in the Army is generally attributable to intemperance. The hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B.

Barttelot) has stated that some 250 per 1,000 of the men recruited deserted before the end of the first year's service. This is not to be wondered at when these lads of 19 are picked up by the recruiting sergeants in low gin-shops. The bulk of them are drunk when enlisted, and they come to their senses to find themselves crimped into a Service which they find irksome, and in some cases loathsome. Of course they desert. The hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex has told the House that 500 men were left behind from one regiment in the Egyptian Campaign. It would be an interesting Return to lay upon the Table of the House, giving the reasons why these 500 men were unfit for service, and why they were left behind. It would be found, I think, that the cause of their unfitness in regard to many instances was drunkenness and debauchery. Lord Wolseley said in a speech delivered after his return from Egypt that he had never seen a drunken soldier all the time he was in Egypt. But that statement does not agree with what the Judge Advocate General said last March, that there had been 364 courts martial in Egypt in seven months, and that—

> "Trials for drunkenness have been unusually frequent, especially when the troops have not been actively employed. In fact, I find that the more the men have to do, and the less they have to drink, the better they, as a general rule, behave."—(3 *Hansard*, [277] 932.)

Why, Sir, the Khedive was so shocked at the continual scandal of drunken British soldiers in Cairo, after the war, that he asked Mr. Thomas Cook to get the temperance people in England to send out someone to try and get the soldiers to become teetotallers and go to coffee-shops instead of low pot-houses. This has been done. The Rev. J. Gelson Gregson, Secretary to the Soldiers' Total Abstinence Society, went out at once to Egypt, and the result of his visit has been that over 3,000 soldiers have joined the society, and a large coffee palace has been established for their use. I will venture to trouble the House with a few remarks taken from the General Annual Return of the British Army for the year 1881, showing the terrible amount of drunkenness prevalent in the Army. Is it to be wondered at when such fatal inducements are held out to young soldiers as that of obtaining beer at a low rate at the regimental canteen, that privilege being classed in the opinion of the War Office in the recruiting circular issued through the Post Office as of the same advantage as the use of a library or a gymnasium and the opportunity of learning a trade? I do not want to go through the figures which have been brought out so ably by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex; but I should like to call the attention of the House to the amount of crime referred to in these statistics and resulting practically from drunkenness. I have taken the Returns for 1881, instead of 1882, because the latter Returns are not yet complete. I find that in the year 1881 there were 44,108 cases, in which 23,470 men were fined for drunkenness, and of these I find that 2,633 were fined four times or over. The courts martial at home were 13,324, and abroad 9,913, making a total of 23,307. I have no hesitation in saying that the great majority of these courts martial resulted directly from intemperance. Indeed, the Judge Advocate General, in reply to a Question which I put to him in this House, admitted that such was the fact. He said that he was unable to give the number of crimes which arose directly from drink, but that a very large proportion were attributable to the influence of drink. The Court Martial Returns show that cases of violence resulting from drink amounted to 1,650, and of insubordination attributed to the same cause 1,472, making a total of 3,022.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): Will my hon Friend state what the Return is which he is quoting?

MR. CAINE: I am quoting from the General Annual Return of the British Army for 1881. As I have already stated, the Judge Advocate General informed me on the 9th of June, 1882, that a very large portion of these offences were committed under the influence of drink. The Returns for 1882 are not yet out. Therefore, I am taking those for 1881, and I have calculated that one-half of these cases were committed under the influence of drink. That would give a total of 1,600, which is a very large number indeed. I find in another case that of all offences of an aggravated character committed by soldiers when in a state of drunkenness, there were 2,661 of drunkenness on duty, 2,147 of drunkenness, and 660 of disgraceful conduct, making 5,468 altogether of aggravated drunkenness. There is another cause of punishment in the Army—namely, absence without leave. Anybody who knows anything of the Army will be aware that those are cases which result almost entirely from drunkenness. I find that the total number in 1881 amounted to 3,293; and there, again, attributing one-half to drink, we have a total of 1,600; altogether, nearly 9,000 cases of crimes of violence, drunkenness on duty, and absence without leave, resulting directly from the drunken habits of the British soldier. The hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex has called attention to the waste in the Army resulting from these punishments for drunkenness. That waste is very serious. The courts martial resulted in 104 soldiers being sent to penal servitude, and there is consequently a loss to the Army of the services of those 104 men altogether, in addition to which the nation will have to maintain them in penal servitude. Then there were 3,820 cases of soldiers who were reduced to a lower grade or to the ranks; 42 were discharged with ignominy; and about 13,000 were imprisoned for various periods with or without hard labour. The total of these punishments in 1881 for drunkenness, taking the fines and courts martial together, was 52,776, inflicted upon over 30,000 men, &c. When we remember that our Army is only 180,000 strong, with a large and increasing number of teetotallers, amounting already to 25,000, this gives a terrible account of the drunkenness in the Army. It means that in 1881 there were no less than 340 punishments per 1,000, and that every sixth man in the Army gets drunk during the year. The percentage is even higher when it is borne in mind that there are so large a number of men who never drink at all. [*Laughter.*] The laugh of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Lancashire (Colonel Stanley) reminds me of a statement which he made when we were discussing the question two years ago—namely, that if they could only be found out, civilians were really quite as bad as soldiers in the matter of drunkenness. If that be really so, it is a terrible commentary upon the drinking habits of the country.

Colonel STANLEY: Perhaps I may be allowed to explain. I think I said on the occasion to which the hon. Member refers that drunkenness in a soldier is much more likely to be challenged than in a civilian, and that many cases are put down as drunkenness punishable in the soldier which in a civilian would pass unnoticed.

Mr. CAINE: Now let the House suppose for a moment that the town of Bradford, which has a population of 180,000, had something like 52,000 cases of persons brought before the magistrates every year charged with drunkenness and disorderly conduct; I am inclined to believe it would not be very long before the people of Bradford would insist upon an Act being passed to deal with such a frightful state of affairs as that in an intelligent Yorkshire town. Now, during the last two years I have brought this question before the House in various ways; but I have been able to get no satisfactory declaration from the Judge Advocate General that anything has been done, or will be done, to deal with this very great scandal in the Army. The War Office recently appointed a Committee to investigate the question of buttons and belts and colour. I do not know exactly what was the important point raised—whether these buttons were to be made of brass or bronze. All I know is, that a Committee was appointed to inquire into the subject; but in regard to this terrible crime of drunkenness existing in the Army, I can hear nothing of any inquiry or any expectation being held out that anything will be done with it. The Judge Advocate General, in answer to a Question which I addressed to him, said it was not the canteens which were the cause of the drunkenness, and therefore I will say nothing upon that point to-night, though I reserve my opinion. But he said it was the low public-houses clustering around the barracks. He said—

> "That the real cause of drunkenness in the Army was not the beer sold in the canteens, which was of a wholesome quality, but the abominable stuff which the soldiers obtained under the name of spirits at the low public-houses in the neighbourhood of their barracks."

Then, will the Home Office and the War Office lay their heads together and say what can be done with these low public-houses? The magistrates in garrison towns appear to neglect their duty most shamefully. Under a Return dated the 17th of August, 1882, we see that there are in the town of Chatham 20 public-houses known to the police as brothels and disorderly houses. They have been reported by the police to the magistrates, year after year, for 10, 12, 14, and in some cases 17 years in succession, as disorderly houses and brothels, and yet the licensing magistrates in Chatham go on licensing them year after year. In Shorncliffe, amongst others, "The Skylark" has been reported 14 years in succession, and is still a brothel. In Colchester, "The Lifeboat" was placed out of bounds by the commanding officer in 1876, and was reported by the police to the magistrates as a disorderly house in 1881, but its licence was duly renewed, and it is still a public-house. The "Gardeners' Arms," in the same town, has been five years in succession reported by the police to the magistrates as a common brothel. It was placed out of bounds for immorality by the commanding officer in October, 1881, but it is still a licensed house. "The Alma," at Colchester, was reported seven years in succession as a brothel by the police to the magistrates. In 1875 the licence was opposed at the licensing meeting, on the ground that the house had become a scandal to the neighbourhood, and an endeavour was made by the ratepayers living in the neighbourhood to see what could be done with Local Option through the magistrates, in whom Local Option is now unhappily vested, but in spite of this seven years' record, and the opposition of the neighbourhood, the licence was renewed, on condition that the house was not used as a brothel; but in June, 1881, the same house was again placed out of bounds by the commanding officer of the garrison, nevertheless, the Colchester magistrates renewed the licence without hesitation. At Maidstone, the "Turk's Head" public-house has been reported to the police as a brothel and disorderly house 12 years in succession, and 12 years in succession this den of infamy has had its licence renewed by the magistrates of Maidstone. I will not take up the time of the House with other instances, but I might report them *ad nauseam*. I must, however, call attention to the scandalous state of things existing at Aldershot, where Her Majesty's Government may be supposed to have some influence. In 1881, according to the Judge Advocate General, there were 11,639 soldiers stationed at Aldershot, and besides 19 licensed canteens there were 49 public-houses and 51 beerhouses existing for the demoralization of the soldiers. In August, 1882, the Judge Advocate General told the House, in reply to a Question, that the punishments for drunkenness amongst the soldiers at Aldershot during the year had been up to the average of the whole of the Army.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN): I stated a little below the average.

MR. CAINE: I take the report of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's remarks from *Hansard*, and I find that he stated that over 3,000 punishments had been inflicted on about 2,000 men, out of an average number of 11,500 troops. These cases occurred, according to the Judge Advocate General, not in the canteen, but in the public-house, and, therefore, the 100 licensed public-houses and beerhouses of Aldershot and Farnborough manufactured 3,000 drunkards during the year. That is quite enough for my purpose. The Army Returns show that 2,000 men have been punished 3,000 times out of 52,000 cases of punishment. Where do these men get drunk? According to the Judge Advocate General, it is not in the licensed canteens, but in the public-houses of Aldershot. On another occasion, I had to trouble the Judge Advocate General with another Question, and I thank him for the pains he has taken to supply the House with information on the Question. He told me, and I trust the House will note the right hon. and learned Gentleman's answer, that not one of these licensed houses had been brought before the magistrates charged with permitting drunkenness or supplying liquor to drunken people. The 35 & 36 *Vict.* says—

> "If any licensed person is convicted of permitting his premises to be a brothel, he shall be liable to a penalty of twenty pounds, shall forfeit his licence, and be disqualified for ever."

It seems to me that a very little pressure on the part of the Home Office upon the magistrates of Aldershot would be sufficient to induce them to put the Act of 35 & 36 *Vict.* in force; if not, let the Home Secretary remove them from the

Commission of the Peace, as unfit for the exercise of their duties. The same Act has a penalty for permitting drunkenness or serving liquor to drunken persons, or keeping a disorderly house—£10 for the first, £20 for a second offence, and afterwards the loss of the licence. The magistrates of garrison towns habitually ignore these provisions, and let these hells upon earth, for I can call them nothing else, ply their brutalizing influence on our soldiers unchecked. Really, the waste and crime in the Army is largely attributable to the drunkenness which prevails. I hope that a Committee, either of the House or of the War Office, will be appointed to inquire into the question of drunkenness and to see what can be done. We, outside of the War Office altogether, are of opinion that a very great deal can be done, and has been done, to improve the condition of the Army by means of temperance missionaries and by the establishment of temperance canteens outside the barracks. We therefore wish the War Office carefully to consider whether or not, in addition to chaplains to look after the spiritual welfare of the men, there should not be temperance missionaries to try and persuade the men to become teetotallers, and, above all, temperance canteens inside the barracks. Becoming teetotallers does not interfere with the efficiency of the Army. There is one fact which I should like to point out. In the recent Afghan Campaign the issue of rum greatly increased the difficulties and cost of transport, and led to the constant infliction of flogging upon the men. I will not trouble the House by reading the opinions of eminent men that I have collected here. They are the opinions, however, of some of the most distinguished men who have served in the Army. I will only quote one of them—namely, that of a distinguished General whom the House has been recently delighted to honour by conferring upon him a Peerage and a pension. I refer to Lord Wolseley, who says that his experience in India bore out the fact that the men were better without drink than with it. Lord Wolseley recommends the Government to restrict the allowance of liquor and to increase the allowance of tea. It is well known that the most brilliant Infantry charge of modern times was made on cold tea, instead of the usual spirit ration. I am proud to say that there was only one man in the famous charge at Tel-el-Kebir who was under the influence of drink, and he was promptly chloroformed by the doctor to prevent his making a noise and so marring the effect of the charge. With that one exception all those engaged in that charge went through it upon a ration of cold tea and without spirits at all. General Roberts gives testimony to a similar effect; and I do not think there is any intelligent officer in the British Army—certainly no intelligent surgeon-major—who will not agree that the work a soldier is called upon to perform can be done better without the aid of intoxicating liquor than with it. If that is true, and if it is also true that drunkenness is the direct cause of crime in the Army, I would certainly urge upon the War Office and upon the Government the propriety of seeing whether something cannot be done to remove this stain from the British Army.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL said, he would not follow the hon. Member who had just spoken into the drink question, for it seemed that the hon. Member had Local Option, Sunday Closing, and Contagious Diseases on the brain; but he would remind the hon. Member that between 1872 and 1882 drunkenness in the Army, both at home and abroad, had diminished 12 per cent.

Mr. CAINE: But the number of total abstainers in the Army has increased in the same period more than 12 per cent.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL said, he was very glad to hear it. He would, however, not pursue that question further. Like his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), he would disclaim all Party motives in the few remarks which he should make. He thought it was a somewhat retrogressive step that the age for recruiting had been reduced from 19 to 18. Then the noble Lord had given some intimation that he was going to deal with the system of bounties, which Lord Cardwell so much denounced. He hoped that whatever was done would not be merely of a temporary nature, but would prove a permanent solution of the question. He feared there might be something in the direction of a return to the bounty system, and to long service. There was one great difficulty in a return to long service, and that was that men were not willing to enlist for long terms; and in former days, when an option was given between long and short service, the greater number preferred the shorter period. He would say a few words as to the general character of the men who now joined the Army. At the present moment he believed we were in a worse position than we had been in for many years as regarded the number, quality, and conduct of our soldiers. There was no great difference of opinion between the Inspector General of Recruiting and those who had most experience of the men, although the Inspector General, in his Report, was naturally anxious to make things look as pleasant as possible. The Inspector General stated that in the year 1882 there was a diminution in the number of recruits for the Infantry alone of 3,896. If the Artillery were added that number would be increased. Sir Lintorn Simmons, who had recently written an interesting letter to *The Times* on the subject, said the decrease was something like 6,000 men, and that about 14,000 or 15,000 new recruits were required every year. Then, as regarded quality, the Inspector General reported that in 1880, 407, in 1881, 432, and in 1882, 439 out of every 1,000 intending recruits were rejected as physically unfit. He supposed that the men no longer came to so large an extent from the country districts. Sir Lintorn Simmons said that the number of recruits who weighed no more than 8½ stone had considerably increased. Then, in 1879, there were only 87 recruits who were no taller than 5 feet 5 inches, whereas, in 1881, there were 272. Then the height required for admission to the Guards had been reduced from 5 feet 8 inches to 5 feet 7 inches. He had been assured by an old Crimean officer that even during the pressure of that War the height had never been reduced below 5 feet 6½ inches. The troops had not only fallen off in physique, but also in numbers. In the State parade on the Queen's Birthday at Aldershot, in the First Scots there were four companies of 25 files each; in the First Dorset, six companies of 21 files each; in the Shropshire Regiment, four companies of 17 files each; and in the First Surrey, four companies of 13 files each. Taking them altogether, that gave on the average, at the outside, about 240 to 300 men in a battalion; and he had heard the other day that one company at Aldershot paraded with only nine men. It was a matter of notoriety that so weak was the battalion guarding the convicts at Portland that they had to send to Portsmouth for reinforcements. These matters were of great importance, and all went to prove the same thing—namely, that the quantity and quality of the troops of the present day were nothing like what they ought to be or had been. Then, as to conduct, he had been able to get certain figures giving some idea of what crime had been compared with what it was in 1872. He chose that time for comparison because the great revolutionary changes in the Army had taken place then, and he had compared the old with the new system to show that there were then means of procuring an Army finer in physique and better in conduct than the Army of the present day appeared to be. In the crimes at home, he found that, in 1882, desertions had increased 6 per cent; violence and insubordination, 57 per cent; sleeping on posts, 59 per cent; drunkenness, 129 per cent. Disgraceful conduct had decreased 36 per cent, and absence without leave 33 per cent. Making away with necessaries had increased 2 per cent, and miscellaneous offences 42 per cent. But what he thought was most serious was that crime among non-commissioned officers appeared to have increased very much. What he really wished to call the attention of the House to was, that our Army now, in quantity and quality and in conduct, was inferior to the Army that existed 10 or 15 years ago. Then he came to the question of waste, which they knew, from disease, desertion, and discharge, was very great, and no less than 25 out of every 1,000 recruits vanished in two years, at a cost to the country of £500,000 a-year, which was worse than a scandal, for it was a serious calamity. He wished he could say the number of the Militia was any better; but there was no question that they had fallen off, as it was admitted by the Inspector General of Recruiting. The one answer for such a state of things was that the duties, both in the Regulars and the Militia, were far more severe than they used to be. There had been a great deal of police duty done, both in Ireland and England, and he could not understand why soldiers should be employed on such duties. He thought that if any assistance was required in the Police Force the Force itself ought to have been increased. As to what he might call the "dynamite scare," and the duty required of soldiers of guarding public buildings, all he could say was that, great as was the confidence he had in the British soldier, it seemed to him that one policeman on such a duty was worth at least three soldiers, who could not leave their posts even though the dynamite was being exploded at their backs. Now-a-days the soldier had not only harassing drill to attend to, but he had to go to school as well. By-and-bye, when the national system of education thoroughly permeated the country, they would probably be able to get recruits who could both read and write, who would not require to go to school; but, at present, the soldier was much harassed by the number of things he had to do. No wonder then that after a few months he got disgusted. When they considered the matter of pay, the wonder became, if possible, still greater. It had been computed that a soldier's pay, all told, was £39 a-year, or about 15*s.* a-week, and when that rate of pay was compared with the price of wages all over the country, it was hardly to be expected that men would enter the Army in large numbers. These were points the authorities ought to put their fingers upon with a view to diminishing harassing duty; and if the executive of the Army turned their attention to them, a great deal might be done. The Army Estimates, as the House well knew, were higher than they ever had been since the Crimean War, and if they were to raise the pay of the soldier by, say, 6*d.* a-day, which would no doubt increase the strength of the Army, that would probably increase the Estimates by £1,500,000. In these circumstances, he could not help thinking that they would have to come sooner or later to the question of more or less diminishing the quantity of White soldiers in the Army and improving its quality. Something, he thought, would be gained by enlisting Coloured men at semi-tropical stations to replace a certain number of White soldiers. There were at the present time, in addition to the 94,000 men at home and the 10,000 or 12,000 in Egypt, no less than 22,000 men scattered over Colonial stations at Ceylon, Mauritius, Bermuda, Canada, the Mediterranean, Hongkong, and so on. He believed in many cases it was possible to substitute Coloured men for Whites with perfect safety. The Coloured soldier would cost only about half what a White soldier did, and especially in tropical and semi-tropical climates there would be an enormous gain. Since Canada had, as it were, started on its national life it had established a National Army, and now Canada almost entirely supplied the Army which in former days came from this country. Australia was doing the same. If the policy he recommended were carried out—not abruptly, but judiciously—there were certain Colonies where in time a very considerable local Force might be raised and paid for by the Colony, and to that extent at once relieve the Imperial Exchequer and meet the difficulty of raising White troops. For one thing, he hoped the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War would not have any more Committees or Commissions. They had had Committees and Commissions *ad nauseam*; but the misfortune was that, after they had sat for months, or even years, and spent vast labour upon their Reports, a War Minister would probably step in and upset the whole of their recommendations, as was done, for example, by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to Lord Airy's Committee. They seemed, indeed, to be constantly going round in a vicious circle. He would ask the noble Lord to try an experiment with regard to one branch of the Service. Let him take the Foot Guards. They were 1,000 men below their strength. Let him try to raise them to their full strength on some system likely to be of a permanent nature. Illustrious and distinguished officers often told them that a great deal could be done if there was more money; but, without gainsaying that proposition, what the House and the nation ought to see was that they got their money's worth. Year after year they went on in this House calling for a reduction of the Estimates, saying the Army was not so efficient as it should be, and yet things seemed to go on without any change whatever. He could assure the Government, in conclusion, that no obstruction, veiled or unveiled, would be offered by that side of the House to any plan, if it was a good one, which the noble Lord the Secretary of State for War might submit to deal with the question. They all wished for an effective solution of the difficulty, though at the same time to see the Estimates kept within bounds. A partial meddling with the question would not do; it must be dealt with fully and comprehensively, and he was certain that a merely temporary solution would prove a failure.

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL (Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN) said, it was of great importance, in dealing with this question of crime in the Army, to arrive at the actual truth, "nothing extenuating or setting down aught in malice." He fully believed, as had been observed, that if they could get rid of drunkenness in the Army they would greatly diminish every other kind of crime; and he could assure his hon. Friend the Member for Scarborough (Mr. Caine) that there was no man in that House more anxious than he was to secure that result, because, unfortunately, there was no one who saw so much of the effects of drunkenness as he did. But the question was whether there had or had not been an improvement? With reference to the figures quoted by his hon. Friend, he regretted that he selected the statistics of 1881 rather than those of 1882. It was true that the figures for 1882 were incomplete, as they applied only to the Forces at home; but drunkenness was greater among soldiers at home than among those abroad, and therefore they might be fairly taken by him as an indication of the state of the Army generally on this point. There was, then, a very considerable improvement between the two years 1881 and 1882. Taking 100,000 men as the basis of calculation, the number of courts martial for drunkenness on duty in 1881 was 1,232, and in 1882 they fell to 1,076. The cases of simple drunkenness in 1881 was 1,059, and in 1882, 888. The number of men per 1,000 fined for drunkenness in 1881 was 129, and in 1882 it was only 115. Those figures showed a great and satisfactory decrease in the crime. The hon. Gentleman had said the great extent of this crime was due to outside influence. Of course it was; but as to the low public-houses in garrison towns, to which reference had been made, the military authorities could not interfere with them, injurious as their influence was on the Army. Hon. Members might easily imagine what an outcry would be raised if commanding officers had power to suspend the licences of public-houses within a mile of the barracks in a town like Manchester or Bradford, as proposed by his hon. Friend. That would be Local Option, or, rather, Personal Option, with a vengeance. At present, all they could do was to place such houses "out of bounds," a course which was adopted to a great extent in large towns. The comparison which the noble Lord (Lord Eustace Cecil) made between the years 1872 and 1882 was hardly fair, because the former was an extraordinarily good year—in fact, one of the best they had ever had as regarded crime in the Army. But, as a matter of fact, the condition of the Army in 1882, in this respect, would bear comparison with any previous year. In the five years previously the figures were nearly stationary. In 1881 the number of courts martial at home was 9,421, and in 1882 it fell to 8,319. The number of offences at home decreased from 13,324 in 1881 to 11,927 in 1882, while the sentences fell from 9,251 in 1881 to 8,196 in 1882. There was also a remarkable diminution in the percentage of offences by non-commissioned officers, something like 33 per cent. There had, in short, been a considerable reduction in every kind of offence, except one, in the Army serving in the United Kingdom. A great deal had been said on the subject in regard to the troops in Egypt, who were on active service, and he had been anxious to obtain for the information of the House the number of courts martial held in that country. He should state, however, that the records of general or district courts martial only came to his Office. He did not receive those of regimental courts martial. The total number of courts martial held among the troops in Egypt up to that day, and received by him, was 480, of which only 12 were general courts martial. Surely that was not an unsatisfactory state of things.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, he quite admitted that it would be difficult now to induce men to enlist at once for 12 years; but we should recognize the fact that there was a difficulty in obtaining recruits, and we should give the recruit the advantage of a good bargain. He would, therefore, suggest that if a man enlisted for six years, and at the end of that time he elected to remain for another six years, and then for nine years longer, he should be allowed to do so, in order to become entitled to a pension, provided, of course, that he was a good shot, and so on. It was said that if we induced a man to remain 12 years with the Colours we got all that he was worth out of him. But if at the end of six years we offered a man no inducement to remain for 12, he would go out, because if he remained until he was 31 or 32, and then went out, his position was far worse. When it was found impossible to retain in India all but a very small proportion of men, that was all that need be said, because it was notorious to everyone who had served in that country that service there was the most popular of all, and that by giving £3 or £4 bounty half the regiment might be got to re-enlist. If the noble Lord would give what he would call Free Trade in the Army, if he would give the men a choice of going into the Reserve or going on with the Colours at their discretion, he might retain from 20 to 30 per cent of old soldiers in every regiment. And even the most fanatical advocates of short service, with the exception of Lord Wolseley, all said that it was desirable to have from 20 to 30 per cent of old soldiers, independent of non-commissioned officers, in each regiment. What we wanted to get rid of was uncertainty. Even non-commissioned officers below the rank of sergeant had no certainty. He hoped the noble Lord would take into consideration the suggestions that had been made.

GENERAL FEILDEN said, that the officers of the Army had been most unfairly charged with maladministration of justice, so much so as to be a cause of additional crime. But the greatest danger possible was likely to arise to the Army, unless the reins of discipline were drawn closer. Of this he was sure—that the best officers and those who had the best regiments were the men who were at once the most strict and the most kind. You could not command a regiment or an Army unless you had the iron hand in the velvet glove. Unless a change took place we should have an Army that would disgrace us. It had been said by officers of ability that if the Transvaal and the Egyptian Campaigns had lasted much longer it would have been necessary to have men shot. Complaints was made of the waste of the Army; but the fact was that those punishments most likely to be efficacious in preventing the waste had been abolished at the very time when they were most required. And with regard to the want of men in the ranks, we had simply sacrificed the First Line to the Reserve. If Lord Cardwell's original scheme of six years with the Colours, and 25 per cent of old soldiers to be retained in each regiment, had been fairly carried out, we should have seen the Army in a very different condition to-day from that in which we now found it. The country must be prepared to spend more money on the Army if they desired to have an efficient one; and, at the same time, Members of the House must take more interest in the question, and must teach their constituents to take more interest in one of the most important questions which could be brought to the attention of the House.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, I do not think the figures given by my right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General, although some difference of opinion may have been expressed in regard to them, bear out the view that there is any serious defect in the discipline of the Army. On the contrary, I think, the House will be extremely gratified to know that Lord Dufferin, on leaving Egypt, wrote to the General commanding the Army of Occupation, expressing entire approval of the manner in which the troops had behaved both at Cairo and Alexandria, and adverting to the almost total absence of crime and the manner in which the men had conducted themselves in reference to the Native population with whom they were brought into contact. When soldiers are hard at work, and have not much time to themselves, it is not to be wondered at that crime is comparatively rare; but when they are at leisure and in idleness, as they were at Cairo, it appears to me to reflect great credit on the Army that there has been so great an absence of crime. I entirely concur with the hon. and gallant Member for North Lancashire (General Feilden) in regretting that subjects of this kind do not appear more attractive to the House than is to be gathered from the present empty Benches; upon a question of so much importance as that which has been raised by the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot). It must be somewhat discouraging to officers and soldiers, and it certainly is discouraging to those who are charged with the administration of the Army, to find that matters so important have to be discussed before almost empty Benches. The hon. and gallant Baronet has brought forward a subject of great interest in a speech as usual of very great ability, but I think it would have been more convenient if the hon. and gallant Member had confined himself more closely to his text, and had addressed his observations to the subject of recruiting and the present condition of the Establishments of the Army. We are all perfectly aware that the hon. and gallant Member has never concealed his dislike to the changes introduced by Lord Cardwell and his Successor at the War Office, and I cannot help thinking that the aversion the hon. and gallant Member has always avowed has somewhat coloured the view which he takes of the present condition of the Army. He has referred throughout his speech to the difficulty of making men good Cavalry and Artillery soldiers in a short time, and of the prejudicial effect upon the discipline of the regimental system which passes a large number of men so rapidly through the ranks. He has deplored the loss of the regimental system, and he has expressed a hope that in some form or other it may still be found necessary to revert to the old system. All of these subjects appear to me to be wide of the immediate question, which, having regard to the Notice placed on the Paper by the hon. and gallant Member, he desires to bring under the consideration of the House. There was one allusion the hon. and gallant Member made which I regretted still more to hear; that was when he spoke of what he described as the disgraceful scare which took place among our troops in the South African Campaign. I believe there is no Army, however well-organized it may have been or can be under any system, which can always be entirely exempt from incidents of panic. But the South African Campaign, like our campaigns in India and in Egypt, has shown that young soldiers are capable of very gallant conduct; and I think it is to be regretted, and it cannot produce good effect, that attention should be pointedly drawn to an incident, possibly susceptible of explanation, of a character which in my opinion no Army has been or ever will be entirely exempt from. The hon. and gallant Member referred to the bad effect produced upon recruits by their being rapidly hurried to duty before they have entirely acquired their drill. That is an observation in which I heartily concur, and an order has been given for the issue of a Circular for the drilling of the recruits for three months at the depôt before entering upon the ordinary duties of the regiment. The hon. and gallant Member also referred to the strength of the Reserve, and he complained that the present system is not only a failure in securing a sufficient number of men with the Colours, but that it has also failed in securing a Reserve. He quoted the number of the Reserves. He stated that on the 1st of January there were not more than 16,000 of the Reserves. But I have already pointed out that the Reserves cannot be in two places at once, and that men serving with the Colours cannot be with the Reserves. A large number at that date had been mobilized, and were on the 1st of January, although not actually present with the Colours, counted in the Returns as forming part of the Establishment of the Army. That fact I mentioned in the statement which I made in moving the Army Estimates. The course taken in demobilizing the Reserves was to allow the Reserve men six weeks' furlough, during which they received pay and rations, before they were discharged. The greater part of the men who had been called out were at that time taking their furlough which was preliminary to their discharge. They have now rejoined the Reserve, and the Return on the 12th of May was not 16,000, but 28,700. The hon. and gallant Member also referred to the dissatisfaction and discontent which he says has been caused among the Reserves owing to the bad treatment which they have received. This is the first time I have heard of any complaint. I explained at some length, in moving the Army Estimates, the course taken in regard to them. I do not think it is necessary that I should recapitulate what I have already said on this subject. During the time they were on furlough they were receiving pay and ration allowance, and I think every man was able to leave the battalion and look out for fresh work or take up his old employment with £2 or £3 in his pocket, If there is any discontent I greatly regret it, but I think it is hard to say that the discontent has been caused by any action on our part. The hon. and gallant Member also spoke in strong terms of the extreme inefficiency of the system which rendered it necessary to call out a Reserve of 15,000 or 16,000 men for the purpose of despatching a small expedition like that to Egypt. But in moving the Army Estimates I also dealt with that subject. I showed that a very small portion of the Reserves called out were actually employed in Egypt at all. I stated that 10,582 actually joined the Colours, and that of the 9,700 Infantry only 1,500 joined the Home and Mediterranean battalions; that 2,200 were sent out to form depôts; that 2,200 were absorbed in the formation of second depôts, which were prepared but not sent out; and that there volunteered for the Army Hospital Corps and Transport Corps 460, leaving available for the establishment of a third Division, if it were necessary to send it out, 3,340 men. Therefore, it is very far indeed from the fact that the battalions actually sent out for service in Egypt were composed mainly, or to any considerable extent, of Reserve men.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: I do not wish to interrupt the speech of the noble Lord, but I stated in my remarks that the number actually sent out was 4,363.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I understood the hon. and gallant Member to state that in order to send out a very small expedition it was found necessary to call out 10,000 Reserve men. But the 10,000 men were mainly called out as a precaution, and it was not found necessary, nor was it the fact, that those men were actually sent to Egypt. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) explained in the early part of last year the steps which had been taken for making an efficient Army Corps, and that, as the scheme had only just been adopted, it had not its full nor anything like its full operation. The hon. and gallant Gentleman and the noble Lord the Member for West Essex (Lord Eustace Cecil) have referred to what they described as the deterioration in the quality as well as in the numbers of the troops, and the noble Lord went in great detail into an examination of tables from the Reports of the Inspector General of Recruiting to show that the size and weight of the troops had diminished. The noble Lord has taken a very extraordinary course, however, because what the Inspector General of Recruiting in his Report says is that in the past year a much greater number of men who presented themselves as recruits were rejected than heretofore. In the year under review he says the duty of examining recruits by the Army Medical Department, as a rule, had been strictly performed; and the Medical Returns showed that the number of rejected had risen from 407 in 1880 to 432 in 1881 and 439 in 1882; whereas, in 1876, 1877, and 1878, the numbers were respectively 273, 293, and 298. Then, I do not understand by what process it is argued that because a larger number of recruits are rejected by the medical authorities, therefore the physical quality of the troops has deteriorated; on the contrary, it appears to me that the inference to be drawn from the fact is that the recruiting authorities are more strict than heretofore, and the probability is that the physical quality of the troops is improving rather than deteriorating. Appendix C, which was quoted by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, is one which gives the age, height, and weight of the recruits inspected; but it is not stated, and it is not the fact, that of those recruits the whole were taken. On the contrary, a large percentage of the whole number were rejected; and, therefore, it must not be supposed that the physical qualities of the troops have deteriorated. My right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General has, however, dealt with the subject, and I need not go into it again. In respect of crime in the Army, reference has been made to the state of crime in 1872; but hon. Gentlemen opposite have thought it right altogether to ignore the fact that during the last five years the statistics of crime of every description have been steadily improving. I now come to a subject which has been specially dealt with by the hon. and gallant Gentleman—namely, deficiency in recruiting; and in commenting upon the deficiency in recruiting in moving the Army Estimates a few weeks ago, I pointed out that the deficiency is one of entirely recent growth, and is in no way to be attributed to short service. One would have thought, from the observations that have been made, that deficiency in recruiting had hitherto been entirely unknown, and was due to the adoption of the system of short service; but the facts are entirely the reverse. Whatever objection may be urged to the system of short service, up to last year recruiting never failed to provide the necessary number of troops for the Army. On the contrary, under the old system of long service it was absolutely impossible to obtain the necessary number of recruits. If the hon. and gallant Gentleman refers to a table given at page 10 of the Army Returns for the present year he will find an account of the effective strength of the Establishment on the 1st of January every year from 1862 to 1872, and he will see during those 11 years that the deficiency varied from 3,000 to 9,000 men, at which it stood in one year—I think the year 1871—while in every year, with two exceptions since 1872, during which period the short-service system has been in operation, the number of recruits on the 1st of January has been in excess by an amount varying from 1,000 to 2,500. Therefore, I think it is rather hard on short service that the first year any difficulty is found in obtaining the necessary number of recruits, the system should be immediately attacked, as if to it, and it alone, was due the difficulty of obtaining the necessary recruits for the Army, when it is clear that the difficulty existed to a still greater extent under the system of long service. I quoted from the Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting what, in his opinion, were the causes of the deficiency in the number of recruits obtained last year. The employment of a considerable number of Reserve men in the Army had, of course, the effect of withdrawing them from other employment; and when increased means of employment were found, those who would otherwise have come forward as recruits were withdrawn. Another thing to which the deficiency of recruits last year was due was the step taken by my right hon. Friend last year in raising the limit of age from 18 to 19 years. In the year 1881 there were enlisted 3,901 recruits between the ages of 18 and 19; whereas, in 1882, only 197 recruits were so enlisted. We were exposed to an exceptional drain from two causes. Last year a very large number of men who had enlisted under the long-service system were entitled to take their discharge; and, at the same time that this exceptional number of long-service men were obtaining their discharge, the full force of the new system of men passing from the Colours into the Reserve was beginning to be felt. These two circumstances caused a considerable drain. The hon. and gallant Member has asked me what is the actual state of the Army at the present moment. I will state the numbers. On the 1st of May, in the British Establishment the Cavalry were 182 in excess of their strength, the Artillery were 1,450 below it, the Engineers 48, the Foot Guards 940, the Infantry 6,206, and the Departmental Corps somewhat in excess; giving a balance of deficiency in the Army in the British Establishment of 8,520 rank and file. In India the Cavalry were 111 below the strength of the Establishment, the Artillery 548 in excess, and the Infantry 758 below; making a total net deficiency of 8,841.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT: That was at the beginning of the present year.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: That was the actual state of the Army on the 1st of May. Of course, the position will be, on subsequent Returns, somewhat worse. About 5,000 reliefs from India would probably be on their passage home on the 1st of May, or about to take their discharge, and this would make the subsequent Returns show an increase of deficiency amounting to somewhere about 5,000 men. Of course, that deficiency would be repaired as recruiting proceeds, and it must be remembered also that the deficiency is, to a certain extent, an artificial one. It is a deficiency of the actual number below the Establishment. The Establishment, however, was raised for the purposes I described in moving the Army Estimates, on the 1st of April, by 2,700. Therefore, the deficiency has been increased by that increase of Establishment. Again, there always has been, and there always will be, to a great extent, in the future, what may be called a normal deficiency below the Establishment in the month in which we are at present. The Army has generally, during the month of May and June, been several thousands below its Establishment, and this will be more the case in the future as the number of short-service men increases. That this must be the case will be evident to the House upon a few moment's consideration. The Army is like a cistern filled evenly by a process which goes on during all the months of the year. The recruiting does not vary very greatly, and the supply is gradually obtained in every month of the year. But the greatest part of the drain takes place in two or three months only of the year, when the men are arriving from India. The men from India do not come home at the exact moment they complete their service, but they come home in large drafts, and as soon as they arrive at home they are discharged. The greater part of the annual drain, therefore, of the Army takes place in the months in which we now find ourselves, and there is, and always will be, a deficiency in the present month. The increase in the Establishment voted by Parliament and the usual deficiency which always takes place at this period of the year will probably account for 6,000 or 8,000 men. I am very far from saying that that is not a serious matter, and one which requires the earnest attention both of the Government and of the House; but I venture to think that it is wrong to attribute it entirely to the organization which has recently been adopted. The noble Lord the Member for West Essex (Lord Eustace Cecil) called upon me not to adopt any temporary measure which might be advisable. Well, Sir, considering the peculiar circumstances of last year, we may fairly consider the deficiency temporary.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL: The noble Lord has rather misunderstood me. I hoped he would do more in the shape of a permanent addition than of a temporary addition.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: If the evil is found to be a permanent one, I entirely agree with the noble Lord that it would require a permanent remedy; but it is difficult to know precisely what is the extent of the deficiency, and I think we should be making a great mistake, if we were to rush suddenly into new changes or any considerable alteration of the system, until we are satisfied that the difficulties we have to face are not temporary, but permanent difficulties. The effect of the measures we propose to take has already been explained to a certain extent. We have decided, as I stated in March last, to relax the stringency of the rules in regard to recruiting. We have not reverted absolutely to the limit of age of 18, at which recruits may be taken; but we think that confidence may be placed in the recruiting officers, and we have, therefore, allowed them a discretion, and we do not compel them to reject men who, in their opinion, would make eligible soldiers simply because they have not arrived at the age of 19. A large discretion has, therefore, been given to the recruiting authorities, and, with the experience they have gained, I think they are capable of exercising it to the advantage of the Service. The chest measurement of the gunners of the Artillery has been reduced from 35 to 34 inches, and the standard of height of the Foot Guards has also been reduced. The hon. and gallant Member has heard that recruiting is now going on favourably; but the hon. and gallant Member warned me beforehand that he was not conciliated by the fact that recruiting for some weeks has been going on advantageously. I am informed that in the opinion of the recruiting authorities the quality of the recruits obtained has not in any degree fallen off. If the recruiting of the first four months of the year, and more especially of the last few weeks, be maintained—and we have been recruiting lately an average of 600 men per week, and last week we recruited 740 men—we shall obtain from 29,000 to 30,000 recruits in the year, which will certainly be sufficient and more than sufficient to meet the normal requirements of the Service, although, perhaps, not sufficient to supply the deficiency which I have stated to exist. Now, the question is, what steps are to be taken in order to supplement the supply of recruits, and to fill up the deficiency which now exists in the ranks of the Army? Of course, the first step to be taken is to endeavour in every way to check the ordinary waste of the Army —the waste by desertion, and the waste of all kinds. So far as our experience of the present year goes that object has been to a certain extent attained. For the last few years the annual average of desertion has been 4,843, and the number of desertions during the past months of the present year has been very little more than 1,000, so that if the rate of desertion does not increase in the present year the total desertions this year will only be 2,500 against an annual average of 4,843. The number of men discharged by purchase is also decreasing. We propose to take measures for the purpose of temporarily checking the flow of men from the ranks into the Reserves. I agree that nothing would be more to be deplored than that the formation of a Reserve should be checked or impeded permanently; but I agree with what the hon. and gallant Member has said on that subject, that if we are to have a deficiency anywhere, and if we cannot get the men, the deficiency of recruits upon the Establishment with the Colours is the first thing to be considered, and the Reserves, if necessary, must bear a temporary loss. With that object we propose, as has been stated, to give a larger bounty to men who are in India for the purpose of inducing them to extend their service. The matter is not decided yet, but it is under the consideration of the War Office and the India Office. The noble Lord the Member for West Essex (Lord Eustace Cecil) has referred to the fact that I said to-day that only 400 men accepted the bounty offered last year. I believe that is greatly due to the fact that the offer was not made last year to the men in sufficient time. If the offer is made to the men in time to enable them to make their arrangements and to consider the subject before having arranged to return home, I believe a moderate bounty would probably secure an extension of service on the part of a number of these men. If, on the other hand, it is only offered after the men have made their arrangements for returning home, a comparatively small number only would accept it. It is also proposed to offer a small bounty to men at home who would be eligible for drafts to extend their service for five years. For the present, all men who would be entitled to take their discharge in six or seven years will be allowed to extend their service so as to complete 12 years, and at the expiration of 12 years they will be eligible for re-engagement in order to entitle them to a pension.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL: Is that to apply to all men?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: It will be held out to all men who wish to extend their service. All men who wish to extend it for the period of six years will be allowed to extend their service up to 12 years. Of course, these steps will retard the formation of the Reserve; but as soon as they have effected their object of filling up the ranks of the Army, it will be perfectly possible to recoup the Reserve. It may appear that in these proposals there is some risk of increasing the Pension Vote; but that, in my opinion, is not a very serious risk, because at the expiration of 12 years the men will be entitled to £36 as deferred pay. But they would not be entitled to that deferred pay until they leave the Army in the event of their re-enlisting, and the prospect of receiving £36 in ready money will weigh very strongly with them when they consider whether they should re-enlist or leave the Army. Of course, the length of time during which these measures will go on will depend on the state of recruiting, and on the number of men who appear inclined to avail themselves of our proposals. At all events, the change will furnish us with an answer to those who say that we are discouraging large numbers of soldiers who desire to continue their service with the Colours by insisting that they should leave the Army at a particular period. On the other hand, what we propose will, I think, have a beneficial effect, because we shall now ascertain exactly whether there is any considerable number of men who are disgusted by being forced to leave the Army after the lapse of a certain number of years. For the Guards, we propose to make a certain change in the manner of enlistment. We propose to enlist men for 12 years, three of which will be spent with the Colours, and nine with the Reserve. At the same time, we shall allow the men at any period of service to extend the period of three years with the Colours. We hope by this means to increase the number of recruits, and we shall be enlisting men for the shortest period that is at all desirable with a view of securing their thorough training. On the other hand, we propose to allow men who desire to extend their period of service to extend it either up to the six years or even to a longer period. The hon. and gallant Member has referred to the subject of the general waste of the Army, and he has referred also to the Report of Lord

Airey's Committee. I do not think, at this time of night, that it is necessary for me to go into the general question of the waste of the Army. I entirely admit that it is a most serious and important question, and one which ought ever to be present to the minds of those who are responsible for the administration of the Army. But it seems to me almost useless at this particular moment to revert to the question of the waste of the Army and the recommendations of Lord Airey's Committee. The House has had those recommendations before it for two years, and proposals have been made on the Report of that Committee. It was the subject of discussion in this House two years ago. If the waste in the Army was increasing it might be necessary to refer seriously to the consideration of the question; but it is altogether erroneous to suppose that it is increasing. On the contrary, it is a diminishing quantity. In the speech to which I have been obliged to refer more than once I gave figures upon that subject, and I do not think I can place the matter before the House more shortly than I did then. I showed then that, in 1878, the waste of men recruited in that and the two previous years was 270 per 1,000; and that, in 1881, the waste of men recruited in that and two previous years was 208 per 1,000. The diminution continued in 1882, the latest year for which we had Returns, and if it were continued in 1884 it would be 146 per 1,000, an improvement in the whole period of 124 per 1,000, or nearly one-half the waste which prevailed in 1878 among the younger soldiers. We are, therefore, to a very considerable extent, achieving the object which Lord Airey's Committee had in view—namely, in checking the terrible waste among our younger soldiers which formerly prevailed. That waste is now gradually diminishing, and we may hope that it may cease altogether in the course of time. The adoption of short service in the Army has given us useful information on many subjects; and if we could find among soldiers recruited for an obligatory service with the Colours of three years a number of men willing to extend their period of service sufficient for the needs of India and the Colonies, I think we may yet arrive at a solution of the difficulty of the whole question. If we can adopt a plan for the whole Army, by which men agreeing to enlist for three years would consent to extend their service, then I think, to a great extent, our present difficulties would be got over, and in that way, I think, we should be able to check the waste of the Army. These are the measures which we propose to take. Some of them have a temporary and others have a permanent character. I do not think at present that it is desirable to make greater proposals. On the whole, I hope the House will be satisfied with the explanations I have given, and with the result of the discussion which has been raised on this subject by the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite.

Colonel STANLEY: I think, Sir, the House will agree with me that it is almost impossible to over-estimate the importance of the statement which has just been made by the noble Lord. The discussion, commenced by the speech of my hon. and gallant Friend behind me, delivered, I fear, in rather a thin House, has been well worthy of the attention of the House. At any rate, it has had the effect of bringing forth a most important announcement from the noble Lord. I think he is to be congratulated upon having looked in the face the grave state of things that exists, and for having frankly and honestly proposed to the House such remedies as he deems necessary. The noble Lord, it is true, entered in some detail upon a criticism of something which had been said in regard to the shortcomings of the Army, and he has rightly enough pointed out that the deficiency in the Army which has taken place within the last few years is mainly due to the short-service system, which has now been in existence for 12 years. I am bound to say that the statement the noble Lord has made, so far as I am able to judge, can hardly be looked upon as anything less than going back to a permissive system of long service. As I understand it, his statement amounts to this, that, at all events at the present time, any soldier who enlists can claim the right to re-engage—that is, that he can go on for a pension after his 12 years of service.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: The first operation is not re-engagement, but an extension during the period of his enlistment. He is enlisted for 12 years, and what he is able to do is to extend his service with the Colours.

Colonel STANLEY: But, as I understand, with a distinct right to re-engage?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: If he goes on for 12 years, and is a man of good character and fit for service, he is entitled to re-engage.

Colonel STANLEY: I will not express any opinion upon the question at this moment, but I want to get at the facts first. The matter is a very important one, and it is necessary to take it in detail. I understand that he enlists for 12 years, and he has a right to extend, as the noble Lord puts it, the Colour service to 12 years. After that time he may, of his own option, re-engage for a further period of nine years, going on for a pension?

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER: With the leave of his commanding officer.

Colonel STANLEY: That is a very important qualification, and I think that on some future occasion the noble Lord will find it well to clear up the expression he used to the effect that this extension to long service might be temporary or otherwise, according to the necessities of the Service and according to what the Secretary of State may think necessary for the service of the time. I want to draw attention to that point at once, because I think whether we advocate short or long service makes no difference. People will agree almost on all sides that one of the great difficulties attending recruiting has been the uncertainty in which the men have found themselves. It is a great thing to be able to draw men into the Service—to be able to say that at the present time a man may engage for 21 years' service and a pension. But if the Secretary of State, whoever he may be a few years hence, is able to say to those men—"I do not want you now in the ranks, and you must leave the Service altogether," there will still be that uncertainty which really spoils recruiting. I quite agree with the noble Lord in the step he has taken. I do not think he expressed it in words, but his arguments led up to it, that the state of things to which we have come is one very little removed from the Service which existed formerly. We are to have the service extended by seven, eight, and, in some instances, nine years with the Colours. It is comparatively a small step, but I am far from saying that it is not a wise or an unnecessary one. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that exactly to this extent you are doing away with the chances of the Reserve, which was one of the main institutions of Lord Cardwell's scheme. It is quite true that the Secretary of State looks upon this as one of the advantages which may countervail to a certain extent the advantage of pension. On the other hand, the man who does not go on for a pension to 21 years would receive deferred pay at the end to the extent of his Colour service, whatever that may be. That to a certain extent will apply; but as I understand, on the other hand, there is no corresponding extension of service for 21 years in the Reserve. At the present time, the total service with the Colours and with the Reserve is 12 years. I do not know whether the noble Lord intends to extend the period of Reserve service also, with a view of meeting the deficiency which would otherwise take place. There is no doubt whatever that difficulties may be experienced in regard to this matter, and that it is a very grave state of affairs. According to the statement of the noble Lord himself, there were 8,700 men below the strength on the 1st of last month, and 5,000 are now on their way home, or shortly will be from India, and a large proportion may not be disposed to re-engage. Even deducting the 2,700 men by which the noble Lord increased the Estimates when he proposed them this year, even omitting those men, it is perfectly clear that the Army is practically at least 10,000 men below its strength. It must be borne in mind that the Reserve system was established not only to meet the necessity of filling up the battalions to take their place in the field, but was also instituted to remedy the deficiency of battalions when in the field. Therefore, I hope the noble Lord will carefully consider whether, now that he has increased the amount of inducements to remain with the Colours and to take on for longer service, he will not also correspondingly take into consideration some system of extension at least to the amount by which he has reduced the Reserve at the present time. There is no doubt that, for some time past, people have been asking whether the price we have been paying in money and in men for the Reserve was fully compensated for by the advantages of the present system? Of course, the noble Lord's Predecessor was placed under great difficulties in trying in this country a similar system of short service by voluntary enlistment which in other countries is carried on under compulsion. In this matter in this country we must put our pride in our pockets, and we must confront the fact that, with the voluntary service, we must get the men upon their terms and not upon ours. Therefore, whatever advantages there may be in the system which has been proposed, I still think that the importance of the Reserve is one the magnitude of which it is almost impossible to exaggerate. Nevertheless, I think the noble Lord takes the right view of the situation, when he says that when it becomes a question between the Establishment with the Colours and that with the Reserves the Establishment with the Colours is most undoubtedly the first thing to be considered. Now, this is a great change, and I hope we shall not be thought unfair if we press for a good deal of further information. In the first place, the whole estimate as to the growth of the Reserve is interfered with; and I should very much like to know if the noble Lord has had any calculations worked out as to what the growth of the Reserve is likely to be under his system —whether he has had worked out any Papers, corresponding to those laid upon the Table of the House when the deferred pay system was introduced, showing what, after a term of years, would be the effect of the growth both of deferred pay, and what undoubtedly will now be the growth of the Pensions Vote accompanying it? It was felt that the amount would increase more after a certain time; but it was also said as an inducement to the House that, after a particular period, the decrease in the Pensions Vote would more than counterbalance the increase in the Deferred Pay Vote. Now, all these calculations are, of course, entirely set aside by the change which the noble Lord has intimated to the House, and I hope, therefore, that on the earliest possible occasion he will allow us to obtain from him such further information as I think the House has every right to expect. At this hour, and after the important announcement which has been made, I do not wish to go into some matters which have been treated by several other hon. Members in the course of the debate. I entirely agree with what was said by my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Cork County (Colonel Colthurst)—namely, that you want in these matters freedom of trade. You want to get men who will come into the Army on the best terms you can afford to offer, and when you get good men you want to keep them, if they so prefer it, with the Colours, or in the Reserve, if they find that condition suits them best. In a voluntary system like ours, as I have said before, pride must be a secondary consideration; you have to consider how you can carry out your system of voluntary enlistment. It must be admitted that a great change is taking place day by day in respect of the Reserve; and, after the experience of the last few years' deficiency of recruits, I think the feeling of the House and the country will be that this grave evil must be promptly and efficiently grappled with, and I am far from saying that the noble Lord, in the changes he has made, will not have the support even of those who are unfavourable to the scheme.

Colonel KINGSCOTE said, he would not go at that moment into the question as to the great lack of recruits, although there was much which invited him to do so. There could be no doubt as to the deficiency that now existed; it was even greater than people supposed, and the difficulties in the way of getting recruits, so to speak, made his hair stand on end. He hoped the noble Lord would remember that there was no more certain way of getting recruits than by letting them know exactly what they might expect. We might enlist a certain number of men for a few years who had got into some scrape, or who joined the Army because they wanted to have a lark; but the men who wished to make the Army their profession were those to whom longer service was necessary. It was such men as these that they ought to try to keep in the ranks either as privates or non-commissioned officers. Therefore, he rejoiced that the noble Lord had taken the step he had announced, and, if it proved to be successful, he hoped it would be extended.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he congratulated the noble Lord on the decision he had announced that evening.

He had frequently expressed his belief that they would never succeed in obtaining a suitable Army for India until they had an Army composed of long-service and short-service men. That would be the effect of the plan of the noble Lord. But he rose also for the purpose of saying that the change would not necessarily have the effect that had been attributed to it, of diminishing the Reserve. If men were allowed to enlist for a short period, with the certainty that they would not be sent to India, he believed that a large number of recruits would be attracted to the ranks. The system would be beneficial, not only in maintaining the Army abroad, but in maintaining at home the number of men necessary to defend the country.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON said, he was somewhat disappointed with the speech of the noble Lord, because he endeavoured to create an impression that everything was right in the Army, and that no reasons existed for alarm or anxiety. The noble Lord had failed to disprove what had been so amply shown by the figures of his hon. and gallant Friend, which constituted a tremendous indictment against the present system. His hon. and gallant Friend urged that in the last decade crime in the Army had gone on increasing; the noble Lord met this by saying that it was not increasing this year. His hon. and gallant Friend had proved that the number of cases of desertion was never greater than it was at that moment. As to recruits, it was allowed by the noble Lord himself that we were 8,000 short of the proper number; and that fact alone was quite enough to make hon. Members who did not belong to the Army, and the people at large, feel that there was something wrong. *Esprit de corps*, if it had not disappeared from the Army, was seriously weakened; while as to the territorial system, it had broken down altogether. He asked any hon. Gentleman who lived in the neighbourhood of any of the local military centres to visit the barracks, and he would find there 30 or 40 men only in place of 400. It was a fact that 25,000 men out of an Army of 95,000 were unfit for service; one-third of the Army that went to Egypt was taken from the Reserve, because that proportion of the Regular troops were unable to go. But the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Judge Advocate General thought he could get over all these difficulties by issuing Circulars. That was his method of curing drunkenness in the Army, of which the hon. Member for Scarborough (Mr. Caine) complained so justly. The real difficulty was that they had fallen into the habit of getting non-effective soldiers too young or too weak for service, and veiling the real state of the Army from the public. He observed that some of the expressions used by the noble Lord, and by his Predecessor in Office, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, on this subject were identical. The words of the late Secretary of State for War were—"Every week we are getting more men and better men, and we are able to allow a number of men of less than six years' service to go to the Reserve." That was pretty nearly what the noble Lord had said; but it was merely throwing dust in the eyes of the public. Lord Wolseley, in one of his despatches, had stated that "Her Majesty's recruits acted with as much valour and courage as Her Majesty's oldest soldiers." Such a statement from such an authority was absolutely misleading. The complaint was not that boys could not fight courageously, but that they could not endure the hardships of a campaign. He said that the system pursued by the Government in that House and throughout the country was to blind the public to the real state of things in the Army. The noble Lord had acknowledged in his speech that for years to come we should want 36,000 recruits annually, and that at the present moment we were only getting them at the rate of 26,000 a-year. And how were we getting them? By lowering the standard of physique. As the result of that system, the waste of the Army was at the rate of 6,000 men a-year. Was not that a statement which should cause grave anxiety to the country? Desertion alone had cost in the last few years £3,000,000 sterling to the country. These were facts which ought to be plainly stated to the House by the Minister responsible for the Army, who should not endeavour in any way to cloak or conceal from the country the actual state of affairs. The House and the country had a right to know precisely how they stood with regard to the Army in all its weakness and in all its strength. The truth in this case could do no harm; the real danger lay in misleading the House by concealment of the truth. Supposing that during the War in Egypt the Italians, or or some other European Power, had thrown themselves into the battle against us, where would that Army have been which was strong enough to fight those who ran away, but melted away before the ravages of disease and climate? He said it was nothing less than gambling with the National Assurance not to state in that House, in its full extent, the failure of the present system of recruiting, and its injurious effect upon the Army, for we might be perfectly certain that there was not a Foreign Office in the whole of Europe that did not well know its actual state.

EARL PERCY said, the House must be aware that the statement they had heard from the noble Lord that evening was one of a most important character. Amongst other things they were, to a great extent, to go back to the long-service system, the abandonment of which had cost the country so large a sum of money. That change would not only reverse what had been done, but it would assuredly bring heavy charges upon the country in the future by way of pensions to the men. He should be glad to know if any calculation had been made as to what those future charges would be? Another point to be considered was the effect which this change would have upon the Reserve. But on that subject they had heard nothing. He rose principally for the purpose of asking the noble Lord what opportunity the House would have of discussing these great changes? He hoped that that opportunity would be afforded at no distant date. It was impossible that the changes could be discussed at that Sitting; and, moreover, they were of such a character as to require much consideration before they were debated. He hoped to hear that the Army Estimates would be brought forward early, or else that some other opportunity would be afforded by the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked the noble Lord if he could lay upon the Table an Estimate of the cost of the changes he intended to make, because he understood that the Government not only intended to return to the old system, but that they proposed to institute a more expensive form of long service? He believed that under the old system the soldier had only the right to a pension, but he would hereafter have a right to deferred pay also. Therefore, it was evident that the Non-Effective Vote would be gradually increased, and that the House, before discussing the matter, should be in possession of the probable cost of the alteration.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, it would be necessary to take the Army Estimates during the present month of June, since additional money would be required for Military services during the last week. He had already explained to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Lancashire, who understood the proposal, what was the case with regard to deferred pay; but he would again state publicly that the soldier would earn deferred pay to the amount of £3 a-year during his first period of service. At the end of 12 years, he would, therefore, be entitled to £36 on that account. If the soldier re-engaged, he would be entitled to a pension, but would not earn £3 of deferred pay during his second period of service. His deferred pay would not be paid—the £36 previously mentioned—until the close of the second period, whenever the soldier was finally discharged.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

COLONEL STANLEY asked the Prime Minister if he would be good enough to state, as he had promised to do, what Business would be proceeded with on Tuesday, in the event of the two Annuity Bills not continuing after a certain time?

MR. GLADSTONE replied, that the Corrupt Practices Bill would come first, and the Scotch Tenants' Compensation Bill second, after which it was proposed to take the Police Bill.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [31st May] *reported.*

Resolutions 1 to 6 *agreed to.*

Resolution 7.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he had to apologise that he was not in the House when this Vote was taken yesterday. He wished to make an appeal to the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Courtney) which he had previously made to the noble Lord his lamented Predecessor (Lord Frederick Cavendish); and he was glad to be able to make this appeal in the presence of the Speaker and of the Prime Minister, who, he was sure, were better informed upon this question than any other hon. or right hon. Gentleman could be. He (Mr. R. N. Fowler) wished to appeal to the Government to consider whether they could not, in another year, increase this Vote. He was perfectly aware of the fact that it was held to be an unpopular thing to attempt to increase a Vote; but he thought, considering the very important services that the officers of the House of Commons rendered the country at large, a suggestion for increase was a matter which the Government might very properly consider. He knew it had sometimes been argued, on the other hand, in Committee of Supply, that the proper course, in order to put the salaries paid to the officers of the House of Commons and the House of Lords on an equal footing, that the salaries of the former should be reduced rather than that of the latter should be increased. He believed, however, that that course would be impraticable, for the reason that the House of Lords had given up certain funds they had at their disposal on condition that their officers should be adequately remunerated. That was an honourable understanding with the other House of Parliament; but, on the other hand, it was perfectly true that the officers of the House of Lords were much better remunerated than those of the House of Commons. He thought, under the circumstances, the course for Parliament to take was not to decrease the salaries of the officers of the House of Lords, but to raise the remuneration of the officers of the House of Commons to the same level. That had already been done in the case of one very distinguished Officer of the House of Commons—namely, the Chairman of Ways and Means. He was aware that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Rochester (Sir Arthur Otway), who now occupied the position of Chairman of Ways and Means, had accepted the position at a very great personal sacrifice; still it was necessary for him to allude to the circumstance he had mentioned, because the fact that such a course had been taken in the case of a distinguished Officer of the House was a reason for its being pursued in the case of the other officers. This was hardly a Cabinet question; but, as he believed the decision of the point he was raising rested with the great Officers of State and with Mr. Speaker, he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister himself. He put it to him as strongly as he could, not only as his own opinion, but that of hon. Members generally, that the officers of the House of Commons were inadequately remunerated, and that the subject was one well deserving the attention of those who could exercise control in the matter. He put the matter before the Government as he had done on former occasions, and he was rather glad that he had not been able to draw attention to it yesterday, because he was now able to bring this matter before right hon. Gentlemen more fitted to deal with it than he would have been if he had mentioned it in Committee of Supply.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolutions 8 to 12 *agreed to.*

Resolution 13.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he was sorry not to see the President of the Board of Trade in his place just now, and he would therefore appeal to the Government to consent to the postponement of this Vote until Monday. There were two or three questions he wished to ask as to the legal charges connected with the Board of Trade. He saw an increase from £18,300 to £22,550, and, no doubt, hon. Members would sympathize with him in his desire to call attention to it. If the Government would be good enough to postpone the Vote until Monday, the House might be able to have some explanation on this subject.

Resolution *postponed* until Thursday.

Remaining Resolutions *agreed to.*

CONSTABULARY AND POLICE (IRELAND) (PAY AND PENSIONS) BILL.

(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone.*)

[BILL 171.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he had put down a Notice of Amendment on this stage; but, as it was one proposing an increased grant of money, as a private Member he had been informed that the course was irregular, and he apologized for it. He would state, however, that his Amendment, if it could have been put, would only have involved a very small extra outlay. It related to a very deserving class of men; and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to consider the subject, and see whether he could not himself bring forward the proposal. The case his Amendment had been prepared to meet was one which had very seldom occurred; but it had occurred, and might take place again. A young constable might catch a cold whilst on duty, and die of a malady resulting from it, or he might die from the effects of injuries received whilst in the execution of his duty. Such a young man might, out of his pay, have been in the habit of sending home a certain proportion for the support of his aged parents. He (Colonel King-Harman) had known cases where a young constable, who had met with his death in this way, had left behind him relatives who had not only had to suffer the great grief of his loss, but had also, in consequence thereof, suddenly found themselves without a penny in the world. Ample provision was made in the Bill for the pension of widows and children of constables dying in this way; and he now pleaded for power to be given to the Lord Lieutenant to grant similar pensions in aid of distressed parents, whose only stay was in the person of a young constable who might have been taken away by some blow, accidentally administered, or sudden calamity to a constable whilst in the execution of his duty.

MR. TREVELYAN said, he found it very difficult to resist the appeal of the hon. and gallant Member; but he was very much afraid that he had no choice in the matter. This Bill was a very peculiar one, and it was a very important measure in this respect—that it was almost drawn upon the lines of certain other important Acts which governed the condition of various large forces, and that it likewise followed the lines which were adopted in another measure which was at present in an inchoate state; and any proposal which was adopted in this Bill ought, they might say, to have been adopted in the Bills which had given a Police Force to England, and would have to be adopted in those Bills which would follow in the future. Likewise, the principle which the hon. and gallant Member proposed to insert in this Bill would have to be adopted in other services in the Irish Police if it were adopted here. He hardly felt justified, in a Bill dealing with the Irish Constabulary, to establish this important principle.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN: I do not ask this as a right for the relatives of the Constabulary; I only ask that the Lord Lieutenant may have power to make grants of this kind if he thinks it desirable.

MR. TREVELYAN said, he felt the full strength of the hon. and gallant Member's contention, and also the force of the safeguards by which he proposed to protect it; but so small was the probability of an inroad being made into the public Exchequer by the very modest proposal put before them that he thought, when a case of this kind occurred, as it very rarely had occurred, and very rarely would occur again, it might be met by other means. He remembered very well that other means were found in the case of sailors who had been lost at sea; and in the very rare case to which the hon. and gallant Member referred he thought that a similar course would be adopted. If the hon. and gallant Member would refer the special cases which, in his knowledge, had occurred to him (Mr. Trevelyan), he would endeavour to see whether something could not be done in regard to them. If, unfortunately, it should ever happen that any large number of the Royal Irish Constabulary, or the Dublin Police, should be injured or killed whilst in the discharge of their duty, then he concluded that special means would be taken to provide for those they left behind, who had been dependent upon their wages — such means as were taken by the Admiralty after the loss of the *Eurydice* and the *Atalanta*. He was extremely sorry that he did not feel himself able to accede to the wish of the hon. and gallant Member.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he was glad the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to accede to the desire of the hon. and gallant Member, for if he had done so the Irish Members would have had to press upon the Government for some provision for the widows and children of persons who, from time to time, had been shot by the police, who were a very much more numerous class than the aged parents that had been dependent upon Members of the Constabulary Force killed or injured whilst in the discharge of their duty.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE asked whether the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary could see his way to the adoption of the Amendment he had put upon the Paper, which dealt with the case of much graver hardship? He did not ask for a decided promise; but only for an undertaking that the right hon. Gentleman would consider the matter.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, that upon this subject he had spoken at some length yesterday; and though there was by no means unanimity in the House, he must say that he had never spoken with more complete conviction as to the course it behoved him to take than he did on that occasion. He, like other Members of the House, had had to submit to the ruling of the Chairman of Committees; and, while that ruling was unquestioned in its justice, he, like other Members of the House, regarded it, although he would very much have liked the matter to go to a division, and to have been decided by a division. But it was quite one thing to wish that a matter should go to a division, and another to urge that a clause should be moved for the purpose of sending it to a division, when one's self was anxious that it should go to a division for the purpose of having it defeated. He so much objected to the principle of the clause which the hon. Member asked him to move, that though he imagined there might be some grievance under the present system, and though he had a good deal of sympathy with the men who believed they had a grievance, he felt that he should not be justified in moving the clause—in fact, that it would be highly irregular for him to do so.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

BALLOT ACT CONTINUANCE AND AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Sir Charles Dilke, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 5.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. O'Brien

Mr. ONSLOW said, that before Mr. Speaker put the Question he would appeal to the right hon. Member who had charge of the Bill to know what course the Government intended to take with regard to it? If he was not mistaken, on Monday night it was proposed to take the Corrupt Practices Bill; and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman whether it was not rather inconvenient to hon. Members to put down the Ballot Bill, as it had been put down, night after night, bringing people down to the House to discuss it, when there was not the remotest chance of its coming on? Under the circumstances, he would appeal to the right hon. Member who had charge of the Bill as to whether he could not defer the Committee stage until they had got through the Corrupt Practices Bill, or, at any rate, until they had disposed of the second stage of that measure? There was a great deal of analogy between these two Bills; and it appeared to him that it would be a great convenience to the House if the Government, instead of putting the Bill down for Monday, would say when they really intended to bring it on. Did they intend to bring it on as a Government measure immediately after the passing of the Corrupt Practices Bill, or did they intend that some other measure should intervene between the Committee stage of the Corrupt Practices Bill and the Ballot Bill? As the right hon. Gentleman to whom he put the question might know, he had taken a great deal of interest in the Ballot Bill; and he had been down in his place a great many nights expecting it to come on, in common with numbers of other hon. Members who sat on the Opposition side of the House. As he had said, it would be a convenience if the Bill were deferred until the Second Reading or Committee stage of the Corrupt Practices Bill had been disposed of; and if some Member of the Government would give them a distinct pledge that that course would be adopted they would be glad.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, the proposal before the House was not, as the hon. Member supposed for Monday, but for Tuesday, at a Morning Sitting. He could only say he hoped this Bill would come on speedily; and he should be extremely loth to postpone the Committee stage of the Bill until the Corrupt Practices Bill was through, as that might occupy a considerable time. He feared he could not give the promise for which the hon. Member asked; but he would promise to make every effort to bring the Bill before the House at the earliest possible time; and he was not without hope that that might be on Tuesday.

MR. ONSLOW asked if it would be the first Order of the Day on Tuesday?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he feared it would be the second Order; but he hoped it might be reached.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, he thought it was a proper course to put this off to Tuesday, and he hoped it would be brought on; but he feared that was not very likely. He wished to urge that, whenever the Bill was brought on, it would be at a time when there could be some discussion upon it.

Committee *deferred* till *Tuesday* next, at Two of the clock.

MOTIONS.

INCLOSURE PROVISIONAL ORDER (HILDERSHAM) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm the Provisional Order for the Inclosure of the Common Fields and Pastures situate in the Parish of Hildersham, in the County of Cambridge, in pursuance of a report of the Land Commissioners for England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 209.]

LAND DRAINAGE PROVISIONAL ORDER (NO. 2) (DIDCOT, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HIBBERT, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861," relating to Didcot Improvements situate in the several Parishes of Didcot, East Hagbourne, and Long Wittenham, and in the Chapelry of Appleford, in the Parish of Sutton Courtney, in the County of Berks, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HIBBERT and Secretary Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 210.]

House adjourned at One o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 4th June, 1883.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Lord Lurgan, after the death of his father.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) * (75).

Third Reading—Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders * (60), and *passed.*

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL: My Lords, I have a Notice to call attention to the state of the Auxiliary Forces. No Motion is appended to it, as I did not wish to bring one forward, unless secure of a majority to carry it. But I shall hope to indicate a course which might be usefully adopted, and submit it to the judgment of your Lordships. My Lords, to explain the Notice, and give myself a *locus standi* with regard to it, it may be necessary, for a moment, to refer to a debate in this House, about four years ago, on the 28th of April, 1879. The proposal was for an inquiry as to whether the Militia ought not to be available for service in all garrisons, either of the United Kingdom or the Empire. It was much supported in the House, although it was not ultimately brought to a division, in consequence of some remarks from the illustrious Duke who often sits on the Cross Benches. I am no friend to annual Motions; but still inclined to think that, if the whole subject of the Auxiliary Forces passed away, that debate would be more sterile than it ought to be. At the same time, the blemish I propose to touch is not the same as that which occupied attention at the period referred to. My Lords, it is not only because four years have passed that the subject needs consideration, but because late events prepare us to consider it. It is only after military efforts, or after military incidents, that we can hope to gain attention for a topic of this nature. In 1879 the close of the war between Russia and the Porte had disposed the House to examine our armaments. In the present year the campaign in Egypt has renewed a tendency to do so. To pass by the Session would be fatal to those who have improvements to suggest, or criticisms to bring forward. The deficiency I wish to mention is common to both the most conspicuous of the Auxiliary Forces. It does not apply, however, to the Yeomanry so much, for reasons I need not go into at present. I am not without anxiety as to the effect of anything which falls from me on the officers of the Auxiliary Forces. It is far from my intention to disparage them. The Volunteer Force gained the object for which it was suddenly created in 1859—namely, that of adding to security under the French Empire. The Militia have had many witnesses to back them. Gibbon, the historian, himself a captain of the Hampshire Grenadiers, has spoken of the discipline they had attained, when, in the middle of the last century, they had been some time embodied. Mr. Clode, whose industry and talent deserve acknowledgment from all who go into these questions, has made a curious remark, which may be a well-founded one —that had there been Militia in Scotland in 1745 the Pretender would not have established the position from which he marched triumphantly as far as Derby towards the capital. No one doubts that, in the long war from 1793 to 1815, the Militia were of service. They may well be proud of the united auspices under which, in 1852, they were re-organized. The measure was brought about by the Duke of Wellington, who urged Governments to have recourse to it; by Lord John Russell, who determined to adopt it; by Lord Palmerston, who interfered to fix the shape it should assume; by the late Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli, who, coming into power, ultimately carried it. The drawback of the two Forces is not one for which the officers can be held responsible. It is, that they command inadequately trained and but approximative soldiers. None of the men receive instruction for a twelvemonth. My Lords, all military writers have concurred that it is impossible to gain efficiency under that period. To cite a string of references might appear pedantic. There is but one opinion among those whose pages I habitually consult, Sir John Burgoyne, General Macdougall, General Hamley, and, above all, the author of *The Soldier's Pocket Book*, who is not now among us. Upon the Continent, the same opinion is apparent. It is exhibited more clearly in the system of one year volunteers, by which, in France and Germany, young men, who support their own expenses, are permitted to escape the triennial period imposed by general conscription. It is assumed that one year is the shortest time in which they can become adapted to campaigning. Supposing it could be reduced a little, and you take 300 days as a minimum for the preliminary training. The recruit in the Militia has no more than 63, and in the Volunteers no more than 32 at present. Now, in this sphere, the great discovery of modern times appears to be that, if a soldier is once formed by the true quantity, the just measure of preparatory exercise, a slight amount of annual discipline preserves his faculty from rusting; but that, if the basis of original consecutive instruction is deficient, no subsequent amount of intermittent drill can possibly replace it. If the Militiaman and Volunteer went through much more in a few years than ought at first to have been given, it would be useless for efficiency, because it had not been concentrated. I quite admit that, upon joining the Auxiliary Forces, I was under the impression that a short period of drill, with two or three months at an encampment, might qualify men in essentials. Reflection and experience have led me to an opposite conclusion, which the military world had long ago arrived at. My Lords, the result is, about 300,000 men locked up in the United Kingdom, who would require, as it is generally estimated, an additional six months to ripen them for service. It is excessively improbable that a margin of the kind would be attainable. The rapidity of modern wars has now become proverbial. But, unless Auxiliary Forces are qualified to meet an enemy when required to do so, they are not free from disadvantages. In the first place, they involve expense which might be otherwise distributed. It is calculated that 40 regiments might be added to the Line by a transfer of the Vote for the Auxiliary Forces. Next, they absorb men, at least a part of whom might flow into the Regulars. After that, they cheapen and deteriorate the value of titles, and of grades which used to be exclusively professional. Last of all, during the period of service, they are so much strength withdrawn from the productive labour of the country. That evil is, of course, enhanced, when merchants, stockbrokers, and traders, become commanders of battalions, and thus are led to interrupt the business on which their own prosperity depends, together with the wealth of the community. My Lords, as these Auxiliary Forces cannot serve abroad, or even in Colonial garrisons, their function is either to resist invasion, or avert it. They are not qualified to resist invasion, from the defective preparation which they go through. They are not suited to avert invasion, from the extent to which their inefficiency is published. No Foreign Government is overawed or influenced by the mere number of our Auxiliary Forces. The reason is, that military *attachés* have now become an institution of diplomacy. It is true they are not always listened to, as the memorable case of Baron Stoffel may remind us. But Baron Stoffel was not listened to as an expositor of strength, and might have found more willing ears had he been led to chronicle deficiencies. The military *attachés* in our capital are sufficiently enlightened to point out that, for six months after war begins, the Auxiliary Forces of Great Britain will be useless. The remedy — although it may not be attainable immediately—consists in giving every Militiaman and every Volunteer 300 drills before you count him as effective. Of course, objections have to be considered; and, as regards the Volunteers, improvement must be reached by cautious, gradual, and even tentative proceedings. The difficulty of training the Militiaman during a twelvemonth would be reduced by the number of brigade depôts scattered now over the country. Expense, no doubt, would be augmented, as it must be, by any change which tends to national security. But it is better to pay more for a defence, than much for an illusion. Expense, however, would not be increased without a countervailing diminution. If Militiamen were at once transformed into real soldiers, you might, upon the principle I have already stated to the House, reduce, perhaps, by one-half, the annual exercise which, on the present footing, does not render them efficient. As regards the Volunteers, it would be necessary to enlarge the capitation grant. But there is reason to suppose you will have to do that, in any case, whether or not a new condition is exacted. Officers of Volunteers are now weighed down by the expenses they incur. To preserve the Force, it may be indispensable to free them from the embarrassments their sense of duty leads them to submit to. On this subject, and the interior of regiments in the Force, I venture to direct the House to the article by Captain Leese, of the Central London Rangers, in *The United Service Magazine* of this very month, and, therefore, easy to refer to. The Blue Book of the War Office has also witnesses upon it. The upshot is, you can extend the drill, whenever you extend the capitation grant. But, as to extravagance, no system is more costly than that of spending £1,000,000 on 300,000 men who would be useless to the country. There is a further answer to the objection of extravagance. We have been extravagant already. The sums expended in redeeming Purchase and providing for retirement are far greater than those which will be needed to transfer an inefficient Army of Auxiliaries into an efficient one. Those sums have not been accurately given. Some reckon them at £2,000,000; others at nearer £20,000,000. But can there be a question as to the comparative importance of the objects. Can it be doubted that to give fighting power to the Militia and the Volunteers is more essential than it was to establish officers who had not paid for their commissions, even admitting—if you like it—that such officers are better, braver, and more instructed than the former ones? As well might you contend that tulips and champagne are more essential than sea-coal and bread to a well-regulated household, as that a body of non-Purchase officers are more required by the State than the discipline of Auxiliaries who are to guard it in emergency. The next objection which requires to be encountered, but in passing only, is that some improving process is going on already, by which the change required is certain to produce itself; that it is useless to precipitate a foredoomed result, or to disturb a safe and steady evolution. It is true that, since the War of 1870, many changes have arisen. But, as regards preliminary drill, nothing has been done in the Volunteers; while, for the recruit of the Militia, one month has been added. According to this ratio, one month in a decade, the true standard will be reached in 80 years, or towards the middle of the 20th century. Have men who reason in this manner the slighest power to guarantee the country against peril in the interim? Will they be living all that time to watch our security? Can they pretend to hold that, until the middle of the 20th century, you will never want a ready-trained Militia; that every war will give six months of leisure to improve it; that during that six months the Regulars are certain to suffice for all important operations? My Lords, if we reflect with coolness for a moment, we shall see that the series of extraordinary measures which have followed the excitement of 1870 involve new grounds for such reform as I have pointed to. The Militia Reserve has been adopted as an important element of strength in the sum total of our armaments, for foreign, as well as for domestic service. The statement of the Government, on Friday last, in "another place," has made it more important. If long service is partially restored, the Army Reserve is partially diminished. The Militia Reserve is, therefore, less than ever immaterial. But it consists of men who have not received one-quarter of the training which is necessary. According to the Army Re-organization Committee, page 34—

> "A raw recruit trained for 56 days at preliminary drills, and then receiving 28 days' instruction for three or four consecutive years, cannot possibly be regarded as a trained soldier."

The illustrious Duke on the Cross Benches, at page 313, corroborated these expressions. The inadequacy of the Militia Reserve — in discipline and quality—is a glaring and indefensible anomaly. It ought to be improved, or else discarded altogether. It can only be improved by bringing to the proper standard the recruits of the Militia. Another feature of the new reforms will strengthen the position which I have brought before your Lordships. According to the favourite and repeated language of the War Office, Auxiliary Forces, under their new system, are, to a great extent, united with the Regulars. They have, in theory, the same centres to refer to, the same commanders, in the last instance, to direct them. At this moment, the 60th Rifles, with its headquarters at Winchester, has several Militia regiments and some Volunteer corps subordinated to it. Amalgamation of the kind is futile and deceiving, unless Auxiliaries, as far as possible, are raised to the military value of the troops with which it is the official boast and the official watchword to align and to identify them. Unless they are so raised, the language which we hear so often is but a method of imposing upon popular credulity. The supposed amalgamations would dissolve as soon as war began; and, therefore, never have in any way contributed to national resources. To add a great deal to the preliminary drill of the Militia and the Volunteers would not, indeed, remove their inequality with Regulars, but make it far less glaring. There is but one more objection indispensable to notice. It is, that if Auxiliary Forces have been of use before, although they were not drilled up to the standard of efficiency, they may be still of use, in spite of their admitted imperfection. Now, Volunteers at the beginning of the present, and end of the last century, were embodied as fast as they were organized, and went on perpetually drilling to be ready for invasion. When the chances of invasion were thought to have passed away they were disbanded altogether. As to Militia, down to recent times it might be calculated that there would be six months after a war began to finish and mature them. The wars of 1859, of 1866, and 1870, render it impossible to count on doing so any longer. It does not, therefore, follow that because, in 1852, a half-trained Militia was an institution of considerable value, at present it has any. Those who now insist on its inadequacy, or even on its uselessness, are not arraigning the sagacity and policy by which it was at first contrived, or afterwards withdrawn from abeyance. My Lords, it may be seen at a glance that there are certain barriers of national security which lie within each other. The Auxiliary Forces may be regarded as the nearest and the most interior. It clearly cannot be depended on. But such a fact might be accepted or passed over, if those beyond it were impregnable. The Army stands immediately beyond it. At present, Ireland requires 20,000, Egypt 10,000, London a greater force than usual. Seventy thousand is the utmost we could hope to bring into the field against an enemy. If an invasion did arise, it cannot be pretended that 70,000 men would be sufficient to encounter it. We are, therefore, thrown upon the Navy. There is, at least, a great division of opinion on its adequacy. Lord Henry Lennox, Sir Edward Reed, and a considerable school have frequently disputed it. Our Naval barrier has failed in well-known instances of history. Experience as yet can tell us nothing about iron-clads, except, indeed, that in a fog they are highly capable of running down each other. The outer circle of defence consists in foreign policy. It is easy to imagine combinations or alliances, which would diminish the chance of war, or take away the prospect of invasion. But they are not apparent at this moment. The conclusion is, that we are thrown back on the Auxiliary Forces, and that to correct their weakness may be the only path of safety to the Empire. My Lords, I do not wish to occupy the House much longer, and am impatient to hear remarks from other quarters on the subject. But it would be too much against my feelings to sit down without alluding to the extraordinary article of Captain Kirchhammer, an Austrian Staff Officer, upon the military weakness of Great Britain. Although it appeared in *The Nineteenth Century* of April, 1881, it has not been replied to; it ought not to be forgotten, and it entered much into the grounds which have induced me to bring the subject forward. Captain Kirchhammer goes over an exhaustive survey of our obligations and resources, concluding that, unless the latter are increased, the former will be entirely abandoned. Captain Kirchhammer has referred to various transactions in which our policy has failed, as having no solution but the want he has delineated. As he reasons, without reference to one Party or another, since 1856 wars have taken place, Treaties have been framed, and boundaries overthrown, without the approbation, or against the protest, of Great Britain. The public conscience will sustain him. But if, as he contends, our objects have been usually frustrated, it arises either from the incapacity of statesmen or the insufficiency of armaments. It is less invidious, possibly more just, to connect it with the last-mentioned cause, and to proceed at once to such remedial measures as are possible. My Lords, no one can deny that, if the Auxiliary Forces were qualified for actual service, which they are not, a great improvement would be realized. No one can deny that it is much easier to labour for that end than it would be to enlarge the Army or the Navy. As there are, no doubt, financial problems to consider, well-organized inquiry is essential. No Government will undertake so great a change without authority beyond itself to recommend it. I have reflected carefully upon the methods of inquiry. Of late years, Committees of the War Office have abounded. They have not been useless, and they are not uninstructive; but their effect is weakened by their number. The War Office is entitled to repose after so long a parturition. A Commission might be nominated; but the tendency and turn of a Commission depend, in no small degree, upon the Government. Should the Government be prejudiced against a certain line of change, it is not easy to depend upon a body springing wholly from its fiat. A Committee of this House is, therefore, a more desirable tribunal. Both Parties would contribute to it. Diplomatists and military men, together with the officers of the Auxiliary Forces, may be blended in it. There would be no lack of witnesses to throw a light on the deficiency, no lack of witnesses to ascertain how far it can be prudently corrected. This House has little scope for active legislation. In resisting or amending what it disapproves, its function, we have seen of late, is doubtful and precarious. Inquiry has thus become its sphere more urgently than ever. It could not better occupy its vacant time or unexhausted energy at present, than in preparing to render the Auxiliary Forces, which add a burden to finance, a means of safety to the Realm, as well as influence beyond it. Although I do not move for a Committee, it may easily be brought about by the concurrence of your Lordships.

Viscount CRANBROOK said, that the subject introduced by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) was, at that moment, of such great importance, and had so extensive a bearing upon the condition of our Military Forces, that he (Viscount Cranbrook) was glad to have the opportunity of calling attention to some Questions which he had on the Paper last Friday, but which had been postponed, with respect to the policy of the Government on those matters. A Question had been also put in the House of Commons upon this subject, and had been dwelt upon at considerable length on Friday last; and it was of great importance that their Lordships should be fully and accurately informed with reference to the military resources of the country. He quite agreed with the noble Lord opposite, who had brought this subject under the notice of the House, that there never had been a time when it was of more importance that the Auxiliary Forces of the country should be placed upon a satisfactory footing. There was nothing more lamentable, when the Army was said to be in a state of disintegration, that the same condition should also fall on the Militia—that the Militia was not up to its strength, nor anything like it; and that the Militia Reserve was said to be in an unsatisfactory condition in respect to numbers. In short, the condition of the Army generally was such, that the prospect could not be looked upon altogether without some cause for alarm. Although he did not wish to exaggerate or excite that alarm in any unnecessary degree, they had had rumours and newspaper reports, tending to show that there was uneasiness in the country with respect to its resources, and that, after the great expenditure which had been made in the Army of late years, they had not that efficient organization which they ought to have. He must say that that was a state of things that ought not to be allowed to exist at a time when there were clouds on the horizon in more than one quarter which might, at any moment, break, and require the country to be able to display its strength. He could assure the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Morley) that he was not about to make any attack upon the Department he represented, nor to seek to make the question a Party one, because it was too important for any consideration of that character to enter into it; and, beyond that, he was assured that all of their Lordships were desirous of combining together for the purpose of doing everything that was necessary in order to render the small Force which we could put into the field as perfect as possible. He had been four years at the War Office, and when he resigned the Office of Secretary of State for War he left the Army overflowing. In 1877 the Army was some 2,000 over the Establishment, and recruiting was going on at such a speed that it was possible to send men into the Reserve at a rate that promised to raise the numbers of the latter very considerably. In the month of March, 1878, when he introduced the Estimates, the Army was some 1,700 in excess of the Establishment. What he wished to know was, how it was that this flow of recruits into the Army had been suddenly checked? In 1877 he introduced the system of deferred pay, and also increase of pay to the non-commissioned officers; and from the time when those advantages came into operation there was a rapid increase in recruiting. He could say also, with respect to the character of the recruits, that the illustrious Duke the Commander-in-Chief, having taken pains to examine the matter in 1878, was able to say that, up to that time, they were of a good class; that the officers reported of their regiments that they were of the same class as in former years, and were calculated to make good soldiers. He (Viscount Cranbrook) contended, however, that although there was no change in the material, it must be remembered that, if young men of 18 years of age were enlisted as recruits, on the short-service system, for six or seven years, the first two years of their service must necessarily be thrown away; and, consequently, there was not time to get the full use of them as trained soldiers. Such men might be very good soldiers as far as actual fighting was concerned; but they would be unable to bear up against the hardships of a long and arduous campaign. The maximum age for enlistment had been raised last year to 19; but that, in his opinion, was entirely a mistake, and not the proper remedy; because lads of the class from which recruits were drawn did not always increase in strength between 18 and 19. They were of a class which was generally ill-fed and ill-lodged; and, from 18 to 19, there was little improvement in their condition, and they rather lost than gained in comparison as regarded physique and powers of endurance, with those who entered the Army at the earlier age, when they were well fed and cared for. He would not hesitate to take them at 18; because at 19 they would be equal to any men of the same class at 20 if left to themselves.

Moreover, there was certain to be a great loss, in point of numbers, by raising the minimum age for recruits, inasmuch as most young men of 19 had already marked out their line of life. But, although he was in favour of recruits of 18 being taken, he thought that they should not be put to heavy and severe work until they had arrived at maturity. The question was, how all this was to be accomplished; and there were, no doubt, great difficulties in the way of carrying out the desired object. He had understood from what had fallen from the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for War in the other House, on Friday night, that it was the intention of the Government to permit men to re-enlist for 12 years, and that at the expiration of the term they might, with the approval of their commanding officers, continue for 21 years. The statement upon that point of the noble Marquess, as reported, appeared to be a little obscure; but that seemed to be its substance. He wished, however, to point out that it was not altogether a satisfactory statement, for it left the matter uncertain, and the men, when re-enlisting for a long period, would like to know what would become of them after the period of their second enlistment had expired, because they would then be cut out from all civil employment; and they would wish to know what the country was willing to do for them in the shape of pension and emolument. He did not think that that point had received sufficient attention. The short-service system had, no doubt, brought them into a serious difficulty in this respect—that to send very young recruits out to India was to send them to their death; and, therefore, they could not supply either India or the tropical Colonies with young recruits. If there were two periods of service to choose from, men would usually choose the shortest term, as they would think that it gave them a longer time in which to make up their minds. He entirely disagreed from those who thought that we should have two Armies—one founded on long and the other on short service; and he sincerely trusted that that was not to be among the experiments about to be made. The deficiency that would occur in the Reserve by permitting the men to re-enlist in the Line might be met by allowing the Reserve men to re-enrol themselves for a further term. When they considered, however, what had occurred with regard to the Reserve they would see what a difficult question this was to deal with. When Lord Cardwell first brought forward his scheme establishing the short-service system, he calculated that the Reserve would amount to some 80,000 in 1880. We were now in 1883, and he (Viscount Cranbrook) believed that, at the outside, the number of the Reserves did not exceed 28,000 men. And even that had been brought about by exceptional circumstances. It had been by endeavouring to get men into the Reserves, whenever the Army was overflowing; and, in that way, the number had been more at certain times than it could possibly have been under Lord Cardwell's system. He (Viscount Cranbrook) was himself instructed, in 1877 or 1878, that he might calculate on having, in 1882, 43,000 men in the Reserves; and yet they saw how those calculations failed, from the enormous waste there was in the Army, owing to the mysterious disappearance of the men. If they made those calculations on paper they found themselves misled in the end; because they had not that to rely upon which was the groundwork on which they proceeded in former days. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) had alluded to one subject in which he (Viscount Cranbrook) himself had always taken great interest, and that was the question of Militia Reserves. Of course, they could not have a Militia Reserve if they had not a Militia. It was very material, no doubt, that the Militia should be well trained; but they would never have a good Militia that would give themselves up to the prolonged period of training for 300 days of which the noble Lord spoke. The men were men with other businesses. They came out when they were called upon; and the noble Lord rather exaggerated the deficiencies of the Auxiliary Forces, when he spoke as if the Militia could not immediately be called into use. They knew perfectly well that there were numbers of Militia regiments which, for himself, he should not hesitate to place in garrisons to set free troops of the Regular Army—regiments well fitted for active service, and composed of men who, in a short time, would be perfectly adequate to have care of those garrison towns. This was proved at the time of the Crimean War. And when they had called out the Reserves, and the Militia Reserves with them, he remembered the illustrious Duke saying that, after they had been out for some weeks, it was extremely difficult to tell a Militia Reserve man from the Regular Army Reserve man. He (Viscount Cranbrook) deduced from that the lesson that in the multiplication of Militia lay the chief defence of the nation. They must, then, take care to keep the Militia regiments up to their full strength, and increase the number of those whom they took into the Militia Reserves. If they did not do so, those steps they were taking backward from short service would result in what had resulted in the history of the Army before—that the time would come when, under some great crisis or crash, such as that of the Crimean War, from the want of trained men to send out as reliefs, when the old troops were for the time destroyed, we must either send out young recruits, wherever we could get them in the market, or the Army must be left without recruits at all. The essential thing for this country was that it should have something to fall back upon. And one of our great defects had been that, with respect to carrying on our little wars—for instance now, when we were using the Army of Occupation in Egypt—no steps were taken to raise the Army beyond the ordinary peace Establishment; but they threw onerous duties on an Army which was reduced in its numbers, and therefore they made the Service unpopular by the very fact that they were putting upon the men duties which they ought not to discharge. In London, at that moment, they had the Guards brought down, he knew not how many, below their strength, and with sentry duty aggravated beyond anything in former times. He should like his noble Friend (the Earl of Morley) to tell him how many nights in bed the ordinary Guardsman now gets in London. It was a most material point. They were sapping the strength of those men, if they did not get a sufficient number of night's rest, by means of the arduous and disagreeable duties to which he had alluded; therefore, if the Service was to be made popular, the men must be relieved as much as possible of the irksome duties which they had to perform, which could only done by having a sufficient number of men. And if such was the state of matters in England, what were they to say of India? How many regiments were efficient in India? He gathered, from the statement which was made the other night, that there were at least 5,000, which was more than five battalions, wanting of the 50,000 men which we supplied to India. He hoped and believed there was no danger of another Mutiny. He hoped and believed there was no risk of complications happening in India which might call for a great force on the part of this country; but he could not but recollect that, if there had been only two regiments in particular places in India at the time of the Mutiny, it was not impossible that great outbreaks would have been put down at once, instead of developing and expanding as they did. Five thousand men, one-tenth of their whole Army, wanting in India was a most formidable deficiency. He would have been almost afraid of speaking about it in that House some weeks ago; but the fact had been published everywhere, and there was now no secret about it. But when they realized what it meant the fact was more serious; because it meant that the supply had to be sent from this country, and sent, too, from among the matured men, leaving the country still weaker, with an Army composed of youth and immaturity. With reference to the system of short service, which had existed since 1870, he would say that it had had a most ample and fair trial. He would undertake to say that, under the Government of which he was a Member, so far from putting any impediment in the way of its working, they did everything they possibly could to have it fairly and fully tried; and if it was now breaking down, let there not be any shame or feeling of repugnance towards taking a step, as they might call it, backward, if it was necessary, in order to bring about efficiency; but let them do it boldly and determinedly, and give the Army rest when they had done. Let them know what the Army wanted, and the terms and conditions in which recruits were to be expected in the Army, and let them have the best men that could be got. Let them do something to put our Forces on a proper and permanent footing, with the Auxiliary

Forces in the background as a defence, containing within it a large Reserve, able to take the field with the Regular Army, not at the beginning of a war, but as a real Reserve to fall back upon whenever occasion might arise; for the Government should not forget, with regard to what was called the first line of defence, that a great deal of apprehension was felt as to whether our ships were sufficiently strong in themselves, or sufficiently armed, as compared with the fleets of other nations. This, however, was not the occasion to discuss Naval affairs. Let them not shrink from the expense of filling up the Militia and extending the Militia Reserve, and thus be ready to supply wants which would arise, because in that way only could they make themselves secure. Thanking their Lordships for their kind attention, he begged to ask the following questions:—How far below the numbers voted the Army now was, and what was the deficiency in each arm of the Service; what was the deficiency in the Militia, and, if any, in the Militia Reserve; what changes had been made in the terms and conditions under which recruits were taken, and at what rate were they coming in; what was the deficiency in the British troops in India, and how distributed, and what means had been and were being taken to supply it; at what age and after what service were soldiers sent to India; and what was the effect on the Reserves of the present state of things?

THE EARL OF MORLEY said, he could assure the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cranbrook) that he (the Earl of Morley) echoed the sentiment with which he began his very able and interesting speech—that questions relating to the Army were of a very serious and important nature, and ought not to be made, in any sense, Party questions. He was quite sure that the noble Viscount himself, who had had so much experience at the War Office, and knew from experience the difficulty and responsibility of the post of Secretary of State for War, was quite as anxious as those who were now charged with responsibility were that the Army should be as efficient as possible. The Notice given by the noble Lord who opened the debate (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) was somewhat vague in its character, as, until he (the Earl of Morley) heard the speech, he had not the remotest idea of the points to which the noble Lord was going to call attention in the general condition of the Auxiliary Forces. The noble Lord, however, was very bold in his suggestions, and a little rash in his assertions, as to the efficiency and use of both Militia and Volunteers. He (the Earl of Morley) entirely concurred in what had fallen from the noble Viscount opposite—that the noble Lord who opened the debate had very much underrated both the efficiency and the value of our Auxiliary Forces, the Volunteers and Militia, and last, not least, the Militia Reserve. But the noble Lord made a very extraordinary suggestion—the only one which he (the Earl of Morley) could really grasp throughout the whole of the speech—for improving the condition of the Auxiliary Forces—namely, that the military training of recruits for both branches of the Auxiliary Forces should be increased to 300 days. He was afraid that, if that suggestion were adopted, they would shortly not have many remaining of the 300,000 men who, the noble Lord said, were now uselessly locked up. He would now turn to the more important questions which the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cranbrook) had addressed to him with regard to the Army generally; and he would, in the first place, deal with the second question put by the noble Viscount, relating to the Militia and the Militia Reserve. But it was only right that he should explain to the House that it was by no means easy to give exact figures; and, therefore, that those he gave must be taken with certain qualifications, which he would endeavour to explain in the course of his statement. He would, however, place the matter before their Lordships' House as clearly as it was possible for him to do. The present enrolled strength of the Militia, as nearly as he could give it, was 109,767, which was something like 20,000 men below the Establishment. That might sound alarming, and the fact was certainly anything but satisfactory; but it must be remembered that this was just the time of year when the Militia was at its lowest strength. He would also remind the noble Viscount that the Militia was always considerably below the Establishment; and during the last 12 years the deficiency had always existed, and at times had been a great deal more unsatisfactory than the figures he had given. There was another point that also affected the general strength of the Militia in the last two years—that the Irish Militia, which consisted of 28,000 men, had not been called up, and recruiting had consequently been stopped; this diminished, of course, the enrolled strength of the entire Force. Up to the present time, they had been recruiting most satisfactorily both in England and Ireland; and he should not be far from the mark when he said that, during the present year, they had obtained about 18,000 recruits for the Militia. In respect to the Militia Reserve, also, the period immediately before the annual training was the most unfavourable time of the year to take. The number of the Force was something over 25,000 men, which was a deficiency of a little under 5,000. There, again, the Irish Militia came in; and, comparing the state of the Militia Reserve in 1882 and 1883, the decrease was almost entirely borne on the Irish Establishment. That was to be expected; and he had no doubt that, at the end of the present training, we should largely make up the deficiency existing in that branch. He then came to points relating to the Army generally, and he would take the figures in respect to the deficiency as given in the official Return of the 1st of May. At the same time, he must here again remind their Lordships that figures taken at this time of the year required qualification. To meet the existing deficiency which he admitted, it was proposed to alter, to some extent, the qualifications now required from recruits, and the terms on which they were enlisted. He proposed to lay a Memorandum on the Table, explaining definitely what changes were to be made. At this period of the year reliefs were constantly returning from India, taking their place on the English Establishment for a short time, and then being discharged; so that at one time the English Establishment might be temporarily above, and at another time considerably below, its strength. On the 1st of May, then, the deficiency in the number of the English Establishment was:—Artillery, 1,450; Engineers, 82; Guards, 940; Infantry of the Line, 6,200; and Colonial Force, 240. That gave a total deficiency of 8,900; but, deducting 400 excess in other branches of the Service, there was a net deficiency of 8,500 men at home. Now, in India, at that date, there was hardly any deficiency at all—only 321. Those figures, however, really gave an inaccurate idea of the real state of things, for they gave an exaggerated idea of the deficiency on the Home Establishment, and an inadequate idea of the deficiency on the Indian Establishment. The deficiency on the Home Establishment was to be qualified in this way. The strength of the Infantry in the last Estimates was raised by 2,400 men, the object of that being to raise the strength of the regiments on the roster, and to prevent their being too much attenuated after the drafts were sent out from them to India in the autumn. It was clear that that increase could not have taken place within the last month, nor, indeed, was it anticipated, even if they got the recruits, that it could take place immediately, the object being to strengthen the low-strength battalions by degrees, so as to prepare them for sending out drafts in the trooping season. To get at the true deficiency at home, therefore, it was obviously fair that he should deduct that 2,400, which brought the deficiency down to 6,100 in round numbers. It should be borne in mind, also, that, at this time of the year, men from India were returning home; that they were kept on the Indian Establishment until they were disembarked in this country; and that they were then borne for a short time on the Home Establishment before being discharged. The waste of the Army was, therefore, far greater now than at any other time of the year, because of men coming home in large batches from India, and being discharged as invalids, or as having served their time. Practically, the whole annual waste of the Indian Army was concentrated into the first half of the year, and was made up gradually by recruiting throughout the whole year. Thus, they must always anticipate that, the number of men annually leaving the Colours being, under the short-service system, larger than it was formerly, the deficiency would always be larger also. They could not safely reckon without a normal deficiency in May and July of 2,000 or 3,000 men from that cause, and that would reduce the abnormal deficiency at home to something like 4,000 men on the figures he had just given. On the 1st of May 7,000 men had already returned from India who had been discharged altogether from the Army or had gone into the Reserve. It was calculated that, at the end of the trooping season, when all the troops would have returned home from India, about the end of the present month, the deficiency in India would be—in Cavalry 368, and in Infantry 4,603. In the Artillery there would be a small excess of about 30, so that the total deficiency would then be about 4,941 men. He admitted that that was a state of things to which the noble Viscount opposite was quite justified in calling attention, and asking for an explanation; and he would, as far as he could, endeavour to explain the reasons that led to it. He thought he might fairly say, from the figures he had quoted, that the total deficiency on the Indian and English Establishments amounted to something between 6,000 and 8,000 men. He did not wish to enter at length into a comparison between the long-service system and the short-service system; but it was a curious fact that upon the 10 years from 1863 to 1873 there had been invariably, on the 1st of January, a very large deficiency on the Establishment, amounting, on the average, to something like 4,000 men. Taking, however, the nine years following, from 1873 to 1882, there had been in every case, with one exception, a surplus of strength on the Establishment; and, taking that into consideration, he thought it could hardly be denied that they had been more successful in the short-service system than in the long-service system in keeping the Army up to its Establishment, and in a state of efficiency as regarded numbers. He had been asked what was the cause of the present deficiency. This subject must be considered from two points of view. In the first place, the outflow from the Army had to be considered; and, in the second place, the inflow into it. The outflow from all causes was commonly called the "waste," but this was a misleading term; those who left the Army to go into the Reserve, or at the termination of their time of service with the Colours, could not be placed in the category of waste at all. He would divide the men who left the Colours into three classes —1, those discharged from unavoidable causes; 2, those who left of their own accord; 3, those who left in consequence of the Rules of the Service. First, taking the cases which were inevitable in all systems—namely, those arising from deaths from invaliding and discharges for bad conduct—he found an invariable tendency to decrease during the last 20 years; and if noble Lords would look at the figures, they would see that the discharges from the causes he had mentioned were rapidly decreasing. Secondly, as regards men who leave the Army of their own accord, either legally by purchase, or illegally by desertion, he believed that they must always have men going from those two causes. With regard to desertions, it must be remembered that among them must be taken the cases of men who had deserted, and therefore were counted as deserters several times; and, therefore, the number of desertions could not be taken as the actual amount of "waste" arising from that cause. They had been as watchful as they could be in regard to the matter of desertions, and had inflicted punishments of very great severity on the men who had been convicted of fraudulent enlistment during the past year; and he believed they had had a remarkable effect, and he hoped they would tend to discourage desertions in the future; indeed, during the present year there was a marked decline in the numbers of deserters. This decline had now been continued for some years. A third class of men left the Colours in accordance with the Rules of the Service—namely, those who left the Army to go into civil life, or into the Reserve; that depended entirely on the existing arrangements. Last year the depletion from these causes had been very considerable indeed, and higher than in previous years, and for this reason—that in 1870 they had enlisted a large number of long-service men—namely, for 12 years, and in 1876 a large number of short-service men—namely, for six years; and the term of enlistment for both expired last year. So that there were, in 1882, what remained in the Army of no less than 46,000 men enlisted in 1870 and 1876 whose term of enlistment terminated last year. That he believed to be the principal cause of the deficiency—a deficiency which he deplored as much as the noble Viscount—resulting from this double drain on the Service. They had to obtain recruits to supply the places of these two classes of men in the same year; but they had only the ordinary inflow. No doubt, this cause of deficiency would diminish year after year; still, he was prepared to admit that there would be from the short-service system more than the average outflow of past years. As regards the inflow of recruits, the noble Viscount opposite had asked him how he accounted for the check in recruiting; and he thought he should be able to account for that in a very satisfactory manner. If he had to say that they had had a smaller number of recruits wishing to enter the Army, it might be justly said that the Army was more unpopular; but they had found that really last year a larger number of men had had recruiting notices sent them than in any previous year. The total number of men applying to be received last year was more than 45,000; but, out of that number, only 23,000 had been approved. The reason of that was that, in the first place, the age had been raised from 18 to 19; and, in the second place, the medical examination had been very much more stringent. The standard itself had not been raised; but the instructions given to the medical officers had been of a much more stringent character, and had been more stringently carried out. In the third place, though he did not attach so much importance to the fact, the not calling out of the Irish Militia had, no doubt, affected the recruiting for the Army to a very considerable extent. As to the progress of the recruiting this year, he thought he could give a very satisfactory account. Up to the 1st of May 8,665 recruits had been obtained; and, judging from the Returns of former years, he thought they might calculate that this rate would give 29,000 recruits in the course of the year, and that number would be amply sufficient for all their normal needs. In the month just past, excluding last week, they had been receiving recruits at the rate of 640 per week; and the number for the last week but one was 768. The Returns for last week, which were not complete, as they excluded London and some other large districts, would amount to about 750. It was perfectly true that the increase was due to several special causes, and partly to the lowering of the age and standard. In April last a Circular had been issued to commanding officers of districts, authorizing them to accept men under 19 years of age, if they thought they were likely to become good soldiers; and at the same time they were permitted, on the same conditions, to take men between 5 feet 3 inches and 5 feet 4 inches in height. As for the age of the recruits, it was undeniable that some thousands of men—say, 4,000 at the least—were lost to the country last year, because they could not be taken when they were less than 19 years old. Now, it was in theory highly desirable that they should have no men in the Army under 19, or even 20 years of age, and this was easily managed in countries where there was conscription; but where the Army was recruited from Volunteers, they had to consider at what age they could get the largest number of men, and the best qualified men. The fact was that at 18 men were beginning to settle their occupations for life, and the recruiting authorities, if they did not take them then, lost them altogether. He did not by any means anticipate that the present recruits would prove mere weeds. The authorities had great confidence in the discretion of the medical officers; and not only were the medical examinations more strict now than they used to be, but the regulations recently made provided that recruits should remain for their first course of drill at the depôts for three months — an arrangement which kept them under the observation of the medical officers who passed them, and the commanding officer who approved of their being enlisted, and saw them through their course of training. With respect to the Guards, the deficiency was, as he had stated, 940 men; and he greatly deplored that deficiency, especially considering the extra duties—performed, however, with the greatest alacrity — which had been thrown upon the officers and men of the brigade during the last few months. It was now proposed to reduce the standard of height to 5 feet 7 inches, and, at the same time, to reduce the age for enlistment to 18, as in the rest of the Army. This reduction had hardly had, as yet, time to operate. He might, in passing, notice that the system of paying sergeants for obtaining recruits had been altered in July last, and regularly-paid recruiting sergeants were now employed throughout the country. This change might have temporarily checked recruiting; but he was confident that this was a right and proper change, and the success they had had with recruiting this year proved that the check, if check there had been, was only temporary. The policy of the War Office was not to entrap young men into the Army by false pretences, but to induce men to join by letting them know exactly what they were about in doing so, and the favourable conditions of the Service on which they were entering. By that means, it was hoped that a more than sufficient number of recruits would be obtained for their ordinary requirements. These recruits, however, would not be available for the Indian drafts, which, in consequence of the deficiency already stated, would be abnormally numerous next autumn; because it was laid down that no men should be sent to India who were under 20 years of age, or who had less than one year's service. These regulations respecting service in India remained unaltered. It was proposed to endeavour to reduce the demand for drafts by offering inducements to men now in India to extend their service with the Colours; and the War Office was now in communication with the India Office as to the expediency of taking steps in this direction. The offer of £5 was made to men willing to extend their service to 10 years; but that was done just before a large number were returning home, and a very small proportion of them availed themselves of the offer. Further communications were now passing between the War Office and the India Office. With a view of making good the deficiency both at home and abroad, and also of endeavouring to render the Service more popular throughout the country, by giving greater elasticity to the conditions under which soldiers now served, they proposed to make changes of some importance in these conditions. They proposed to allow every man who had been enlisted, or who would be enlisted as long as this Order was in force, to extend his service to 12 years; and then—subject to the conditions which had always existed—namely, that he was an efficient soldier, and had been approved by his commanding officer—he would be allowed to re-engage, and to serve for 21 years, when he would receive his deferred pay and a pension. Further, with a view of meeting the Indian demands next autumn, they proposed to give a bounty of £2 to all men in regiments which had a battalion in India, who were between their fourth and seventh year of service, and who re-engaged for 12 years. This bounty was not new in principle, for now men who were allowed to extend their service to 10 years for foreign service were, in the regular course, granted £2 on embarkation. Practically, they now proposed to give the £2 in anticipation, so that they might be ready to send the men to India when required. It might be said against these proposals that, if carried into effect, they would involve a return to long service, and, consequently, a diminution, if not destruction, of the First Class Reserve. This he denied. The essence of long service was that a recruit should be bound to remain in the Army for the best part of his life—namely, for 12 years. Short service bound him only for seven or eight years. It was not proposed to alter this in any way, but to open the door to those who desired, of their own accord, to remain with the Colours for a longer period, or even to serve on for pension. At the present time this proposal would have a double advantage. If many men extended their services, it would relieve them from what was, he admitted, a difficulty, as it would diminish the demands which India would make upon them next month, and would, at the same time, render the Home Army more able to meet those demands, by having a larger proportion of men qualified for Indian service in the ranks; and it would assist in making good the deficiency in the total Establishment, the existence of which he admitted. It would, at the same time, test the question whether there were, as they were frequently told, large numbers of men who were driven out of the ranks, against their own wishes, by their regulations. The Reserve would, no doubt, suffer in proportion to the number of men who extended their services, or who re-engaged; but, at a time like the present, when there must be a deficiency either in the Reserve or in the First Line, it seemed to him obviously expedient that the deficiency should be rather in the Reserve. When their Establishments were again complete it would be easy to replenish the Reserve by allowing men to leave the Colours before the termination of their first engagement, as had been done on former occasions when recruiting was more than sufficient to supply casualties. Moreover, an addition would this year be made to the First Class Reserve by enrolling a certain number of men—the Estimates provided for 2,500—in the Supplemental Reserve first instituted last year, which was to be composed of men who had completed 12 years' service, and which was not to be liable for service till all the First Class Army Reserve had been mobilized. The principle on which the proposals he had described were based was that the greatest latitude should be given to the soldier in making his choice as to the term for which he would serve. In the case of the Foot Guards, it was proposed to carry this principle a step further, and alter the terms of enlistment. It was proposed to enlist men for the Foot Guards for only three years, to allow them, at any time within that period, to extend to seven, and in the seventh year to extend the service to 12 years, when, subject to the usual conditions, they, like the rest of the Army, would be allowed to re-engage for pension; the difference between the enlistment for Guards and the Line being that the former would, in the first instance, be enlisted for three, the latter for seven years. In both cases the men would have the option of serving longer. The exigencies of supplying drafts for abroad, and the necessity for preparing the Infantry battalions high on the roster for service in the First Army Corps, rendered it at present difficult, if not impossible, to apply the three years' system to the Army generally. He should add that Guardsmen who left after only three years' service would not earn any deferred pay; but if they served on, the deferred pay which they would receive on leaving the Colours would be reckoned from the date of enlistment. The scheme would, he hoped, help to supply the deficiency now existing in the Guards; and the experience of its working in a limited corps, which had no foreign service, would be very instructive. On the one hand, they had been told constantly that if they only reduced the term of service to three years they would get any number of the best class of recruits; and they would largely increase their powers of selection, and, by keeping them for a shorter period with the Colours, double their Reserve. On the other hand, it was stated that they were driving out of the ranks, by their regulations, men most anxious to serve on. The experiment they were about to try in the Army generally, but more crucially in the case of the Guards, would give a definite answer to these opposing theories. Possibly it might be found that there was truth in both, and this would be the most satisfactory solution of the question. He frankly admitted that he, judging from past experience, did not anticipate that a large number of men would avail themselves of the offers of re-engaging for pension. Among other things, the receipt of a considerable sum of ready money, as deferred pay, was an inducement to many men to leave the Army and start themselves in civil life. He had now answered all the noble Viscount's questions, except one, which related to the strength of the First Class Army Reserve. At present the strength of this Force was 28,700, and in the course of the month it would probably reach 30,000, as it would receive a number of men returning from India. Moreover, they hoped this year to add to the Reserve Force the 2,500 men of the Supplemental Reserve already mentioned. He had now, he hoped, given frank and clear answers to all the questions put to him by the noble Viscount. He had admitted the deficiency to which the noble Viscount had very properly called attention, and had, as far he could, given the causes which had resulted in this deficiency, both as regarded the increased outflow of men from the Army, and the diminished inflow of recruits in the last year, and shown that it was due to abnormal causes, and not to the reluctance of recruits to join the Army. He had also explained the measures which it was proposed to adopt to meet their present difficulties. Those measures were of an experimental and, possibly, of a temporary character. They in no way abandoned, as some unjustly said, the principle of short service; but they carried as far as could be done, with the exigencies of a Foreign Army to meet, the principle that the soldier should be free to leave or to remain in the Army, according to his wishes or the circumstances of his life. Experience alone would show how this system would work, and how far it might require modification. It was, of course, open to the Secretary of State to introduce such alterations in future as circumstances might require; but he wished to explain distinctly—as there seemed to be some misapprehension on the subject—that such future modifications would only affect the men enlisted after their publication. The men now in the Army, or who hereafter enlisted under the conditions which had been described, would, of course, not forfeit any privileges they might have obtained in consequence of any change of Regulations effected after their own enlistment. Under short service they had obtained more than double the number of recruits given them by long service. And the applicants to enter the Army were annually increasing, and were, as he had shown, sufficient for their annual wants. The deficiency now existing—the gravity of which he did not for an instant depreciate—was the result of abnormal causes, and he believed that the measures which he had described would gradually diminish and finally extinguish that deficiency. He maintained strongly that such deficiency as existed could in no degree be attributed to the system of short service, and he hoped they would never diverge from the path on which they entered when Lord Cardwell introduced that system. Experience had shown that no other system would yield an adequate supply of recruits, and none of the Committees or Commissions which had considered the question had been able to suggest any other system which would give them a Reserve.

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE said, he was extremely gratified at the discussion which had been brought about by the reference of the noble Lord (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) to the condition of the Auxiliary Forces. It was a question, he need hardly say, of the greatest importance, and he was glad it had been so exhaustively dealt with as it had by his noble Friends on both sides who had addressed the House on the subject. As a rule, it was undesirable that Army arrangements, which were not working as smoothly as one could wish, should be brought prominently before the public; and it was not desirable the public should imagine that there was a much greater deficiency of men than there ought to be; but the subject having been brought forward, the best way was to deal with it fully and frankly, as his noble Friend (the Earl of Morley) had done. It was a matter of perfect indifference to him (the Duke of Cambridge) whether they had long or short service; all that he wanted to see was a good Army, as good a one as could possibly be had for its small size; and the test of whether one system was better than another, was its success in drawing men out of the labour market. If they found one system better than another for that purpose, and that under it they could get the best men, they should adopt it. The system of short service as carried on abroad was peculiar, but a very simple and a good one. All the men were bound to serve, and the result was that men were never wanted; that was, one-third went home, and one-third joined the Army at the same time, and in two or three months were ready for all duties. But in this country, that could only be done by conscription, and that he was not in favour of. About one-third of the whole Army in Germany was discharged into the Reserve every year; and, on the very day they left, their places were filled up by recruits. In our Service the men joined by enlistment, and, as a consequence, we had weak battalions, as the labour market offered other attractions, and it became a question as to the power of money in that market, and as to what we could get the men for; and we could have no Army at all unless we were prepared to pay for the inducements to enlist. But, under conscription, recruiting cost nothing, for the law obliged every man to serve for a time. We had, therefore, all the disadvantages of short service, without the advantage that resulted from the law forcing men to serve. He should prefer men to enlist at 19 or 20; but we could not get men at that age, because they were otherwise employed. The boy of 18 had not made up his mind with regard to any business; and, therefore, he was more easily attainable for the Army. Lads who entered at that age made good soldiers in the long run; but, at first, they could only be employed on light work. They could not be sent for service abroad. Therefore, if we could take younger men, they could be trained, and they would be better soldiers at 20. It was the same with young men as with young horses; they would work better if they had been trained to it. But these younger men should not be called soldiers at all; they should correspond to boys in the Navy; and the Army should train boys to be soldiers, as the Navy trained boys to be sailors. We ought to have 10,000 more men, as we were now called upon to send to India, on an average, one-fourth of the battalions every year. Between 200 and 250 men had to be sent on an average every year as a draft from 450 men on the Home Establishment. Consequently, occasionally only 200 men were left at home, and generally the home battalion was not up to its full strength. Of course, the Army was bound to assist the Civil power in keeping the peace; and, at the present time, the Guards alone were 940 under the Establishment, and yet they were called upon to supply 74 sentries more in London than had ever been required within his recollection. At the same time, although the men disliked that duty, they discharged it with alacrity and without complaint. Of course, the men would not stay unless it were made worth their while to do so. As to the question of deferred pay, he found men would take the £18 and go, rather than have the prospect of receiving a larger sum, or even a pension, at the end of a longer period of service. In that way, deferred pay operated against long service; but it was given for the excellent reason that men should not loaf about the country after they had left the Army. If a soldier on his discharge got £18, he had something to start with in life, and he could not say that he had been neglected by the State. If he chose to squander away the money, that was his own affair. He believed, however, that if we could induce men to come to the conviction that this deferred pay might be put into the savings bank to accumulate, it would be better both for the men and for the State. He did not think the shifting of men from one regiment or battalion to another was desirable, as it tended to make men dissatisfied. People had an idea that a soldier was a sort of man who did not care where he went or what he did. It was probably true that he did not care where he went; but, at the same time, he liked to be with the men he had made friends of. Men were not shifted about in the Cavalry, and what was the consequence? Why, that men could always be got for that arm of the Service; and, at the present time, it was over its strength, while the Infantry was 6,000 below theirs. He believed that when men enlisted, they did not much care where they went; but, once in a regiment, they wanted to stay in it and remain with their comrades. His noble Friend had said that he could not imagine anything better than the system of Reserves. But if they had no Army, they could not expect to form or keep up a Reserve; for where were the men to come from to go into that Reserve? He thought that they ought to get more Reserve men from the Militia; and, although he was not in favour of conscription, there ought to be some means of keeping up the Militia to its full strength, whether by conscription or any other means—although, of course, they could never have conscription, as our whole system was opposed to it. It was also, he thought, a great mistake to keep recruits too long at a depôt. They ought to be sent to their regiments as soon as possible. With regard to the subject of desertion, it was known that, in many instances, men had deserted because they had been compelled to stay at the depôt. They should be required to present themselves at the depôt, and should be sent on to their regiments without delay. He knew that desertion was made a profession of by some men, who deserted over and over again for the purpose of getting a sum of money and a free kit; but they were not allowed to mark or tattoo the men; and, therefore, it was in many cases impossible to know whether a man had been in the Army before or not. Let the men be marked or tattooed in some way, by a special system of vaccination, so that it might be known that they had been in the Army. There was, no doubt, an enormous number of desertions; but they were much fewer, in reality, than they appeared to be, because, if one man deserted four or five times, these desertions were represented over and over again as separate instances. He felt satisfied at the discussion which had taken place, and he trusted good would be the result. Whether there were short or long service he cared comparatively little; but what he did greatly care for was, that we should have an efficient Army.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY said, he hoped there would be no question of conscription for the Militia.

His Royal Highness the illustrious Duke (the Duke of Cambridge) had stated that the question of maintaining the efficiency of the Army was merely a question of money. He (the Earl of Galloway) would admit the truth of the argument; but he would also say that the efficiency of the Militia was equally a question of money. The Militiaman was the cheapest soldier we had. If we wanted a Reserve, it was to the Militia we should have to trust, and not to the Army. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Morley) had assigned, as the real reason of the deficiency of the Army, that, in 1876, about 24,000 enlisted on short service, and left the Service last year. But the noble Earl went on to say that many men enlisted in 1870, on long service, whose term expired in 1882, forgetting that in Infantry regiments the period of enlistment on long service was 10 years, and not 12.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, he gathered, from what had been said, that the Army had been in a state of transition for about 15 years, and that the last state of the Army was worse than the first. Voluntary enlistment, short service, Indian reliefs, and low Establishments could not work together as a military system. The short-service system had admittedly broken down, and the system of linked battalions had proved to be a failure. He called attention to the circumstance that it still was extremely difficult for a soldier, however meritorious, to obtain a Government office or civil employment upon his discharge, although everybody agreed that such appointments ought to be open to him. The remedy for present deficiencies would be a return to longer engagements, and breaking up the linked battalions. An attempt was announced in the former direction, but under Regulations so complicated that it was very difficult to understand them. Indeed, an attorney would be required with each regiment, in order to explain to the men the nature of their engagement. The noble Earl asserted that no change of system was intended by what was now proposed, and if he thought that 12 years and seven years were the same thing, he could have the benefit of that opinion. He hoped that the new departure now about to be followed by the War Office would prove much more successful than the present arrangements.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE said, he wished to correct his reference to the proportionate number of men sent as a draft to India every year, by stating that he had said 250, instead of from 160 to 200.

VISCOUNT HARDINGE said, that he was glad to find that at last the Secretary of State for War had determined to face the difficulty, and to resort to optional long service. When Lord Cardwell's scheme first came before their Lordships, it was supported by many noble Lords, on the understanding that there should be 24 per cent of men enlisted on long service; but that understanding had not been kept. Lord Airey's Committee, of which the noble and gallant Lord on the Cross Benches was a Member (Lord Napier of Magdala), had recommended such a percentage, but their recommendations had been disregarded. While so many men were sent into the Reserve there was no ground for wonder at the deficiency on the Establishment, which had now to be remedied by a partial re-introduction of long service. Under these circumstances, he thought the short-service system had been somewhat overdone, for the Reserve had been filled with three years' men. The noble Viscount (Viscount Cranbrook), who had left the House, had, merely because recruiting was brisk, sent into the Reserve large bodies of three years' men; and they were now suffering from the effects of it—from the large number of three years' men who were claiming their discharge. Then Lord Cardwell refused to send Reserve men to the Cape, because he said that they were only intended for a great European war. But such a war might not occur for half-a-century, and, therefore, that was the weak point about it, for no Government would take the responsibility of calling it out for a small war, lest it should become unpopular. It was owing to this, that in the late wars, such as those at the Cape, we were obliged to trust to a "scratch pack" of volunteers, half of whom were boys, instead of sending out the Reserves. He was bound to say that when Lord Beaconsfield called out the Reserves, they answered fully to the expectations formed of them. At the present moment, out of the regiments to be contended with in reference to both the Army generally and the Militia was the severity of the discipline that was at once, and injudiciously, applied to recruits. A Circular was issued some time since to non-commissioned officers, pointing out that the want of tact and forbearance with young recruits had tended to make the Service unpopular with them, and that the result had not been advantageous to the Service. Another fact to be regretted was, that of the large number of recruits obtained so few, comparatively speaking, came up for attestation subsequently.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL said, he rose to explain for a moment. He had been so much misinterpreted by the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for War (the Earl of Morley), that he might have interrupted him at the time, but did not care to do so. The noble Earl had described him as recommending that Volunteer recruits should at once be burdened by 300 drills. The very words he (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) had employed were, that, in that Service, we should resort to cautious, gradual, and even tentative proceedings. Nor, in the Militia, was he the advocate of any change at all, until the subject had been thoroughly investigated. According to the noble Earl, the counsel he (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) had offered would put an end to the Auxiliary Forces. He was surprised to hear from a Member of the House, that a Committee of the House would have an influence so fatal. A Committee of the House was the only counsel he (Lord Stratheden and Campbell) had urged, and, in the long course of this discussion, not one objection had been offered to it.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 4th June, 1883.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* the County of Wexford, *v.* Garrett Michael Byrne, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee—Postponed Resolutions* [May 31] *reported.*

Lord Truro

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—£5,973,912, on account.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Land Tax Assessments (Appeals) * [213].

Second Reading—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) * [195]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) * [196]; Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) * [192]; Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 4) * [201]; Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) [7]; Registry of Deeds (Ireland) [202]; Corn Sales [95], *debate adjourned.*

Considered as amended—Tramways Provisional Orders * (No. 2) [168].

Third Reading—Gas and Water Provisional Orders * [165]; Water Provisional Orders * [166], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY —THE VENTILATORS.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (DISTRICT RAILWAY).

Moved, "That the Report from the Committee on the Metropolitan District Railway Bill [presented on 31st May] be now read."—(*Mr. Marriot.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Sir ERSKINE MAY read the Report.

MR. MARRIOTT said, that, with the permission of the House, he desired to make one or two observations in reference to the Report which had just been read. It would be in the recollection of the House that a short time before the House rose for the Whitsuntide Recess an Instruction was given by the House to the Committee on the Metropolitan District Railway Bill to give facilities to the Corporation of the City of London and to the Metropolitan Board of Works, to close certain ventilating shafts within the City of London and on the Thames Embankment, upon certain reasonable terms. The Committee did not meet until the 31st of May, and he would state very shortly what took place before the Committee. The counsel who appeared for the Metropolitan Railway Company represented that Parliament had made a grievous blunder; and, although the learned gentleman was kind enough to give the House of Commons credit for excellent motives, still he considered, notwithstanding the worthy sentiments which actuated them, a grievous wrong would be inflicted upon the public if the original plan were departed from, independently of which there would be delay in the completion of the Inner Circle Railway. In point of fact, the counsel for the Railway Company said that the Company would be able to complete the Inner Circle Railway within a year; and that if the Railway was not completed within that time great inconvenience would be caused to the public. Nevertheless, sooner than consent to what was proposed they would give up their Bill for the completion of the Inner Circle Line. It was not for him to make any remarks upon this action of the Railway Company. It certainly did seem somewhat foolish on their part to set themselves, as they did, entirely in opposition to the wishes of Parliament. After the speeches of counsel, the Committee retired, and decided that they must act upon the Instruction given by the House. Remarks were made by counsel on both sides, and the Railway Company undertook, he thought very wisely and properly, not to oppose any measure which the Metropolitan Board of Works or the City of London might think proper to introduce for obtaining a suspension of the Standing Orders, in order to enable them to bring in a Bill at their own cost. He could not complaim of that; and, being in that position, the City of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works had to consider what course they would take. He might state, however, that recent experience, since the former debate took place, had shown these ventilators to be not only noxious, but extremely dangerous, and such as to satisfy everybody that they ought to be removed at the earliest possible moment; whereas, by the proposal of the Railway Company, they would have had to wait, at all events, until the end of next year, and the ventilators would have been a source of danger in crowded streets—such as Queen Victoria Street—for 12 months longer. All they could do now was to get a Bill through as fast as possible, and as the House knew the Standing Orders stood in the way of that, what they intended to propose was that the Standing Orders should be suspended. In doing that, they were not acting without the authority of precedent. There were three precedents in the year 1867 alone—in the case of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 2) Bill, the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 3) Bill, and the Great Eastern Railway Bill. In those cases the Standing Orders Committee declined to suspend the Standing Orders; but the House acceded to the proposition for suspending them. In another case, in 1878, the East London Railway Bill was moved without having gone before the Standing Orders Committee at all; and, notwithstanding that fact, leave was given to bring in a Bill for the payment of the debts of the East London Railway Company, the House supporting and sanctioning that Resolution. This year, early in April, an application was made to the Standing Orders Committee to suspend the Standing Orders, so as to allow both the Corporation of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works to bring in Bills. The Committee declined to suspend the Standing Orders; but he had the authority of the Chairman of the Committee—the right hon. Member for the University of Oxford (Sir John Mowbray), who was, unfortunately, not in the House that day—for saying that the circumstances which had since taken place had entirely changed his view. The obstruction had become serious, and the House fully supported the recommendations made by the Committee to whom the Bill was referred. That Committee had not even had an opportunity of hearing a word either in favour or against the Instruction of the House; and, therefore, they recommended the House of Commons, in view of the importance of the subject, to give facilities to the Corporation of London and to the Metropolitan Board of Works for bringing in Bills to enable them to deal with these ventilators. He believed that the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works was prepared to make a proposal of that kind, and that he would receive the support of the City of London. All he (Mr. Marriott) could do was to call the attention of the House to the Report of the Committee, and he trusted the House would support the Resolution about to be submitted to them.

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG remarked, that, after the action already taken by the House, it would not be necessary to take up any time by going into the question of these ventilators. The action already taken had been fully endorsed by the Instruction given to the Committee presided over by the hon. and gallant Member for East Derbyshire

(Admiral Egerton). The Metropolitan Board of Works and the City of London were perfectly ready to go on with their evidence, and they were very anxious to be allowed to do so; but those who were in charge of the Railway Bill did not think it expedient to persevere with it, and therefore they withdrew their Bill. The Committee presided over by his hon. and gallant Friend made a recommendation that the Metropolitan Board of Works and the City of London should have every facility given to them for carrying out the recommendations of the Committee; and the only way in which they could proceed was by suspending the Standing Orders, so as to enable the Metropolitan Board to bring in the Bill they were anxious to bring in some time ago for the purpose of removing these obstructions and nuisances. He could quite confirm what the hon. and learned Member for Brighton (Mr. Marriott) had stated. He had the authority of the right hon. Member for the University of Oxford (Sir John Mowbray), the Chairman of the Committee on Standing Orders, for saying that the circumstances had now entirely changed from what they were before. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman was not able to be in his place, because, if he had been, he certainly would have supported the proposal of the Metropolitan Board of Works to suspend the Standing Orders. He (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) knew perfectly well that it was an extraordinary course to ask the House to suspend these Standing Orders. But unusual circumstances required unusual remedies. He was unable to understand why, considering what had happened, the Railway Company should have refused to enter into the question. He believed it could be proved to demonstration that all the ventilation could be much better provided by other means, if the House would kindly accede to the request he now made to them to suspend the Standing Orders, and allow him to bring in a Bill, which would be referred, at the earliest possibe moment, to a Committee. All that he could say was that these obstructions were destructive to the Embankment Gardens, and upon the roadways in the City they were actually dangerous. He therefore earnestly impressed upon the House the necessity of insisting upon their removal. So far as his own observation went, one of these ventilators, which it was said, in the course of previous discussions, would never be used, was constantly vomiting forth offensive and noxious gases. He begged to move—

> "That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that leave be given to the Metropolitan Board of Works to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Metropoliton District Railway Act, 1881, in relation to the openings or shafts authorisea by that Act to be constructed in roads or open spaces within the Metropolis, for the purpose of ventilating their Railways; and for other purposes."

He intended to propose that a Bill should be brought in by the noble Lord (Lord Algernon Percy), the hon. and learned Member for Brighton (Mr. Marriott), and himself.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that leave be given to the Metropolitan Boards of Works to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1881,' in relation to the openings or shafts authorised by that Act to be constructed in roads or open spaces within the Metropolis, for the purpose of ventilating their Railways; and for other purposes."—(*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.*)

Sir THOMAS CHAMBERS said, the Motion made by his hon. and gallant Friend the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works was not in exact conformity with the terms of the special Report of the Committee—namely, that, in view of the importance of the subject, the Committee were of opinion that facilities should be given to the Corporation of the City of London and to the Metropolitan Board of Works to enable them to bring in a Bill dealing with the ventilators. The Motion submitted by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works was confined to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and did not include the Corporation of the City of London. He had risen, therefore, to remedy this defect; and he proposed to move an Amendment, not in any hostile spirit, but in order to carry out more fully what was the obvious intention of the Committee. The Amendment he proposed was, to insert in line 2, after the word "the," the words "Corporation of London and the." In other words, the object of the Amendment was to enable the Corporation as well as the Metropolitan Board of Works, both of whom were equally concerned in regard to jurisdiction, and both of whom were equally anxious for the removal of these ventilators, to bring in Bills.

Amendment proposed, in line 2, after the word "the," to insert the words "Corporation of London and the."—(*Sir Thomas Chambers.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG said, he was quite willing to accept the Amendment, and also a further Amendment which the hon. and learned Member proposed to move.

MR. FIRTH said, he was glad that the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works had accepted the Amendment. It was extremely unusual for these two Metropolitan Bodies to be found acting together, and he was glad to see that it was the case in the present instance.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, in line 3, after the word "Bill," to insert the words "or Bills."—(*Sir Thomas Chambers.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ANDERSON said, he did not think that much good would result from opposing this absurd proposal; but he did not think it ought to be allowed to pass without a few words being said upon it. The action of the House in the matter had, in the first place, been to give a severe slap in the face to one of its own Committees, and a Committee whose action was approved of by the House itself, when it consented to read the Bill containing the original provision a third time. The proposal now before the House was to give another slap in the face to the Standing Orders Committee of the House, that Standing Orders Committee having had before them this very question only a few weeks ago, and having, he believed, unanimously refused to suspend the Standing Orders. It was quite true that the Standing Orders Committee found themselves now in a very difficult position. They found, from the action of the House, that they would have this proposal forced upon them; and, therefore, an announcement had been made by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works that indirectly the Standing Orders Committee would no longer oppose the granting of the power which they refused to grant only a few weeks ago. That being so, he believed there was no advantage to be gained by opposing the Motion. He could only say that he regretted exceedingly the course which the House was taking in the matter, and he was sorry that he could not prevent it.

MR. CROPPER said, he fully agreed with the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson). On a previous occasion he had expressed his own views upon the question as to the small amount of damage done by the ventilators to the Embankment Gardens, and the great deal of good they were doing to the people down below. As, however, the hon. Gentleman was not going to take any action in the matter, he (Mr. Cropper) would not attempt to divide the House on the subject. He trusted when a Bill came before the House, and they were enabled to see its provisions, a full opportunity would be afforded for discussing it, and, if necessary, of amending it with advantage.

SIR JAMES C. LAWRENCE said, his hon. Friend the Member for Kendal (Mr. Cropper) spoke of the very small amount of damage and inconvenience occasioned by the ventilators. He trusted the House would not take it for granted that there were no grounds for the complaints which had been made in regard to the inconvenience caused by the ventilators. Perhaps he might be allowed to mention a circumstance which came under his own observation a few days ago. He had frequently passed one of these ventilators, in the middle of the roadway on the Embankment; but he had not remarked any smoke or steam coming from it until the other day, when he perceived a large volume of steam coming out of the grating. He was in a Hansom cab at the time; the horse started, and he also saw two carriages drawn by horses which the coachmen had great difficulty in managing. He thought this little experience of his own the other day more than answered the observations which had been made by the hon. Member for Kendal (Mr. Cropper).

MR. CUBITT said, the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee was, unfortunately, absent; but, speaking for his right hon. Friend and for himself, as an individual Member of the

Standing Orders Committee, he certainly did not consider that the present Motion was in any way a slap in the face. When the matter came originally before the Standing Orders Committee the circumstances were very different, as the hon. and learned Member for Brighton (Mr. Marriott) had explained, from what they were now. Under the then circumstances the Committee found themselves unable to suspend the Standing Orders, and if the circumstances remained the same still they would be prepared to act in the same manner; but a great change had taken place, owing to the peculiar action of the Railway Company, and he believed, if the matter, as it now stood, were to come before the Standing Orders Committee, a different decision would probably be arrived at. He knew it was the opinion of the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee that, as this was a special case, it would be very much better that power should be given to meet it by a direct Instruction of the House than by referring it to the Standing Orders Committee. By the course now proposed to be taken the question could be settled with greater speed than in any other way, and, at a late period of the Session, that was a consideration which ought to weigh with the House. He therefore cordially supported, as an individual Member of the Standing Orders Committee, the proposal of the hon. and gallant Member for Truro (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg).

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that leave be given to the Corporation of London and the Metropolitan Board of Works to bring in a Bill or Bills to amend "The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1881," in relation to the openings or shafts authorised by that Act to be constructed in roads or open spaces within the Metropolis, for the purpose of ventilating their Railways; and for other purposes.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (DISTRICT RAILWAY) BILL.

On Motion of Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Bill to amend "The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1881;" and for other purposes in relation thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James M'Garel Hogg, Lord Algernon Percy, and Mr. Marriott.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time.

LONDON COMMISSIONERS OF SEWERS (VENTILATION OF RAILWAYS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Thomas Chambers, Bill to repeal Section 12 of "The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1881" and to substitute other provisions in lieu thereof, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. William Lawrence, and Mr. Robert Fowler.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

THE CHANNEL ISLANDS—FRENCH CLAIMS.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS: I beg to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, or if more convenient I will postpone the Question until Thursday, Whether there is any truth in the report that the French Government has made a claim to any of the smaller Islands in the neighbourhood of Jersey; and, if so, whether the inhabitants of the Channel Islands have made any representation on the subject; and, in case they have done so, what action the Government will take in the matter?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The inhabitants of Jersey have made a representation on this subject, which was entertained this afternoon by the Lords of the Privy Council, who informed the representatives of the inhabitants that the matter was under consideration, and that on an early day a reply would be given.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS asked whether the Home Secretary could say what the actual claim was?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The real complaint was that the French fishermen had invaded the exclusive privileges of Jersey and its appendages. That matter is being carefully considered, and an answer on an early day will be given.

Mr. CALLAN: Might I ask whether the French have not as equal right to these Islands as the English have to Egypt?

INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF AN ENGLISHMAN.

Colonel DAWNAY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it be true that, in March last, at Allahabad, an English Gentleman, who had chastised one of the Native servants of the Guicwar of Baroda for grossly insulting hsi sister, was beaten until he was insensible, by the order of the Guicwar; whether the English gentleman has brought an action against the Guicwar; and, whether there is reason to suppose that Lord Ripon is using his influence to hush up the affair?

MR. J. K. CROSS: I cannot give the hon. and gallant Member for Thirsk any information on the subject; and before even inquiring into the matter I must ask him, though he has informed me privately, to state publicly what is the authority on which he relies in making so grave and extraordinary a charge against Lord Ripon.

COLONEL DAWNAY: I have great pleasure in affording the hon. Gentleman the information he requires. I received the information from my brother, who has just returned from India. The last paragraph in my Question cannot be said to refer to absolute fact; but it is in accordance with the general belief prevailing at Allahabad.

MR. J. K. CROSS: Do I understand the hon. and gallant Gentleman that he gives his brother as the authority of the statement contained in the Question which he has asked me? If that is so, it is my duty to inquire into the truth of the matter; and when I receive an answer to the Question he shall have it.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. WILLIAM CARSON.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it a fact that Mr. William Carson, recently appointed a justice of the peace for the county of Fermanagh, did when in business several times compound with his creditors, and, on the last occasion when he was insolvent, his certificate was refused by the bankruptcy judge; and, whether under these circumstances he will be retained in the commission of the peace?

MR. TREVELYAN: It is not the fact that Mr. Carson, recently appointed a Justice of the Peace for the county of Fermanagh, did, when in business, several times compound with his creditors, or that he was ever refused a certificate by the Bankruptcy Court. The following are the real circumstances of the case:—Mr. Carson, when a very young man, entering business about 40 years ago, in consequence, as he states himself, of having taken upon himself the liability of others, was for a time unable to meet his pecuniary engagements, and was obliged to seek the protection of the Insolvent Court, where he obtained his certificate. Subsequently, however, he paid all those creditors in full, and for many years carried on business with much success, and having realized a considerable independence, he retired altogether from business 12 years ago. This gentleman will be retained in the Commission of the Peace, and I hope this explanation will satisfy the hon. Member for Cavan.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: I should like to be allowed to ask the hon. Member this Question—whether he knew the fact, when he put his Question on the Paper, that this misfortune happened to this gentleman 40 years ago?

[No reply was given.]

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he proposes to bring forward during this Session any measure to redress the grievances of the Irish National school teachers?

MR. TREVELYAN: It it not the intention of the Government to bring forward this Session any measure relating to the Irish National school teachers.

METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT AND BUILDINGS ACTS AMENDMENT ACT —THE HOTEL METROPOLE.

MR. STORY-MASKELYNE asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether, in reply to a communication from a Committee of the Board to the Institute of British Architects regarding the design for the elevation of the Hôtel Métropole, the Council of the Institute stated that—

> "In the opinion of the Council, the design of that building, more especially as regards the portion above the ground storey, is unworthy of its intended position; and that the said design should be considerably modified before approval be given to it by the Metropolitan Board of Works;"

and, whether his answer relating to this subject, on the 10th of May, to the effect that the Board had sanctioned the erection of the said building without having submitted any altered elevation to the Council of the Institute, still represents the attitude of the Board of Works in regard to this question; and, if it does so, if he would explain to the House how the Board deems itself justified in evading the conditions embodied in an Act of Parliament (of 1873) which indicates the Institute of British Architects as the authority to judge of the designs of any buildings to be erected on the site of Northumberland House, in order especially to prevent the erection of structures calculated to deface one of the most important sites of the Metropolis?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: I beg to inform the hon. Member that his quotation from the letter of the Council of the Institute is perfectly correct, and that my answer of the 10th of May still represents the attitude of the Board in this matter. I cannot, however, for one moment admit that the Board has evaded conditions imposed by Parliament, and I must express my surprise that the hon. Member cast such an imputation on the Board. The wording of the Act was intended to convey no more than the suggestion of friendly consultation between the Board and the Council of the Institute, without binding the Board to carry out the suggestions of the Council. If the hon. Member will look at the Minutes of Evidence taken by the Select Committee, he will find that the clause, as originally introduced, provided not only that the elevation should be submitted for consideration, but also that no building should be erected, or contract entered into for its erection, until such elevation should have received the approval of the Council. This was strongly opposed on behalf of the Board; and after a long discussion the Select Committee modified the clause into its present form by substituting the word "consideration" for "approval." In conclusion, I think the House may be satisfied that, after having expended about £700,000 on this improvement, the Board is not likely to allow the value of the land to be deteriorated by the erection of unsightly structures. At the same time, the Board has a duty to discharge to the ratepayers and to its lessees, and must be careful not to prevent the letting of plots, or the erection of buildings, by imposing unnecessarily onerous restrictions.

Mr. STORY-MASKELYNE said, that to-morrow he would put a number of Questions on the same subject to the hon. and gallant Gentleman, with a view to extract further information. One of these would be, Whether one of the architects concerned in the erection of this and other buildings on the Northumberland Avenue was not a member of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and had a share in the property?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG replied, that he would not be in the House to-morrow; but he might say that it was quite true that a member of the Metropolitan Board of Works had a share in the property.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACTS—THE ASHFORD MAGISTRATES.

Mr. BROADHURST asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether his attention has been called to a Report in the "Kentish Express" of the proceedings before the Ashford Bench of Magistrates, in some cases against parents for not sending their children to school, when the Chairman of the Bench, in giving judgment, is reported to have made use of expressions in disparagement of education; and, whether he would inquire into the circumstances of the case; and, if the report should be well founded, whether there was any means of restraining expressions of opinion from the Bench excusing breaches of the Law?

Mr. MUNDELLA: My attention has been called by several correspondents to the report in *The Kentish Express*, and I regret extremely to find, on inquiry, that it is substantially accurate. It appears that the East Ashford School Attendance Committee summoned several parents before the magistrates for neglecting to send their children to school. They were the children of a farmer and of some labourers, and in two instances children of 12 years of age were represented as unable to pass any Standard. The Chairman of the Justices, in fining the farmer, declared that he considered the Education Act to be "the curse of the country;"—[Mr. Warton: Hear, hear!]—and his colleague on the Bench said he fully concurred with him. Various remarks calculated to bring the Act into contempt were made during the hearing of the other cases, and one labourer, who made an appeal to the Bench as to what he should do with his children, was told by the Chairman, "to go and ask Mr. Gladstone, who made the law." It so happened that these prosecutions were taken under Lord Sandon's Act of 1876; but I am sure the House will agree that a Law of Parliament, by whatever Minister it may have been proposed, ought not to be held up to public obloquy by those to whom the duty of its enforcement has been intrusted. I understand that in this Union all engaged in the work of education are discouraged by the hindrances thrown in their way by the magistrates. Her Majesty's Inspector reported in April last that the attendance had been "grossly irregular," and the average lower than in any part of his district. As to the latter part of the Question, inquiry will be made of the proper authority as to what ought to be done in respect to the conduct complained of.

SCOTLAND—THE HIGHLAND CROFTERS—THE ROYAL COMMISSION (EASTER ROSS).

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the Government will instruct the Royal Commission at present in the North inquiring into the Crofter question to visit Easter Ross, for the purpose of investigating the seizing, about fourteen years ago, of a piece of land known as the "Commonty," under an action of division, and the evictions which followed said action; whether the Government will introduce a Bill for the repeal of the Act authorising the division of commonties by adjacent proprietors; and, whether the Royal Commission will inquire into the treatment of the tenants at Easter Ross in the matter of compensation for unexhausted improvements?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I have no power to instruct the Royal Commission to any other effect than the Instruction contained in the Commission itself. Of course, the Committee will go to any such places as they think will require the investigation they are required to make. As to the Act about which the hon. Member asks me, I have inquired of those who are well acquainted with Scotch affairs, and they have not been able to inform me what Act is referred to by the hon. Member. If he gives some further detail about it, I shall endeavour to answer it.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—APPEALS FROM THE SUB-COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it was a fact that, where a landlord appeals from the decisions of the Sub-Commission Court fixing fair rents, and that on a hearing of such appeals the Land Commission dismiss the same, and direct the payment to the tenant of a certain amount for costs should the landlord prefer not to pay these costs, the tenant is obliged, owing to the system at present in force in the Court of the Land Commission, before he can compel obedience to the order, to incur the expense of a special application to the Court for a writ of execution against the landlord; whether, for the purpose of such application, no less than two notices must be previously served, a copy of the order taken out, affidavits made, and all the usual preliminaries incident to an ordinary motion on notice gone through; whether, for all the expenditure incurred, calculated to amount to almost if not as much as the entire sum originally awarded him, the tenant is allowed but the small sum of sixpence; and, whether, inasmuch as the system is capable of being wrought with such expensive and inconvenient effect to large bodies of tenant farmers in Ireland seeking the benefits of the Land Act, he will represent to the Land Commissioners the expediency of assimilating the practice of their Court, regulating the mode of recovering these costs, to that of the other Divisions of the High Court of Justice in Ireland where such form is and always has been unknown?

Mr. TREVELYAN: When either a landlord or a tenant against whom the costs of an appeal have been awarded under the Land Act does not pay the amount due, the mode of enforcing payment is by a writ of *fi. fa.* issued by the Land Commission. Before the writ issues, an application for payment must be made to the person indebted, and an affidavit that such application has been made must be filed. The application for payment may be by registered letter. The affidavit may be sworn before any Justice of the Peace, and is filed without any charge. The writ is issued without any charge. In cases where the costs originally awarded exceeded £1, a sum of 5*s.* is awarded to the litigant who is put to the trouble of enforcing payment in the manner I have stated. The system appears to be simple and just, and not to require any alteration.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (IRELAND) ACT--WESTPORT.

MR. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the restrictions on the holding of fairs and markets in the town of Westport, on account of cattle disease, may now be removed with safety, having in view the fact that the infected area is limited to one isolated farm?

MR. TREVELYAN: The infected farm is only half-a-mile from the town of Westport, and foot-and-mouth disease, though greatly diminished, still exists there; and His Excellency, therefore, fears that it would be dangerous just yet to remove the restrictions on the holding of fairs and markets in the town; but he hopes very soon to be able to do so.

THE STOCK EXCHANGE—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. ANDERSON asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he has considered the Report of a Royal Commission in 1878 on the Stock Exchange; and, whether he contemplates the adoption of any of its recommendations, such as giving them a Charter, with its privileges and responsibilities?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Since the Commission of 1879 there has been to my knowledge no application from members of the Stock Exchange nor from any other person to grant a Charter to that body; and, under those circumstances, and having regard to the great pressure of business at the Board of Trade and other Departments of the Government, I have not at present under consideration any proposal for carrying into effect the recommendations of that Commission.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS — WIDENING OF THE ROAD AT KNIGHTSBRIDGE.

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether his Board will continue the improvements recently effected in Knightsbridge, as regards the breadth of the thoroughfare, by widening the only remaining narrow portion situated between Albert Gate and Wilton Place, before the existing leases expire and the adjacent houses are rebuilt?

SIR JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: I beg to inform my noble Friend that there is no scheme at present before the Metropolitan Board for effecting the improvement referred to; and I am afraid that, having regard to the requirements in other parts of the Metropolis, as well as to the extent of the works and consequent expenditure to which the Board is already committed, the Board would find it impossible to entertain the suggested improvement.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS--THE PROPOSED PARK FOR PADDINGTON.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether it is true that the Metropolitan Board of Works, by declining to state what assistance it will render in the formation of a Park at Paddington, has prevented any action on the part of the Corporation of London with a view to the formation of the Park; whether, in particular, the Board has declined to state, either to the Corporation or to the Park Committee, whether its promised contribution of £1,000 for every acre of Park secured may still be considered available; whether it is the fact that, although the metage on Grain Duty was dedicated by Parliament to the preservation of open spaces, the Corporation of London, the administrators of the Duty, cannot, without the consent of the Board, apply it in preserving any open space within the Metropolis, the district whence the Duty is mainly derived; and, whether the Board has refused to state whether it will consent to the application of the Grain Duty in defraying the expenses of forming the proposed Park at Paddington?

MR. BOORD said, that before the Question was answered he wished to ask Mr. Speaker, whether it was in Order for Questions to be put to and answered by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works? That was the third Question which had been asked of the hon. and gallant Baronet that evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: It appears to me that the Question is justifiable, as it relates to a matter of public interest. and may properly be put to the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Truro.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: I can assure my hon. Friend (Mr. Boord) that I have not the slightest objection to answer the Question. I am quite unable to state what effect the course taken by the Metropolitan Board of Works with regard to the proposed Park at Paddington may have had on the action of the Corporation of London. The Board originally agreed to contribute a sum equal to £1,000 per acre towards the formation of the Park; but when the Bill was thrown out by the Select Committee of this House the Board, having no scheme before it, felt unable to answer an inquiry, made both by the Park Committee and the Corporation, as to the assistance it might feel disposed to render in the matter. The metage on Grain Duty was dedicated by Parliament to the preservation of open spaces in the neighbourhood of London, not within the Metropolis, as defined by the Metropolis Management Act, 1855; and I fail to see how the Corporation could apply the Duty in any other way, even with the consent of the Metropolitan Board. With respect to the last paragraph of the Question, the reply of the Board, both to the Park Committee and the Corporation, was limited to the statement that, as there was no scheme before the Board, it was not in a position to answer the inquiries made.

Afterwards,

Mr. FIRTH asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether the Metropolitan Board of Works have decided whether to take any and what course with respect to the removal of the District Railway ventilators now that the Company have abandoned their Bill; and, whether it is true that the two London Underground Railway Companies are now burning coal, instead of coke, thereby increasing fourfold the foulness of the air in the tunnels?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: If the hon. Member was in the House at the time of Private Business, he will now be aware of the course taken by the Metropolitan Board with respect to the District Railway ventilators. With regard to the second part of the Question, I regret that I am unable to afford the information asked for by the hon. Member.

SUNDAY CLOSING (WALES) ACT.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Head Constable of Cardiff to the Watch Committee, in which he states that, since the Sunday Closing Act came into operation in the district on the 20th September 1882, to the 17th April last, there has been an increase, in the number of persons proceeded against for drunkenness, of 40 per cent., in the number convicted of 60 per cent., and a decrease in the number discharged of 22 per cent.; that the number of clubs has more than quadrupled; that illicit drinking is carried on to a great extent; and, whether he will move Amendments to place all clubs on the same footing as public-houses?

Mr. CARBUTT said, that before the right hon. and learned Gentleman answered that Question, he should like to put another one—namely, Whether it was a fact that Cardiff was not within two miles of Monmouthshire, where the Sunday Closing Act was not in force; whether there was not a population of about 150,000 in close proximity to the Monmouthshire border, some of whom, since the passing of the Welsh Act, resorted on Sunday to Rompney, in Monmouthshire, and only two miles from Cardiff, to drink there; and, whether on their return home they did not naturally require the services of the Cardiff police, and thereby swelled the number of arrests?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that he had not yet seen the Report to which allusion was made, as it was issued annually, and was not yet due. If his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Carbutt) were right, the state of drunkenness in Cardiff seemed to be due not to Sunday closing in Cardiff, but to Sunday opening in Monmouthshire. If, on the other hand, the contention of the hon. Member for Louth was correct, and Sunday closing increased drinking, then many of those who opposed that measure ought to support it. However, the subjects touched upon in the Question were worthy of careful inquiry.

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether, before the House proceeds to the Report stage of the Criminal Appeal Bill, Her Majesty's Government will seek for and obtain the opinions of Her Majesty's Judges, other than the Lord Chief Justice, on the principles and details of such measure, and lay the same before the House?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James): This is the third Question I have answered upon the same subject; and I must remind the House that I have already stated that before introducing the Criminal Code (Indictable Offences Procedure) Bill, I submitted it to the Lord Chief Justice, who approved of it in principle—an approval which it also received from Sir Balliol Brett, the present Master of the Rolls. The Question, as now framed, appears not only to suggest that no measure of Legal Reform should be introduced into Parliament without the sanction of Her Majesty's Judges, but also that after such a measure has been approved of by this House the Judges should be consulted, and exercise, if they thought fit, a power of vetoing the future progress of the Bill. To such a suggestion I cannot, and I do not think the Government will, give any encouragement; and speaking with the greatest respect of the Judges—a respect I sincerely entertain—I must say that if the principle my hon. Friend supports had been acted on in practice, the result would not have been very satisfactory to the progress of reform in the Criminal Law.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE'S TENANTS.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the memorial recently presented to the Land Commissioners on behalf of sixty-two tenants of the Marquess of Clanricarde and others, asking that their cases be heard in the town of Portumna instead of at Galway; whether the majority of these tenants have small holdings, on which the reductions have averaged from 10*s*. to £5 annually; and, whether he is aware that the tenants have announced that, in case the Land Commissioners persist in refusing to sit in Portumna, they will not go to Galway, the possible benefit not exceeding the probable cost of the journey? The hon. Member added: I wish to supplement this Question by one or two others, and I hope the Chief Secretary will be able to answer them. I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether, pending an appeal, the old rent continues to be paid; whether, pending these appeals, processes for the non-payment of the old rent, which the Sub-Commissioners declared to be rack rents, have been issued; and, whether processes of ejectment in cases heard before an investigator under the Arrears Act have not been so issued, and of which, if my information be correct, nothing further was heard after the investigation?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I am afraid I can only answer the Question of which the hon. Member has given Notice. Certain tenants, whose cases are to be re-heard on appeal, have asked, by memorial, that they may be heard at Portumna instead of Galway; but the Land Commissioners have informed them that they regret it is out of their power to comply with this request. In the majority of these cases the holdings are small, and the average reduction made by the Sub-Commissioners was £2 10*s*. annually. The Land Commissioners have no knowledge of any intention having been expressed by the memorialists of not attending at Galway. If the hon. Gentleman will put down the other Questions on the Paper, I will inquire into the matter.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked if there was any reason why the Commissioners could not try cases in the neighbourhood where they arose? Access from Portumna to Galway was exceedingly difficult, there being no railway communication, and the poorer the tenant the greater facilities ought to be afforded for hearing his case.

Mr. TREVELYAN said, he had no power over the Commissioners in this matter; but he thought it must be obvious to the House that a single tribunal of Judges of a high and elevated class sitting all over Ireland could not be expected to sit in anything like the same number of districts as the very numerous tribunals of first instance—the 17 Sub-Commissioners—might be naturally expected to sit. He thought that would be too much to ask of the Commissioners. There were many places certainly where it would be inconvenient to them to sit.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked whether it was not a fact that Portumna possessed a good Petty Sessions Court, in which magistrates sat regularly?

[No reply was given.]

EGYPT—THE EGYPTIAN EXILES IN CEYLON.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any communication has been received from the Governor of Ceylon in respect to the insufficiency of the allowance granted to the Egyptian exiles in that island; and, if so, whether the allowance has been increased since the receipt of that communication; and, what is the amount of the allowance now granted to the exiles?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: Yes, Sir. The Governor of Ceylon conveyed to the Colonial Office his opinion that the allowance to the exiles was insufficient. The Colonial Office sent certain communications through the Foreign Office to the Egyptian Government, with the result that the Egyptian Government has consented to allow an extra £500 a-year for the exiles, in addition to the allowance of £30 a-month, which was the original allowance fixed.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Can the hon. Gentleman tell us how much that will be per exile; and also, whether the amount given to each exile is the same as that stated as a minimum by the Governor of Ceylon?

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY: I do not know how it would be for individual exiles; but it would be about £6 per family per month in addition to the £30. The Governor of Ceylon has expressed his opinion that an additional £15 per month was required.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Might I ask whether any further communications are about to be made in respect to this case?—because I understand that one of the conditions made when these gentlemen pleaded guilty was that the amount of the allowance to be given to them in Ceylon should be decided by the Governor of that Colony.

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY asked that Notice should be given of the Question.

EAST INDIA—CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. WHITLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What is the amount paid by Lord Ripon out of the Revenues of India for the Reuter Telegram purporting to give an account of the Debate upon the Ilbert Bill; and, whether he will also state the amount expended by Lord Ripon in telegraphing home for the past twelve months?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Detailed accounts of the cost of telegrams to England are not furnished to the India Office; but if the hon. Member wishes it, a reference on the subject shall be made to the Government of India.

POST OFFICE—THE AMERICAN MAILS.

MR. ANDERSON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has made the promised inquiry as to the relative rapidity of the delivery of the American Mails on this side, and of our Mails on the other side; and, if the result is such as to induce him to make some such selection of steamers as the American Government makes, declining to send Mails by slow steamers, and favouring all those of known and acknowledged speed?

MR. FAWCETT: My right hon. Friend the Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter) asked me a Question on this subject in April last, and I then promised that I would make inquiry into it. I accordingly appointed a Departmental Committee. They have not yet completed their inquiry; but I can assure my hon. Friend that there shall be no unnecessary delay.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THREATENING LETTERS—JOHN J. REGAN.

MR. O'KELLY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that Mr. John J. Regan, a young man seventeen years of age, was tried, and, on the evidence of an expert, found guilty of writing a threatening letter to Mr. James Coyne, of Castlerea; whether six witnesses, well acquainted with Mr. John J. Regan's handwriting, swore the threatening letter was not written by Mr. Regan; whether, since Mr. Regan's imprisonment, Mr. Coyne has received other threatening letters, which are believed to be written by the author of the letter for the supposed writing of which Mr. Regan is now undergoing imprisonment; and, whether he will order an immediate investigation into this case?

Mr. TREVELYAN: John J. Regan was convicted of writing a threatening letter to Mr. Coyne, a shopkeeper, in whose service he had been employed. The evidence as to identity of handwriting was that of an expert, who had compared the threatening letter with several undoubted specimens of Regan's handwriting. It is the case that six witnesses who were examined for the defence expressed a different opinion from that of the expert. Mr. Coyne has received another threatening letter since Regan was imprisoned; but the handwriting is quite dissimilar to that on account of which Regan was convicted, and there is no ground for supposing that it was written by the same person. I see no reason for ordering an investigation.

ARMY—MILITIA OFFICERS WITH LINE REGIMENTS.

Earl PERCY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether those Militia Officers who volunteered and were selected for duty with the Line Battalions of their territorial regiments in August and September last, many of whom have been employed for various periods since, down to the last month, either with the Provisional Battalions at Colchester and Shorncliffe, or on detachment duty at Aldershot and elsewhere, will receive the same recognition of their services as was granted after the embodiment of the Militia during the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny, by the period of such service being reckoned as doubled towards honorary rank?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: There do not appear to be the same grounds for granting this double time. The officers in question have served voluntarily; whereas in the case of embodiment the officers of the regiment are compelled to assemble, whatever inconvenience may be thereby involved.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—FORAGE ALLOWANCE—MILITIA OFFICERS' HORSES.

Earl PERCY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether a commanding officer of a Militia Regiment is not justified in considering an officer's receipt for forage allowance, and the fact that a horse is paraded by that officer for inspection, as sufficient à priori evidence that he keeps one, or whether a certificate to that effect is in all cases to be required?

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Although it may have been the custom of some commanding officers to accept the officer's receipt for forage allowance and the fact of his parading a horse as sufficient evidence that he *bonâ fide* possessed a horse for the public service, it is not considered that such a practice is a proper compliance with the words of the certificate, which requires the commanding officer to have had the officer's declaration that he did keep the horse. The form in which forage allowance is claimed is about to be altered, so that each officer claiming the allowance shall certify as to the facts of his own case. This will enable the commanding officer to countersign the claim on much the same evidence as he now has when forage is drawn in kind.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE ENNIS POST OFFICE.

Mr. KENNY asked the Postmaster General, Whether any inquiry has yet been made into the insufficiency of accommodation at the Ennis Post Office; and, if so, whether it is proposed to erect a new Post Office better adapted for the transaction of business?

Mr. FAWCETT: In reply to the hon. Member, I may state that alterations are at present being carried out in the Ennis Post Office with a view to the Parcels Post; and I believe the alterations will provide the accommodation necessary.

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—MR. O'NEILL, OF RATHFOLAND.

Mr. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. Denis O'Neill, of Rathfoland, Newmarket on Fergus, county Clare, objected, from the time the matter was first proposed, to the erection of a police hut and to police protection for his safety; if he petitioned the Lord Lieutenant for their removal; if the only crime in the district since October last consisted in the uttering the word "boycott" by certain persons, who were subjected to terms of imprisonment, some as long as three months, for this offence; if he can state from what source these extra police are paid, and at whose cost was the police hut erected; and, if he will state the grounds upon which extra police are still stationed in this townland of Rathfoland?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am informed that Mr. O'Neill did object to the erection of a police hut in the locality in which he resides. The hut, when first erected, interfered with the entry to his lands, and on his petitioning the Lord Lieutenant for its removal it was placed on another site. In July of last year Mr. O'Neill's house was fired into, and since October last an organized system of intimidation was practised upon an individual who acted as a carrier for the police. The presence of the police is considered necessary for the maintenance of security and order. I have already informed the hon. Member, in reply to a former Question, that these men are not extra police under the Prevention of Crime Act. The whole cost and maintenance of the station is paid for in the same manner as that of any other county station, and is not levied upon the locality.

AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS (IRELAND)—THE WEXFORD CORPORATION.

MR. LEAMY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Local Government Board has yet received the report of Mr. Croker on his recent audit of the Accounts of the Wexford Corporation?

MR. TREVELYAN: I have received the Report of the auditor, from which it appears that the tenants in question are leaseholders, and that the auditor, having doubts as to the legality of the course adopted by the Corporation, re-inserted the allowance made to them in the column of the rental for arrears, and reserved to himself the right of surcharge, if he found that the Corporation had acted beyond their powers. The question is, undoubtedly, a legal one, on which the auditor was quite right to get legal opinion. The matter has not reached a stage at which the Local Government Board could interfere. In the event of a surcharge being made, an appeal to the Board lies, under the 12th section of the Local Government Act.

ARMY (INDIA)—JUNIOR MEDICAL OFFICERS.

MR. LEAMY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If, in view of the exceptionally large number of junior Medical Officers in India who are drawing unemployed pay, it is the intention of the India Office to throw open five additional appointments to competition in August next?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Notwithstanding the present exceptional state of affairs, it has been decided, for two reasons, not to put an entire stop to the admission of officers to the Indian Medical Service—(1) to insure hereafter an equable succession of officers to the higher posts; (2) because to do so would inflict hardship on the large number of students who have been reading with this service in view. The number of appointments has been reduced this year to the lowest point compatible with these objects. The average number of appointments for the last five years has been 33; this year it has been reduced to 10.

TREATY OF WASHINGTON—THE "ALABAMA" CLAIMS—THE GENEVA AWARD.

MR. COLERIDGE KENNARD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he is aware that the Court of Commissioners of the Alabama Claims at Washington are now occupied in registering the claims of a new set of petitioners for participation in the funds resulting from the Geneva Award; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to represent to the Government of the United States that such a new departure is a deviation from the original intention of the Geneva Commissioners?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: No, Sir; it is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to interfere further in this matter in any way whatever?

MR. MONTAGU SCOTT: In consequence of the answer of the noble Lord, may I ask if his attention has been called to the following paragraph, which appeared in *The Standard* of Saturday:—

> "*The New York Times* thinks it would be difficult to suggest any topic of international discussion more likely to be barren of happy

result than that which Mr. Coleridge Kennard proposes to raise. It intimates that the conscience of the United States is not entirely clear, and adds:—If we honestly replied to the question, What have you done with the money awarded you by the Geneva Congress? we should be obliged to say that, having satisfied the undisputed claims of the actual sufferers, we have, by Act of Congress, declared that it is nobody's business what we have done with the rest; and we have accordingly given it to a class of claimants who were expressly and specifically ruled out of Court by the Geneva Congress."

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I noticed the paragraph in question; but I do not think the Foreign Office is in any manner called upon to express any opinion on this subject.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—OUTDOOR RELIEF—DUNFANAGHY UNION.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, at the last meeting of the Dunfanaghy Board of Guardians, applications for out-door relief were made on behalf of 140 destitute families and were rejected; whether the chairman of the day, Mr. Wybrants Oldphert, declared at the outset that it would be "a pure waste of time" to go through the list of applicants; whether, among other applications rejected, was one on behalf of Brian M'Gee (a tenant of the chairman), who was stated to be in a dying condition, and who has since died; whether the chairman stated that M'Gee was well off and had a son, lately returned from Scotland, residing with him; whether he is aware that the son referred to is a married man, who has not lived with his father for the past four years, and that the father was supported by private charity since December last; whether a number of other applications were rejected on the statements of a relieving officer named Benson, who mistook several of the destitute applicants for neighbours of the same name who were better off; whether, according to the latest return, the Dunfanaghy Workhouse contains only 38 pauper inmates and affords no outdoor relief, while the expense of maintaining the establishment was last year £1,419, or nearly £40 per person relieved; and, whether, in view of refusal by the guardians to afford outdoor relief, and the irregularities in management disclosed by the late investigation concerning the seduction of an imbecile pauper inmate in the workhouse, steps will be taken to close the Dunfanaghy Workhouse and bring about an amalgamation with neighbouring unions?

Mr. TREVELYAN: What appears to have been a general and preconcerted demand for outdoor relief was made from the Gweedore district at the meeting of the Dunfanaghy Guardians on the 26th of May. The use of the words "pure waste of time" by the Chairman was not in the sense imputed to him in the Question, but referred to the fact that there were 123 applications, some of which the Rev. Mr. M'Fadden—under whose advice the people appear to have been acting—acknowledged to have been made without due cause. The Chairman did not refuse to go through the cases *seriatim*. On the contrary, the relieving officer was directed to visit the houses of every one of the applicants and report upon them individually. Brian M'Gee was dying when the relieving officer visited him, and is since dead. There is no ground whatever for supposing that he died from want. The number of inmates in the workhouse, according to the last Return, is correctly quoted in the Question—the number being 38—but the annual cost of maintaining the establishment is greatly overstated. It is £938, the difference between that sum and the total expenditure of the Union being the cost of the medical charities, sanitary, and other Acts. Steps have been taken to remedy the defective classification of inmates disclosed at the inquiry into the management of the workhouse. It would not be expedient to close it, as the distances from most parts of the Union to the workhouses of adjoining Unions would be much too great.

In reply to Colonel Colthurst,

Mr. TREVELYAN said, that the Local Government Board had gone very carefully indeed into an inquiry as to the state of knowledge or ignorance of the various Boards of Guardians throughout Ireland on the subject of outdoor relief, and had given the matter careful consideration. Of those Boards which did not act upon the system which his hon. Friends preferred, it was discovered that some of them were ignorant, apparently, of their true position with regard to outdoor relief; and in all those cases the Inspector was desired to inform them of the true state of the case.

THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What were the total disbursements last year from the funds of the Royal University in Ireland under the heads of prizes, exhibitions, scholarships, or other rewards of learning, as compared with the cost of the staff, and the sums (if any) paid to Members of the Senate as expenses in connection with their attendances at meetings of that body?

MR. TREVELYAN: For the last academical year the disbursements under the head of exhibitions and scholarships amounted to £1,461. I am informed by the Secretaries to the University that the entire amount which may, under the Statutes, be devoted to this purpose has not been required, owing to the University not being yet in full working order. The entire cost of the University during the same period was, for administration — including office salaries and expenses of members of the Senate—£2,900; and for examinations, £6,300.

MR. O'BRIEN asked if the right hon Gentleman would specify the proportionate amount of the £2,900 which went in travelling expenses to members of the Senate?

MR. TREVELYAN replied, that the travelling expenses of members of the Senate was something under £450.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he was sorry to trouble the right hon. Gentleman again; but desired to know if he could say whether travelling expenses had been granted for members who resided in Dublin, and, therefore, were not at any inconvenience by attending, while they were refused to members who travelled from distant parts?

MR. TREVELYAN: I should be sorry to answer that Question without Notice.

ARMY ENLISTMENT—THE NEW REGULATIONS.

COLONEL STANLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the regulations under which it is proposed that enlistment shall now take place, and an estimate of the probable charge upon the Effective and Non-Effective Votes, resulting from such regulations; and, further, any calculation which may have been made of the probable effect on the growth of the Reserve?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL wished, before the noble Marquess answered that Question, to put two Questions to him, of which he had given him private Notice, on the same subject. His first Question, which he put in consequence of an article that appeared in *The Times*, was, Whether it was to be understood that the noble Marquess's proposals stated on Friday night were to be of a temporary nature, and that once the ranks of the Army were filled, the new scheme would lapse, and short service would be re-established substantially as it had existed before? He also wished to ask whether the new proposals would apply to every soldier in the Army, and to the Marines, as well as to future recruits?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: In answer to the noble Lord's Question, I have to say that no change will be made in the terms of enlistment except as regards the Brigade of Guards. The permission to extend their service and to re-engage is a temporary permission granted to men now in the Service. So long as the Regulations and General Orders under which it is granted are in force, it will be equally available to all men in the Service who are qualified under the conditions specified; but the permission may be revoked at any time hereafter, and we are under no obligation to extend it to men who shall not at that time have availed themselves of it, or to future recruits. Experience, however, may show that, combined with a shorter term of compulsory service with the Colours, it may be desirable to maintain it permanently. As to the Marines, they are enlisted under totally different conditions, and that part of the Question should be addressed to the Secretary to the Admiralty. In answer to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, I have to say that, as the Regulations and General Orders altering the conditions of extension of service and re-engagement are mainly in the form of Amendments to other Orders, and are difficult to understand, I will lay on the Table a Memorandum showing their effect. The only effective charge expected will be the bounty of £2 a-head offered to certain men to extend their service for the drafts to India. This will be met by the saving accruing from the present deficiency of establishment. Deferred pay will not be increased; but to the extent that men take the bounty its payment will be postponed. As regards non-effective charge, it is not anticipated that there will be any material change, for experience has shown that men completing 12 years' service will almost always take their discharge with the deferred pay immediately due, rather than serve on for several years more to obtain a pension. The element of personal selection enters so largely into the case that the effect on the Reserve cannot be calculated. Irrespective of the changes now made, the most recent calculations showed a probable strength of 31,000 at the beginning of 1884, of 36,000 a year later, and of 42,000 at the commencement of 1886. It is not thought likely that many men now about at once to enter the Reserve and take deferred pay will be deterred from doing so by the £2 bounty. Consequently, there should be no immediate loss to the Reserve. Men of shorter service, however, will probably, in many cases, take the £2 to extend their services to 12 years; and to such an extent as they do so their services will be hereafter lost to the Reserve, unless they enter the Second Reserve. Should the state of recruiting be such as to allow of men being passed to the Reserve after three years, or after less than seven years' service, there would be a proportionate recovery in the strength of the Reserve.

Colonel STANLEY: As no calculations have been made, I shall repeat my Question.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: No detailed calculation has been made, nor do I see on what basis we can calculate how many men will avail themselves of the terms offered.

DOMINION OF CANADA—THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—H.R.H. THE DUKE OF ALBANY.

Baron HENRY DE WORMS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in the "Evening News" of May 29th on the subject of the Duke of Albany's willingness to discharge the high and responsible duties of Governor General of Canada; and, whether His Royal Highness's services have been declined?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, it is not for me, I think, to judge of the exercise by the hon. Member of his discretion as a Member of Parliament in putting to me this Question; but this is a Question which it would not be discreet on my part to answer. In the first place, and speaking generally, I pause before agreeing to give reasons, in answer to an inquiry, why any person has not been appointed to a particular office; secondly, because this particular Question raises points of a rather high and delicate nature, which, unless for very grave public reasons, it cannot be desirable to bring into discussion in Parliament; and, thirdly, because I have to consider what might be the effect of my giving a reply in this case as a precedent on future occasions for Questions of a different nature and with a different intent in respect to the Royal Family; and in this instance I think that the example that I should set might be a mischievous one. I must, therefore, Sir, decline to answer the Question; and, in declining, I may say that Her Majesty's Government are aware of the willingness of His Royal Highness the Duke of Albany to render public service to the Crown and the country, and, as they conceive, such a desire on the part of His Royal Highness does him the highest honour.

SOUTH AFRICA—BASUTOLAND.

Mr. BOURKE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he is now in a position to inform the House what are the views of the Cape Government with regard to the legislative arrangements for the superintendence of the affairs of Basutoland; and, whether any communication has been made on behalf of the Cape Government to Her Majesty's Government upon the subject; and, if so, what are the intentions of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the future government of Basutoland?

Baron HENRY DE WORMS asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government had recently received any communication from the President of the Orange Free State on the subject of Basutoland with reference to the Aliwal North Treaty of 1869; and, if so, whether he would state to the House the purport of such communication?

Mr. GLADSTONE: There is no occasion for any reserve with regard to the communication which has reached the Government on this subject. I might read the telegram to the House; but I am not sure that that would be the best way of conveying information to it. Speaking generally, in reply to the hon. Member's Question, I may say that the President of the Orange Free State has signified to the officer administering the Government of Cape Town the interest of the Orange Free State in the measures which are supposed to be approaching in regard to Basutoland, and has made an appeal with respect to the obligations considered to be entailed on the Colonial or Imperial authorities by the Treaty to which the hon. Member refers, and to the importance of the fulfilment of the engagements, such as the President of the Orange Free State considers them to be. So much for this Question. With regard to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bourke), the matter stands thus—We have substantially received information amounting to this—that both on the side of the Basutos and on the side of the Cape Government there is a state of things proceeding which points to the probability of immediate change. The Basutos have, with the exception, I believe, of about 2,000 persons, declined to attend a Conference summoned by the Agent of the Government of the Cape, and that appears to me an indication of a desire for change in that quarter. On the side of the Cape, the construction upon it is that all the Basutos desire to have no further connection with the Colony; and, under these circumstances, the Colonial Government or administrative body have apprised Her Majesty's Government that, as they say, it is certain that the relations now subsisting between the Colonial Government and the Basuto nation will no longer be continued. They also point to the fact that the withdrawal of the Colonial authority will be a serious crisis in the affairs of Basutoland that may be attended with important consequences, and they appeal to Her Majesty's Government to take the matter into consideration without delay. I think, Sir, that is substantially an account of what has taken place on the part of the Cape Government with regard to the Basuto Government and the Orange River Free State. The first duty of the Government has been to take these circumstances fairly into consideration; and they have proposed a draft, which, I believe, will go to the Cape by the next mail, expressing their views. I think the right hon. Gentleman will see that it is premature to attempt to answer now the latter part of the Question—namely, as to the intentions of the Government in respect to the future government of Basutoland, because, undoubtedly, their first duty is to inform themselves fully on the subject, both by communications with the Cape Government, and by making all necessary inquiries in Basutoland itself.

MR. GORST: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the substance of this despatch will be sent out by telegram, and whether it will be laid on the Table?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I wish to supplement that Question, and ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will lay on the Table the Instructions given to Sir Hercules Robinson before he arrives at the Cape?

MR. GLADSTONE: The noble Lord will see this is a Question with regard to which no general rule can be laid down. The general rule, in fact, would be that the document should not be produced until it had reached the Cape. With regard to the despatch to Sir Hercules Robinson, I am doubtful if I could comply, as we are not communicating the views we entertain on any particular question, but are communicating our views generally, and, at the same time, asking for information from those in possession of it. I doubt whether it could be produced in the manner suggested; but I will make inquiries into the matter as to whether I am correct or not on this question.

MR. BOURKE: Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House when it is at all likely that Parliament will be made acquainted with the intentions of the Government with regard to the future government of Basutoland; because, if I am correctly informed, the despatch does not disclose the intentions of the Government, but only expressed a desire to obtain information.

MR. GLADSTONE: It is much more than that. The despatch we are sending out comprises a full exposition of the general views of the Government; but as these general views are not at present entertained by us on adequate information, it is not possible for us, at the present moment, exactly to state how far they apply to the real state of the facts. We should be very desirous to make known to the House of Commons at the earliest practicable opportunity the steps we propose to take, and the views we entertain.

Baron HENRY DE WORMS: May I ask whether Her Majesty's Government will lay on the Table the despatch they have received from the President of the Orange Free State, with reference to the Aliwal North Treaty of 1869?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, they were not in possession of any such despatch. What he held in his hand was all he was inclined to believe. It was a telegram from the officer administering the Cape Government, which referred to the communication which had been received from the President of the Orange Free State.

MADAGASCAR — PROTECTION OF THE LIVES AND PROPERTY OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: Might I ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What steps the Government have taken for the protection of the lives and property of British residents in Madagascar?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Her Majesty's ship *Dryad* is at Tamatave, and Her Majesty's ship *Dragon*, which was ordered on the 24th ultimo to proceed there from Zanzibar, has, no doubt, already arrived. The commanders of these vessels have instructions to take, in concert with Her Majesty's Consul, such measures as they may deem necessary for the protection of the lives and property of British subjects.

SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR —GENERAL MACEO.

Mr. O'KELLY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government had taken any steps to ascertain whether the Spanish authorities had now treated General Maceo in a manner due to his rank; or whether they continued to keep him under lock and key?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government. If the hon. Member will give me Notice, I shall be able to give him a fuller answer.

NATIONAL DEBT BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he would now, in pursuance of his promise, give ample Notice of the second reading of this Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, he proposed to place the National Debt Bill on the Paper for this day fortnight. It could not come on before that, and he feared not even then. The Amendments placed on the Paper had given the second reading a different character to that which was expected. It could only be brought on either as the first Order or early in the evening. Before it was brought on he would give ample Notice.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked at what time the Report of Supply would be taken that night?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, while answering that Question, he might as well state the course they desired for Public Business during the week. The House was aware that they commenced with the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill. After that the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill would be taken. If these, or either of them, were got through in sufficient time to enable him to redeem the pledge given the other night to the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), they would then take the Report of Supply. But he thought the noble Lord would see that it should not be brought on after 12 o'clock unless with the full concurrence of the House generally; but he did not think there would be any occasion for detaining the noble Lord very long in regard to that matter. To-morrow their Business would depend upon the progress made with Bills to-night. If they disposed of both Bills to-night, they should propose to go on to-morrow at 2 o'clock with the Police Bill; but if the two Bills for to-night were not disposed of, they would to-morrow proceed with the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill as the first measure. As to ulterior proceedings, they must be contingent on the progress made with the Bills he had mentioned, Presuming they had the second reading of the two Bills to-day, then they should propose to go into Committee upon the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill on Thursday ; and in that event they should propose to take the Committee on Annuities to Lord Alcester and Lord Wolseley as the first Business on Friday at 2 o'clock, resuming afterwards the Committee on the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, then the Committee on the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill was to precede that on the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, they were not absolutely bound to that course. It was convenient to the House that the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill should not go into Committee this week; but they had no absolutely fixed view on the subject.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE wished to point out that the course proposed by the right hon. Gentleman left a very short time between the second reading of the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill and the Committee stage. It would hardly give time to put Amendments on the Paper, especially this week, when it was not convenient for everybody to be present. He thought that the Committee on the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill should not be taken this week.

Mr. GORST asked whether many of the Amendments had not been thoroughly discussed during last Session?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he wished to consult the general convenience of the House. In his opinion, there were more Corrupt Practice Members—if he might so call them—present this week than Tenant Compensation Members. But there was much force in the remark which fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman below the Gangway. However, in any case, they had plenty of matter ready to engage the attention of the House.

Sir HERBERT MAXWELL asked after what time the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill would not be taken?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Not after a very late hour.

IRELAND—THE PHOENIX PARK MURDERS—MEMORIAL TO THE LATE MR. BURKE.

Mr. O'BRIEN gave Notice that he would ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention had been called to a Circular issued from Dublin Castle, signed by Mr. Courtenay Boyle and Mr. H. Jephson, Private Secretaries to the Lord Lieutenant, calling on all members of the Civil Service to subscribe to a memorial to the late Mr. Thomas H. Burke; and whether, if the Circular was genuine, he would take steps to proceed against the gentlemen who signed it for intimidation, on the ground of their compelling people to do an act which they had a legal right to abstain from doing?

Mr. TREVELYAN: I hope and trust the hon. Member will not put that Question on the Paper.

INLAND REVENUE—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—THE RAILWAY DUTIES.

In reply to Mr. Buxton,

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers) said, the proposed diminution of duty was not to take effect until the 1st of October next; there was, therefore, no hurry about the matter. The Bill was all but ready for circulation.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL.

Mr. CALLAN inquired whether this Bill was not an exact reprint of the Bill previously introduced?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James): It is so, so far as we proceeded in Committee during the last Session; but not beyond that point.

UNITED STATES—IRISH EMIGRANTS.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the following Question, of which he had given him rather short private Notice:—Whether his attention had been called to the statement in the morning papers, through Reuter's Agency, that 15 Irish emigrants were found in a starving condition at North Adams, Massachusetts; and, whether any of them had been sent out by grants from the Government?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Yes; I have received a statement respecting these men; but, of course, the field it covers is very large, because the number of Irish emigrants is very numerous, and the Government emigrants form a very small portion of those who were sent out. In addition to this, it is further improbable that they are Government emigrants, because Government emigrants go out under conditions which make it less likely that such a thing should happen to any of them. However, I thought it very likely that interest would be raised in the House on the subject, and I therefore inquired into the matter; but it may be some time before I receive an answer, as there is no emigration agent near the spot where the occurrence is said to have taken place.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR pointed out that the statement was that those emigrants had gone to North Adams from Boston, where a large number of the Government emigrants had arrived. The right hon. Gentleman knew that the conditions upon which the emigrants were undertaken to be sent by the Government should preclude the possibility of their being found in a starving condition in Massachusetts. When there was supposed to be some danger of persons starving in India, the Marquess of Salisbury, though the cost of telegraphing was very great, sent inquiries by telegraph.

Mr. TREVELYAN: I have ordered the communication to be made by telegraph.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL.—[Bill 7.]

(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Solicitor General.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Mr. WARTON, in moving that the Bill be read a second time on that day three months, said, he must complain of the practice which had arisen among Ministers of introducing second readings by merely lifting their hats, instead of enlightening the House with a succinct and clear statement of the contents of the Bills. The House had a right to have expected, on so important a measure as this, a well-considered introductory explanation from the Attorney General; and he hoped, if the plan adopted on the present occasion was intended to shorten the debate, by keeping some Members ignorant of what the Bill was, the attempt would not succeed. He fully recognized the appropriateness of the introduction of such a Bill as this by a Government of Whigs, who had been noted for their corruption since the days of Walpole; and especially by the Attorney General, representing, as he did, a remarkably corrupt constituency. The Government, with this Bill, represented those who strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel; for, although they brought in this Pharisaical Bill to put an end to corruption, they had been recently defeated in an attempt to obtain a thousand new species of patronage throughout the country, and there was now an attempt being made to resist their creation of patronage in connection with the Bankruptcy Laws. He objected to the Bill, because it left untouched one great source of corruption—that gigantic kind of corruption attempted by the Premier, in 1874, when he promised the total abolition of Income Tax—and also because it left untouched the principal evils of the present elections—the system of employing canvassers, and of nursing constituencies by subscriptions to all kinds of charities. On the other hand, the scale of fees in payment of electioneering expenses was so low that a candidate would be driven from the respectable and honourable class of agents to the lowest members of the profession, since it would be no longer possible to employ any person in the higher ranks of the profession. If the Government really desired to put a stop to corruption, they ought to begin by abolishing the Ballot Acts, which no longer permitted a man to give his vote in an honest and manly way, as formerly, while they enabled the dishonest voter still further to lower himself by accepting bribes from both sides. As practical men, they knew that this Bill was too rigid. It was full of pitfalls for the honest man. It was based on principles of heroic virtue which the constituencies had not yet attained; and, therefore, it would not work. They could not make people moral beyond the tone of feeling which prevailed in their own particular district. If people got accustomed to a thing they liked to have it, and would have it. But Parliament could not make the law respected if it was too severe. The Prime Minister and hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House frequently taunted the Conservative Party for their support of a severe Penal Code; and here were these Gentlemen now proposing to pass a most cruel law, not for the criminal classes, but for men who wished to fight an election fairly. Under this Bill an honest man would be afraid to stand, while the dishonest man would triumph. Let the scale of charges be abolished, and let the Judges have the power of saying whether they thought money had been spent too profusely or not; but let not Parliament lay down a hard-and-fast line, which would only trip up the honest man. The doctrine of agency had been pushed to the most extreme length. If a candidate was speaking to anybody it almost made the man his agent. According to the old tenour of our Criminal Law, agency must be proved most strictly; but here we began at the other end, and if a man did anything for another he was assumed to be his agent. For all these reasons, he felt it his duty to oppose the Bill. He moved that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

MR. LEWIS, in seconding the Amendment, said, that, with regard to this matter, there was not the slightest concerted Party action on the Opposition side of the House. There was no doubt that on both sides a well-grounded and proper feeling was entertained that some strong legislation with reference to Parliamentary expenditure was necessary. But he was afraid that this Bill had been brought in under the worst possible auspices—namely, the impression on both sides that something must be done. When legislation was undertaken in that spirit, it generally turned out very bad legislation. Most Members considered that the merits of the Bill consisted in limiting expenditure. If it were proposed to carry out that object within a reasonable margin, it would be very proper to do so. He admitted that the Bill was a decided improvement on the Bill of last year, with regard to the penalties and the scale of expenditure, and in admitting a substantial difference between the expenditure on borough and county elections. It was only due to the Attorney General to make those admissions. But if they made legislation too severe, they would make it ineffective. The great objection to this Bill was to be found in two things—the general extension of severity, and the increased number of offences to which that severity applied. If the Bill should get a second reading, he would endeavour to amend it in Committee; but he thought it right now to call attention to some matters which involved the loss of the seat, disqualification of the candidate for a number of years for all constituencies, and in some cases for life for the particular constituency in which the offence was committed. Any small act of treating done corruptly would be attended not only with the loss of the seat forthwith, but with disqualification for 10 years as regarded any constituency, and for life as regarded the constituency in which the offence had been committed. Did the House consider that that was a moderate and reasonable punishment? Was there any proportion between the offence and the punishment? Again, no man could take with him to the poll, in a carriage he had hired, a friend who was a voter. If he were to use a hired carriage for that purpose, or if his agent were to do so, he would lose his seat and suffer disqualification. Such an enactment would, in his opinion, be a monstrous way of carrying out what was called purity of election, and limiting expenditure. Supposing, again, that a candidate were to pay a person 5*s.* to exhibit his address in the latter's shop window, or on a hoarding in a piece of waste ground, the candidate would be disqualified. Was the House prepared to mete out such a very heavy punishment for miserable minor offences? The purchase by an agent of two dozen cockades would vitiate an election. It seemed to him that this was carrying legislation not only to a *reductio ad absurdum*, but to the point of madness. Under the Bill, candidates were manacled hand and foot. If an agent hired an extra clerk for one day, or gave a messenger a couple of shillings, and these were in excess of the number specified in the Schedule, the candidate would be liable to lose his seat. He wished to direct their attention to the hardship of such a provision, particularly in a county constituency with 30 or 35 polling districts, where it was impossible to concentrate and enforce management. Another illustration of the severity of the Bill was the provision that if an agent failed to make a full and correct return of the election expenses within the specified time, or if he paid an election bill, however small, 30 days from the date of the return of a Member, the candidate would be subjected to the loss of his seat, and be disqualified. These, however, were but a few examples of the great violence of the Bill. But, perhaps, the most extraordinary clause was that which provided that, if a candidate should be held to have had reasonable cause for believing that a given room hired by him or his agent as a committee room would be required by the High Sheriff for a polling booth, he would be pronounced guilty of illegal hiring, and would lose his seat. He would take it as admitted on the face of the Bill that an illegal hiring would lose an hon. Member his seat. If it were held by a Judge that a candidate had reasonable cause to believe that any room hired by him would be required by the High Sheriff for a polling booth it was an illegal hiring, and would forfeit the seat. Nothing more monstrous and exaggerated could ever find its way into any Bill. What would happen in small villages, where only one room was to be obtained? If he had been asked by whom this Bill had been drawn, he should have guessed by the Members for Universities, for they were the only Members who would escape entirely from the penalties of the measure, being elected under a totally different system. The Bill surrounded Members with pitfalls and possible difficulties at every turn. It would be impossible for any man to contest a county constituency with anything like reasonable safety. This Bill had a Party aspect, for its severest effect would fall on the county constituencies. It was utterly unexampled in its severity, and reckless in its character, and ought not for one moment to receive the sanction of the House in its present severe form. It was also an impracticable Bill with regard to county constituencies. In boroughs within a ring fence there were numbers of workers who were ready to give their services gratuitously. In counties it was different. No one would suggest that "Mr. Roger Chawbacon" could be made sub-agent, however willing to give his gratuitous assistance; for the very first thing he would do would be, by some incapacity or incaution, to lose the seat for his employer. The Bill was impracticable, because, instead of enabling a candidate to dispense with professional assistance, he would require more. The pitfalls were so numerous, the interpretation of the Act of Parliament would be so mysterious, and the offences were so numerous, that no one would say that a candidate could dispense with professional assistance in any one polling district. Professional men must be appointed sub-agents in each district, or the seat would be irretrievably lost. In constituencies of 10,000 or 15,000 electors the whole of the money allowed by the Bill for expenses would have to be spent in professional assistance. In Kent elections had been hotly contested for 25 years; the electorate in Mid Kent was between 8,000 and 9,000, and a candidate would be entitled by the Bill to spend from £800 to £900. If an election lasted, like that of 1868, for three months it would be impossible to get respectable solicitors to act in the eight or ten polling districts besides the principal agent, even if the whole sum allowed was paid as their remuneration. To test the adequacy of the payments allowed, it was desirable to see what was spent by the Ministers who introduced this Bill. They were the great purists; they were also an economical Government, as they knew from long experience, and from what they had done since they had been in power. The Attorney General, under this Bill, would be allowed to spend £380. No one doubted that the last election at Taunton was perfectly pure, for there were reasons why it was desirable to break the continuity of bribery there. The Attorney General and his Colleague ran together, and the same expenditure did for both. They spent £952. That election could not be done for the money which it was now proposed to allow to be spent. In Oxford the Bill would allow £500 to be expended. When the Home Secretary and his Colleague contested it in 1880 they spent nearly £3,000, or six times the amount now to be allowed. Considering the conduct of the Home

Secretary in allowing the unfortunate Macclesfield solicitors to be dragged in manacles through the streets of London, he supposed that he must be the purest of the pure, the very *crême de la crême* of electoral purity. Yet, in a single week's combat at Oxford, the Home Secretary spent £3,200. Now, the Home Secretary suggested that his successor at Oxford should spend £500. With regard to Chelsea, it was proposed that the permitted expenditure in that great constituency should be £1,150. The President of the Local Government Board, who was known to be careful and economical, and possessed of electioneering experience, yet he and his Colleague spent £3,200, nearly three times the amount allowed by the Bill. The Solicitor General, in his nice convenient little constituency of Durham, would be entitled to spend only £350. But at the last election he and his Colleague expended no less than £1,477. Knowing what he did of the Attorney and Solicitor General, he could not believe that they would spend one penny more than was absolutely necessary. Yet the Solicitor General and his Colleague together had found it necessary to disburse four times the amount provided by the Bill. As he had given some of the expenses of the Lieutenants, he would now give the expenses of the General, and what he would be allowed by the Bill. The county of Mid Lothian contained 3,260 electors; the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister would be entitled, under the Bill, to expend £580. Yet, at the last election, his expenses amounted to £2,495. [Mr. HOPWOOD: What did Lord Dalkeith spend?] The hon. and learned Member for Stockport asked how much Lord Dalkeith had spent. Lord Dalkeith did not propose to bind them with rods of iron in the same way as the Prime Minister. With regard to the scale of this Bill, he would point out—first, that it was liberal to very large boroughs—to boroughs such as Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, or Glasgow, it was far too liberal, and it was also liberal to very small boroughs. But, as regarded intermediate-sized boroughs—that was, containing from 4,000 to 10,000 electors—the amount allowed was very niggardly. Another point was the ridiculous inequality of the Bill. Taking his own constituency, the City of Londonderry; it had over 2,000 electors, and he was entitled to spend £380, and no more; he believed he spent on his last election £850. But, in eight constituencies containing an aggregate of electors less in number than that of his own constituency, the sum allowed to be spent was £2,500. Then, taking the case of the City of London, which had 24,000 electors, with four candidates running together, the amount allowed was £4,160. In Bristol, the constituency of which was very nearly the same size, the number of electors being 23,000, with two candidates running together, the amount allowed was £2,010. But in Wednesbury, with a constituency of 20,000, and but one candidate, the amount was only £920. Such variations could be followed throughout the whole scale. Then, taking the counties—In West Cumberland, with 7,900 electors and two candidates standing together, £1,480 was allowed, whereas in Dorsetshire, with 7,400 electors, the amount was £2,220—that was to say, £740 more for a constituency of the same number, or rather less. He was not merely attacking this Bill, but was prepared to suggest a more satisfactory scheme. Taking, again, the double counties against the single—In East Essex, which had 6,600 electors, each party running his candidate could spend £1,400, whereas in Carnarvonshire, with 6,900 electors, they could spend only £700. What was the meaning of this? If anything, an election was more expensive in Carnarvonshire than in Essex, on account of the geographical conditions of the former county. The Attorney General might not be satisfied with this practical testing and manipulation of his Bill; but this was the whole question, and if the Bill could not stand this method of examination it was undeserving of the support of the House. It was, in his opinion, of the utmost importance that the House should understand the true meaning of the Bill, and that its various clauses should not pass unchallenged. He would now come to another set of counties. In Huntingdonshire, which had 3,955 electors, each party could spend £1,160; but in Pembrokeshire, with its 5,000 electors, each party could only spend £660. This was surely not practical legislation, but legislation run mad. It might be a rule of three or a rule of thumb; but it was not a rule of common sense. Then, comparing South Notts with the Isle of Wight; South Notts had a constituency of 4,879, and each party could spend £1,240; but in the Isle of Wight, which had a constituency of almost exactly the same number, each party might spend only £620. The results were the same in numerous other instances. He would now take a few of the borough constituencies, and, as an instance, take Banbury against Barnstaple. Banbury had 1,848 electors, and it was not allowed to spend more than £350. Barnstaple had 200 electors less, and yet each party could spend £700. Under the Bill, Cheltenham, with 5,000 electors, would be entitled to spend £470, while Cambridge, with 200 fewer electors, would have a right to spend just double that sum, two candidates running together. Again, if a man found that he was tied down to expending £500, when he could not do with less than £1,000, the effect would be that he would have to get a nominal Colleague; and thus they would have a system of "bogus" candidates, encouraged under a Bill professing to promote purity of election. They ought to have a practical measure that would do justice to all candidates and all concerned, and that would not put a man on a totally different scale from his neighbour. He believed that that Bill would press harshly on the honest and sensitive man, and but lightly on the unscrupulous man, who would evade it. What he would suggest was that, instead of taking the scale which the hon. and learned Gentleman had put into the Bill, they should have a scale allowing so much per head on the voters in the boroughs, and so much more in the counties; allowing, in the case of single constituencies and in bye-elections, 50 per cent in addition to the scale; so that, although they would not allow the man who stood alone at a bye-election to have double the expenditure that he might have if he had a Colleague, yet they would make a difference of 50 per cent; and that, he thought, would get rid of the ridiculous results that would be produced by the application of the Schedule in the Bill. He was sorry to say he thought this measure was slightly tainted with Party objects. The Attorney General had no sooner introduced the Bill than he was "interviewed" by a deputation headed by the pertinacious Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings), who, before the Bill had even been read a second time, entreated him not to withdraw it, or allow it to be tampered with in any way, because it was thought by the Liberal Party that it was bound up with their best interests. The hon. and learned Gentleman was thus besought not to permit the Tories to interfere with a measure with the success of which the best interests of the Liberal Party were avowedly bound up. He was sorry that the Liberals were making a Party question of this. At all events, the Conservative Party had never done so. He would say, in the words employed by the Prime Minister on a recent occasion, that this kind of legislation was demoralizing. It created offences and crimes rather than allayed them. The Bill was obnoxious in other respects also. In the first place, all these serious provisions were to follow on the decision of a single Judge, instead of on that of two Judges under the old system.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, the hon. Gentleman was mistaken. Two Judges would still be required.

MR. LEWIS said, he would not, in that case, proceed with that point any further. But the Bill contained pitfalls — those which surrounded such words as agents, committee room, clerks, and messengers. There was not the slightest attempt at interpreting those terms. Before he sat down he was bound to say this—Why was it that this corrupt practices' legislation was not respected by the public? Because they did not believe that the Government were in earnest; because bribery prevailed in the highest Councils of the State; because the Government of the day committed it, sometimes in the most unblushing manner. He would give two instances of this—one affecting his own Party, and one the Party opposite. In 1866 a most distinguished man, now no more, was in want of a seat. Being a Law Officer of the Crown, it was essential that he should have it. What happened? A Member for an insignificant borough was induced to retire under promise of a Baronetcy. The Law Officer was elected to the vacancy, the retiring Member got the Baronetcy, and everybody knew that it was value received. He would take a later instance. An unfortunate Member of the present Government, having lost his seat at

Chester, wanted a seat. How was it got? Somebody wanted a Peerage. This Member retired in favour of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and within a little more than 12 months he was created a Peer. Cause and consequence. In the face of such facts as those, how could they expect a country tradesman who received a favour from a Member to think anything of offending against this Act, when he saw acts of this sort done by Ministers of the Crown, in the face of day, and in the most unblushing manner, as if they were matters of course? Let them take another instance. How were all the Lord Lieutenancies of counties filled up? Were the most fit men appointed? No. The greatest politician on their own side got the appointment. At one time the Berkeleys had got power in the House of Commons. There were five or six of them in the House, and it was said that the Berkeleys could do anything. So they could. They gobbled up all the public offices in Gloucestershire. If the House took the Garters and other objects of ambition, it would be found that they fell to men who had been politically useful. The other day he amused himself with looking through the list of Baronets. Out of 124 created since he commenced his political career in 1852, 63 represented Science, Art, Naval, and Military promotions, and retired Judges, persons who had done signal service to the State. The remaining 61 were purely Party appointments. What was the use of hypocrisy on this subject? The fact was that the whole course of public and Party life in this country, illustrated in various ways, was nothing more nor less than bribery —payment for value received and services rendered to Party. How could people be expected to respect laws of this kind when this kind of thing went on? The Bill, in his opinion, was grossly unjust, enormously severe, ridiculously unequal in its operation, and unworthy of support. The Government had been hammering at this Bill for the last three Sessions, and contemplated ending the Session in a blaze of glory, due to their efforts in the cause of electoral purity. But a Bill which would really bring about the desired result should be a just and not an unjust one, and should not, in its operation, be so obviously unequal as this was. With these few words, and with the fullest confidence that his protest would have no effect upon the minds of hon. Members opposite, and also that he should be thoroughly beaten, he begged leave to second the Motion that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL said, that the subject was one which had interested him for a very long time. Before, however, he addressed himself to the question before the House, he wished to say a few words of a personal character. He had the honour of the acquaintance of the noble Lord whom the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) had alluded to as having received the bribe of a Peerage. Everyone who knew the noble Lord must be aware that he was wholly incapable of seeking or receiving a bribe; and in his name, and on his behalf, he repudiated a suggestion so unfounded and so injurious. With reference to the Bill before the House, he believed there was no measure which was so strongly demanded in the country, both by electors and elected. Among the better sort of electors there was growing up all over the country a determination to rid themselves, at any cost, of the degrading tyranny of the purse. He believed there would be a very considerable doubt of the *bona fides* and the honesty of any Government which continued much longer to delay dealing strenuously with an evil which they had all condemned, but which they had done so little to check. On that side of the House there could be no doubt as to the desire for purity of elections. There were a great many hon. Members who were already making very heavy sacrifices in their profession, or in their business, in order to perform their Parliamentary duties efficiently; and they did not think it right that they should also be called upon to make heavy pecuniary sacrifices every six or seven years, or even oftener. It was impossible for the House, after the Commission of 1880, any longer to entertain the belief that even the old-fashioned form of direct bribery had fallen into disuse, while the indirect methods were notoriously numerous. The House would remember how the Report of that Commission mentioned a sum of £3 for putting up a pole with the candidate's colours upon it, £796 for rosettes, and so on. The diary of a candidate had fortunately been preserved by the same means; and there appeared in it the following entries respecting the wants and requirements of the voters:—

> "A wants change of air. B very favourable, but poor. C promises, but wants a little drop. D—wife wants liquoring up."

In addition to these there were the various kinds of bribery which occurred between the election times, when gentlemen desirous of representing a constituency gave parks, museums, and similar gifts. This was known as "salting" a borough. He had not intended to specify any particular case; but since the hon. Member opposite had mentioned names, he would refer to the practice which there existed on the part of the Conservative Party at Chester of paying a large portion of the expenses of a Conservative *fête,* towards which, in the year 1879, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Raikes) contributed £100. This was exactly the kind of corruption which contributed so very largely to the results they deprecated, and they were told it was almost impossible to check it. He believed this indirect mode of bribery would perish, by its very affinity to the profligate expenditure at election time, when once that expenditure had been stamped as not only criminal and immoral, but dangerous. The Bill would, no doubt, require to be amended in several of its details in Committee. There appeared to be too much risk, under the Bill, of a candidate being ruined by the malpractices of his agent; and he would be glad to see the responsibility of a Member for the acts of his agents limited and curtailed before the Bill passed into law. Then, in many places, especially in thinly populated boroughs, the number of polling places should be increased, if the conveyance of voters was to be prohibited; and, in his opinion, if the Bill prevented voters being brought up in hired carriages, it should not allow the rich man to use his own carriages for that purpose. Further, the rectification of the Register might well be undertaken by the State, instead of being left to the uncertain tribunal of the Revising Barrister. But these were questions of detail, which could be dealt with in Committee. He begged the hon. and learned Gentleman (the Attorney General) not to be influenced by mock heroics or mock-pathetics on the question of penalties and expenditure. On the part of those who had long looked for a measure dealing effectively with corrupt practices, he thanked the hon. and learned Gentleman for a substantial boon. In 1877 the Prime Minister wrote that two circumstances struck him most forcibly and painfully in current politics—first, the constant advance of the money power; and, secondly, the reduction, almost to zero, of the chance of entering into Parliament of men who had nothing to rely on except their talents and character, nothing except the two qualities which stood before all others in the capacity of enabling men to render service to the State. That, the right hon. Gentleman said, was likely to lead to a serious amount of mischief; that it was debasing; that it was plutocracy in a most vicious form. Sharing in those views of the right hon. Gentleman, he would give his most hearty support to the Bill, believing that it would go very far to purify both the electoral system and the elected body.

Mr. SHEIL said, he intended to follow the example of the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), and to enter a protest against this Bill, though on different grounds. He regretted that, as compared with the Bill of last year, this measure dealt much more leniently with offenders, although the modifications had probably been made in order to meet the views which were generally expressed last year. The clause relating to corruption through an agent or sub-agent ought to be much more stringent, so as to make it clear to a candidate that if he shut his eyes to an improper act by his agent or sub-agent he would be made to suffer heavily, and an agent or sub-agent likewise would not be guilty of any corrupt practice if he knew that, in addition to being heavily fined, he would be sent to prison. Under the heading "Illegal Practices" they had a series of new offences created which were called illegal hiring, illegal employment, and illegal payment. For these minor offences there was a mere fine of £100. The principle had been thrown overboard that on no pretext whatever should an elector take part in an election for payment, except as either agent or sub-agent. He admitted it was absolutely necessary that the best men should be appointed agents and sub-agents; but so far as the other officers were concerned, the polling clerks, messengers, &c., there was no necessity whatever for their being voters. Their task was chiefly mechanical, and could be performed by non-voters. An abuse which would continue under this Bill was what he had known to be done in Athlone—the employment by the candidate of persons who were likely to vote against him. Agents and sub-agents should be debarred from voting. He also regretted that the prohibition of placarding contained in the Bill of last year had been removed. He ventured to say that no elector had ever been induced to change his mind by one of those placards. With regard to the trial of Election Petitions, the custom of protracting legislation in this country threw so heavy a burden on the Judges that it would not be possible to have more than two Judges engaged in trying them. Besides, after a General Election a large sheaf of Petitions was usually presented. But in Ireland, where the judicial business was not very heavy, it would be quite practicable to have three Judges employed in trying Election Petitions. That was the more necessary, because in Ireland Judges were appointed as Party men, whereas in this country, happily, men were made Judges because of their knowledge of law. At present the Returning Officer could claim a sum of money beforehand by way of security. But once the money was handed over to the Returning Officer, it was sometimes found extremely hard to recover any portion of it. At his own election at Meath, which was not contested, he was obliged to sue a Returning Officer for a part of the money. He suggested, therefore, that the security might be lodged in the county bank, in the joint names of the candidate and the Returning Officer. It was clear to him that the framers of this Bill had chiefly in their minds the condition of England and Scotland, and gave little attention to the impoverished condition of Ireland, when settling the Schedule which set forth the proportion that a candidate's expenditure should bear to the number of votes. In England there were very few boroughs with less than 900 voters, and in Scotland there was only one. In Ireland, however, Dublin and Belfast were the only cities in which there were large numbers of electors. Next came Limerick, Waterford, Galway, and a few others. In Ireland there were at the present time two boroughs with less than 800 electors, two with less than 700, one with less than 600, five with less than 500, four with less than 400, six with less than 300, and two with less than 200. If one of the objects of the Bill was to prevent large expenditure at elections in Ireland, it was to be regretted that those by whom the Bill had been drafted had not kept these facts in view. Notwithstanding these criticisms, he should support the Bill, hoping that in Committee it might be made to resemble more closely the Bill introduced last year. The Irish Members did not expect that much direct benefit would accrue to Ireland through this measure; but, indirectly, good might result from it, for English Members would be sent to Parliament known more for their intelligence and capacity than for the length of their purses, who would be likely to give Members from Ireland a fair hearing in that House.

MR. STUART-WORTLEY said, he would give a general support to the Bill, because, although he believed it to have very great faults, it was clear that something must be done, and in these days it was difficult to get anything done. The Bill adopted two out of three possible courses dealing with corrupt practices. One course, which naturally could not now be adopted, was that of so enlarging the size of small constituencies that corruption should become impossible because useless. The Attorney General had preferred to adopt the course of, on the one hand, increasing the severity of penalties; and, on the other, of proposing the enactment of what was practically a sumptuary law. If the sumptuary law were enacted, they must be prepared to meet with, at all events, only the very qualified success which usually attended the operation of sumptuary laws, and he hoped that before they got to the Schedules in Committee, the Attorney General would give very serious consideration to the inconsistencies that had been exposed, and endeavour to bring about something like harmony. Of course, they all knew that before long there must be a revision of the present inequalities of representation by one Party or the other; but until that time, if they were to adopt the principle of restricting expenditure, let it be applicable with a decent amount of fairness to the state of affairs with which they now had to deal. He was sorry that in the matter of expenditure the Attorney General had not seen fit to pay more regard to the representation made to him in respect to printing expenses. That was one of the cases in which undue restrictions were proposed. They knew a great deal of money was spent on printing; but perhaps of all election expenses it was the least describable as corrupt. It might be said that here and there there were one or two individuals who had corrupt motives in their minds by the employment of printers; but in general the evil of restricting the means of circulating a candidate's addresses would outweigh the small amount of good which would be achieved by restricting the expenditure. The error which it appeared the Government were making was confounding large expenditure with corrupt expenditure. Everyone would wish to see elections cheap; but it did not necessarily follow that expenditure which was large was always corrupt, and in the case of printing an instance was to hand. Reference had been made to old stories about Conservative picnics, but he saw nothing in this Bill which would prevent any electoral inducements of that character. He should be glad to see something done to prevent the establishment of richly-endowed political clubs, with sumptuous billiard and dining rooms, at a merely nominal subscription, when the sole and obvious object was to bias the political views of young men and secure votes for one Party or the other. As he began by saying he should support this Bill, he would conclude by adding that he did not thereby pledge himself to all its principles, but would reserve to himself the right to examine it in Committee.

Mr. CARBUTT said, he wished the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) had thrown less dirt, and had given the House more of argument. He would not, however, follow the speech of the hon. Member, except to say that all his argument was based on the present state of the constituencies. But he would remind the hon. Member, that when they had a re-arrangement of constituencies, they would have fewer small boroughs represented, and more Members would be given to larger boroughs, so that the inequality the hon. Member complained of would not then apply. From his (Mr. Carbutt's) own experience he was disposed to believe that there was a great deal in the suggestion of the hon. Member for Londonderry as to local circumstances requiring a departure from the hard-and-fast rule as to expenditure. His constituency consisted of the three towns of Newport, Monmouth, and Usk, and having to move his committee altogether from one town to another, his expenses were much greater than they would be if three boroughs were in one. With respect to closing public-houses on the day of election, he trusted that the Government would embody the principle of his Bill in a clause in the present measure. He had practically carried the second reading of his Bill in that sense by 55 against 17; but he had been recommended to wait until the Corrupt Practices Bill was introduced, when the question could be more satisfactorily dealt with. This being the case, he considered he had a claim on the Government to make some provision on the subject. But if they did not do so, he should certainly introduce a clause and go to a division upon it; and he hoped he should have the support of the hon. Gentlemen who favoured his proposal two years ago, for he believed that a great deal of corruption would be prevented and public order benefited by closing public-houses when an election took place.

Mr. JOSEPH COWEN said, the House had listened with satisfaction and interest to the very able and exhaustive speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis). No one could contest the accuracy of his statements, or the cogency of the arguments he drew from them. The Bill would, unquestionably, operate in a very unequal way. On some sections of the community it would press with great severity; on others it would have the opposite effect. But he feared all Bills dealing with corrupt practices would be liable to the same criticism. It was impossible to make a perfect measure. His opinion was that the Bill before the House was an honest and sincere attempt on the part of the Government to deal with a great and admitted evil. It was a difficult, detailed, and delicate subject. It would give rise to a good deal of discussion, and possibly to some delay; but he had no fear that the House would defeat the Bill. Laws against bribery were very much of the nature of the Pope's Bull against comets. As long as there were voters willing to sell there would be persons willing to buy, and *vice versa.* Political corruption was a very flexible offence. It easily adapted itself to the constantly-shifting conditions of social life. At one time it was open, flagrant, and avowed. At another time it was insidious, widespread, and impalpable. Formerly, a man bought a constituency just as he could buy a commission in the Army or a living in the Church. It was his property, and he did with it as he chose. When he was prevented from doing this, he bought individual voters, and paid for them at one pound a-head or five pounds a-head, according to circumstances. And having bought them, he could sell them. He could not do that now; but instead of buying individuals, a candidate bought classes or trades. A man, or body of men, went before the constituencies, and said to them—"Give us your support, furnish us with a majority in Parliament, and we will legislate in favour of your section of society in such a way as to allow it to be benefited to the extent of a certain number of pounds or shillings." This, in his judgment, was as an objectionable form of bribery as the open purchase of individual votes. Yet it was practised by all Parties, and was commended by them. And it was a perfectly legitimate course of political procedure in the estimation of the community at large. This Bill did not deal with that class of bribery. It would be difficult to draw a Bill that would. It was an unhealthy state of mind that produced this condition of things, and the only way in which it could be mended would be to elevate the character both of the constituencies and the population. When a healthier and purer political life existed, we might expect some betterance in this regard. In the same way, the forms of intimidation had altered. Formerly, a landlord told his tenants to vote for a given candidate, and they had no alternative but to obey. Tradesmen were ordered by their customers, and such workmen as possessed votes were ordered by their employers to vote in a specified direction; and they did so. This could not be done now, for the Ballot had put an end to it. But a new form of intimidation had arisen. Electoral societies had been scattered over the country. They were to be found in every constituency. They were not established for the promotion of any political principle, nor did they seek the repeal of an old and obnoxious law, or the enactment of a new and a good one. Their purpose was to get a certain political Party into Office, and to keep it there. The candidate or the Member who did not comply with their conditions was subjected to their intimidation. He was put in a political pillory and pelted with all the dirt that partizan prejudice could collect. If he was a poor man, he was compelled to submit. If he was a weak or a timid man, he was coerced into submission. These societies were a copy of the system of electioneering that existed in America. They had created a body of professional politicians—men who drove the electoral machine. In America it was matterless to these machine men what politics a candidate might hold. The same man worked the machine for a Democrat or a Republican. He believed the style of organization that had been established in this country would ultimately and inevitably lead to the creation of a like order of political society. It demoralized the electors and corrupted the Legislature. The Bill proposed to deal with the expenses at, before, and during an election. But these organizations were constantly incurring expenses with a view to damage a candidate or a Member who was not in accord with them. Their canvassing began very often months, even years, before a contest. He could cite a dozen or a score of places in this country where a systematic canvass during the last 18 months or two years had been carried on against Members who refused to wear the Party plush—who insisted upon being Representatives, and not Delegates—who had resolved to act as they thought, and not as they were told. He would like to ask the Attorney General how he proposed to deal with the kind of expenditure that was incurred by such bodies. It ought as clearly to come under the cognizance of the law as expenditure immediately preceding a contest. It was preparatory to a contest. He knew it was difficult to effect this;

but what he wanted was to point out how impossible it was, by any law, however skilfully drawn, to reach the varying forms of political intimidation and corruption. He believed electoral corruption would never be abolished but in one way, and that was to throw the legitimate expense of a contest upon the constituencies and prohibit all other outlay. Some people said, throw the necessary expenses on the constituency. But if you allowed a candidate to incur necessary expenses, it led him to incur unnecessary ones. If you allowed him to incur legitimate, it led him to incur illegitimate ones. A candidate ought not to incur any cost. He knew he would not get the assent of Parliament to that doctrine; but he was satisfied, nevertheless, that it was the right one. The general theory was that a seat in Parliament was a prize to be struggled for and paid for. That theory was a very vicious one. He did not hold it. A seat in Parliament was a service to be rendered. A man could be nominated by his fellow-citizens for the office, or he might nominate himself; but the cost of returning him ought to be thrown absolutely and entirely upon the constituency, or, if they liked, on the State, as the work rendered was for the State, and not for the individual. Until they could screw up their courage to deal with electoral expenses in this way, they would never cure either bribery or intimidation. All the Bills they passed would be evaded or got over. The Bill before the House would mitigate the evils; and, so far as he was concerned, he would contribute cordially to amend it in Committee, and to pass it in the best form it could be worked into. He had no hope that either it or any other measure of a like kind would accomplish the result which some expected from it. As long as ever candidates were allowed to pay for anything at election times, means would be found to twist that payment in an illegal direction. He would vote for the second reading of the Bill, and give it his best consideration in Committee.

Baron DE FERRIERES said, he had on the Paper an Amendment in the following terms:—

"That the only remedy against corrupt practices is the abolition of small constituencies, and it is, therefore, inexpedient to proceed with the Bill until the whole question of the extension of franchise and Redistribution of Seats is submitted to the House."

He regretted that the Rules of the House precluded him from moving that Amendment; but he was convinced that its terms forshadowed the true method of dealing with electoral corruption. He desired, however, to make some observations in opposition to the Bill. The object of the Bill appeared to be twofold—namely, to reduce the expenditure at elections, and to put a stop to corrupt practices. He thought it a mistake to press the Bill forward at present. The desire to reduce expenditure rested upon the fallacy that it was possible to make things cheaper by legislation; but so long as every constituency was run after by two or three candidates, with their pockets full of money, it was idle to suppose that any legislation could materially reduce expenditure. Taking the case of printing, the Attorney General last Session proposed to limit the expense to £150; but in the heat of an election, as the polling day drew near, both parties were driven into issuing posters and circulars, the expense of which it was impossible to limit to £150. It was useless to rely on public opinion to put down the evils of the present system, for sharp practice on the one side or the other only elicited admiration or amusement. Tradition had created a sort of vested interest in the expenditure of money at elections. Stories were current of the lower orders being willing to sell their votes for 5*s*., but the same spirit showed itself in higher grades. It was the practice at such times for the most respectable members of the Press to charge double for the advertisements known as election advertisements; and tradesmen also considered themselves entitled to charge more than their usual prices. The returned costs of an election were nothing like the actual expenditure. The last General Election cost about £3,000,000. Speaking broadly, out of that £3,000,000, £1,000,000 went into the pockets of the lawyers and the hangers-on of their offices. Then £1,500,000 might be put down as having gone in irregular practices, that was to say, not so much in direct bribery, as in treating, and in conveyances, watchers, boardmen, and other items of that kind. Of this £1,500,000, he believed the great bulk returned into the pockets of the publicans. The result of his calculation was, that of the £3,000,000, only one-sixth, or £500,000, was spent in a legitimate manner. There being about 3,000,000 of electors in the United Kingdom the expenditure amounted to about £1 per head. The legitimate expenses seldom exceeded 2*s.* 6*d.* a-head; but allowing another 2*s.* 6*d.* for such expenses, he said that anything over 5*s.* per head was money spent on corrupt and irregular practices. If the candidate was a local man, he knew pretty well how things were worked; but many Members were not resident candidates, but men of position anxious to obtain a seat in that House. They made up their minds to pay, though they might afterwards be surprised at the amount of the bill; but they paid the money and asked no questions. There was much money spent improperly and indirectly which could not be touched by any laws that were made. The only effectual remedy for corruption was large constituencies. Where they had a large constituency they were not left at the mercy of a hundred or two of disreputable electors, who sold their votes for beer or money, and were able to turn the scale at the election. He looked upon it that the Bill, instead of having the desired effect, would seriously aggravate matters, because no respectable solicitor would act as election agent; and, on the other hand, the Bill was so complicated that it would be most difficult to steer clear of the many pitfalls which would beset the candidate. Under the Bill a candidate must have recourse to a third or fourth-rate solicitor whose practice was worth little, and who, if he found a Petition was lodged against the return in which he was concerned, would go away to America, and the candidate would have to keep him, thus increasing expenditure. One result of the Bill would be, of course, materially to reduce the legal and returnable expense of elections, but greatly to increase secret and irregular expenditure. Months after the election, perhaps, the candidate would find that some of his friends had spent £2,000 or £3,000 in his cause, and, of course, as a man of honour he would not like them to be losers. It was a custom which had been winked at, if not actually permitted, by the Election Judges that a candidate was allowed to invite his committee and his supporters to dinner so long as it was done to a moderate extent and there was nothing that was likely to demoralize the constituency. Under the present Bill nothing of that sort would be allowed, or, at least, the penalties would be so severe, that nobody would venture to sit down to an entertainment of that kind, because, not only the candidate himself who invited them, but every one of the guests, would be liable to heavy fine and imprisonment. On the other hand, the brewers would be able to treat the electors all the year round in a quiet way. If they wanted to strike an effective blow against the evils that existed they must alter completely the system of municipal elections. A constant system of treating went on at those elections, which took place every six months—that for Guardians in spring, and that for Municipal Councils in autumn—and he would suggest that these bodies should be elected for six years, the elections taking place triennially. One of the best remedies also for the present evil was the establishment of large constituencies, and he would suggest that this Bill should be put off until the question of the extension of the franchise and the redistribution of seats could be dealt with as a whole. As regarded canvassing, that ought to be put a stop to altogether. Instead of large penalties being inflicted, he believed that a number of small fines would prove much more efficacious. He would only add that he looked upon the support given to this measure by the Conservatives as suspicious, and as an indication that it would work in their favour, for the Conservatives were wise in their generation and always had an eye to the benefit of their Party; whereas the Liberals often neglected their Party interests and acted only on principle—as, for example, in promoting restrictions on the publicans which drove them into the arms of the Conservatives.

MR. GREGORY said, he thought the Bill was a fair and legitimate attempt for remedying the evils which the Inquiry that took place after the last General Election sufficiently demonstrated. It would certainly get rid of three great causes of those evils—namely, paid canvassers, the cost of advertising, and the conveyance of voters to the poll. There was one defect in the present law which ought to be altered. He should like to see a clause defining what was meant by agency, as he thought the Election Judges had gone far beyond the limits of the Common Law in the interpretation which they put upon it. That point was not dealt with by the Bill, and he should be grateful to any hon. Member who would suggest anything like a remedy for that evil. In his opinion there could be no doubt that the Bill was a great improvement on the one introduced last year.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: Sir, I congratulate the House upon the common-sense remarks of the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory). I was glad to hear him bring back the House to a sense of duty in respect to what has been a crying evil for a great number of years. The tone of the debate had rather, if I may say so, lowered itself almost into an apology for bribery and corrupt practice. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) was correct in saying the public would not believe we are in earnest if we believe that bribery is an inevitable evil which it is beyond the power of legislation to alleviate. If we are to believe that this mode of purchasing votes, this inducing a man to discharge a solemn trust on the most miserable and contemptible motives, is inseparable from our electoral system, then the character of the English people has sunk low indeed, and we need not pride ourselves so much upon our Constitution. I believe, on the contrary, that these evils can be grappled with—not rooted out, not eradicated perhaps—but the disgraceful abuses that took place during the last General Election, and were revealed by the Election Commissioners, can, to a great extent, be prevented, and they can be prevented only in one way, and that the way the Attorney General has adopted in this Bill—the way of punishing the man who finds the money. I do not believe so much in punishing the man who receives it. Any man knows when he signs a cheque or finds the money for illegal purposes; and all rich men who purchase their way into the House, we, in the interest of the whole country, ought to discountenance as much as we can. So far as the Bill throws obstacles in the way of the rich man finding his way into the House, I hail it with the greatest possible satisfaction and pleasure. No doubt, there are suggestions which I shall be prepared to make in Committee, and with which it is not necessary for me to trouble the House at this stage; but I should like to impress on the Attorney General, if, in drawing up this Bill, he has allowed the pendulum to swing in the other direction, that to make penalties too severe, to make the law too stringent, lessens the hope of satisfactorily applying it. It is also a mistake to put offences of a different grade of criminality in the same line. A man who gives another £5, and the man who purchases a rosette, to induce a man to vote, ought not to be subject to the same punishment. I shall not waste the time of the House on these matters now; but they will have to be treated in Committee. but there are two matters of principle to which I will draw attention. The first has reference to what the hon. Member for Londonderry has alluded to, the conveyance of voters to the poll. Now I take it our objection is twofold. We not only wish to prevent illegal expenditure, but also to remove all unfair pressure that prevents a man of limited means taking his seat in the House; but, as it now stands, so far as the conveyance of voters is concerned, it gives a direct advantage, a direct premium to the rich man, and places the man of moderate means at a disadvantage. I am prepared to adopt one of two principles, either to prohibit or to permit the conveyance of voters. I object to permitting a rich man to lend a carriage, and prohibiting a man of moderate means from hiring one. Here let me put a concrete instance. Just suppose a vigorous enthusiastic candidate—I will not say of either Party; he may be Liberal or Conservative—is driving round on an election day in a Hansom cab. He calls on a voter—"Well, Jack, been up to vote yet?" "No, I have not; the fact is, I've sprained my ankle and cannot walk." "Oh, jump into my cab, I'll drive you to the poll." Well, the man votes, there is an inquiry, the election is set aside, the candidate cannot sit again for 10 years, and the man himself is subject to penalties. Now, suppose another candidate is driving round in his brougham and he accosts a voter—"Good morning, Tom; been to the poll yet?" "No, I'm not going to walk." "Then get into my carriage and I'll drive you." He does, and votes, and it is a perfectly legal proceeding. Now this is an unfair administration of the law. If it is right for the rich man to place his carriage at the disposal of one party to bring up voters, it is equally right for the man of moderate means to hire for the day a number of carriages for the same purpose. I know in certain localities one party will have more carriages than the other, and I dare say the Attorney General will give us the instance of the hon. Member for Hereford, when farmers and tradesmen placed all kinds of vehicles at his disposal; but in boroughs you must have carriages lent or hired. There are many ways of evading the clause. A rich man might buy up all the conveyances one day on the condition that they are to be brought back at a moderate figure the week afterwards; and I say you must either do away with this distinction, or you must do away entirely with conveyance of voters. I do not say which. You do not allow a candidate to give a voter a glass of wine or a lunch on election day; why should you allow him to give the use of his carriage? If you allow the rich man to do this, then you must allow the man of limited means to hire. The other point to which I would refer is the tribunal. The hon. Member for Londonderry incorrectly stated that the Attorney General proposes to abolish the two Judges, going back on the system of one Judge. I regret that he has not done so, not that I subscribe to the hon. Member's opinion, But I object to a man's character, position, and station in Parliament being placed at the mercy of one Judge. It would be far better to try before one Judge and allow an appeal to the Court of Appeal, instead of having in every case two Judges, like the old custom at the Old Bailey, when two Judges sat with the Lord Mayor. The only other point I need mention is that of agency. It ought not to be dealt with as a *non possumus;* the ingenuity of the Committee ought to be brought to bear to see if in some mode or shape we could not limit or define an act of agency to limit the extraordinary, the extravagant extent to which Judges have carried the doctrine of agency, which practically places a man at the mercy of 800 or 900 men nominally his committee. With reference to the general principles of the Bill, I feel that I must put in just one word as to what has been said with regard to the lower classes being associated with bribery. I believe that there is no class in this country so interested in putting down bribery, and that there is no class so determined to put it down, as the working classes of this country. I am quite sure that any hon. Member who represents a working-class constituency will know that what I state is correct, and that there is no class which is so anxious to put down the practice of bribing as the working class. I trust that in Committee this Bill will be made a most satisfactory measure, both to the country generally and the constituencies, and that it will wipe out of the annals of the House of Commons a feature which has impaired and tarnished its lustre for a great many years.

MR. GRANTHAM said, his great fear was that when the Bill came to be practically tested it would be found that it did not limit electioneering expenses in a reasonable way. Although it might be very laudable to desire that poor people should be admitted to the House of Commons, yet it was equally necessary that expenditure should not be so limited as to prevent an election being properly conducted. The Bill, however, curtailed the maximum amount of expenditure allowed in such a way as not to allow for those which it actually permitted to be incurred. In a constituency like that which he had the honour to represent (East Surrey), one agent would be allowed with nine deputy agents, 52 clerks, 52 messengers, and 46 committee rooms. If he paid 100 guineas to the head agent, and small sums to the other persons employed, and moderate sums for the various committee rooms, the total would amount to at least £1,330, assuming the election to last for a month; while, as the total maximum expenditure allowed according to the present number of his constituency being only £1,380, it would leave only £50 for printing, stationery, postage, telegrams, the hire of rooms for public purposes, and the like—a sum that was absurdly inadequate, especially when it was remembered that it cost just upon £100 to post a single letter to each constituent. It would be almost impossible to conduct an election in the manner prescribed by the Bill. The great error into which the Attorney General had fallen was in confusing corrupt with legal expenses; while among other points requiring consideration was this one—that no distinction was made between a contest in which one candidate on each side was engaged, and another in which two on each side were fighting, and no allowance was made for the varying circumstances under which an election might take place with respect to length of time. A measure of this sort should be practical above all things, or it would be useless; and the Bill, if only it were conceived in a more practical spirit, would be a good one. He should support the second reading as a matter of principle, and in the hope that the unsatisfactory clauses might be withdrawn or amended in Committee.

Colonel NOLAN said, that while he welcomed any measure which would purify elections, still he should say he regarded with suspicion a proposal which gave the power of administering this Act to Irish Judges. They might be perfectly satisfied with English Judges, but the Irish people were not satisfied with their Judges. Some of the Irish Judges, no doubt, were excellent men; but there were some in whom the people had no confidence, and the result would be that while the people had the power of electing Members the Judges in Ireland would have a power of ostracizing from public life for 10 years the Members in whom the Irish people had confidence. Some Irish Judges might have extraordinary ideas as to what was undue influence; they might imagine that a man in whom the whole of Ireland had full confidence exercised thereby an undue influence on the people; and for this reason he should object to the provision which took away from jurors the privilege of saying what undue influence was, and intrusting that power to Judges. There were other objections to this Bill, amongst which was one to the effect that a candidate might be disqualified because he did not appoint an election agent, but took the matter into his own hands. But, on the other hand, if he did provide himself with all the machinery which was contemplated in the Bill, a single flaw in any part of it would lose the candidate his seat. This Bill was brought in to check the evils of a system of bribery and treating which prevailed in England, and of which there was very little in Ireland, and on that ground Irish Members would be justified in watching very narrowly the progress of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. WHITLEY said, he regarded the Bill as an honest endeavour to deal with a pressing and crying evil, and should therefore be sorry if it were opposed by the Members of his Party, who were as interested as their opponents in stopping bribery and corruption, the dealing with which ought never to become a Party question. He recognized the good faith with which the Attorney General had considered Amendments suggested by Members of the Opposition, and he was sure he would accept any further Amendments which would be an improvement to the Bill. He was not going on the present occasion to discuss the clauses of the Bill, many of which he had no doubt would require considerable amendment; but one of the principles of the Bill which struck him as worthy of the attention of the House was the question of agency. The Attorney General had said, and perhaps very truly said, that there was nothing so difficult to define as the Law of Agency; but to his (Mr. Whitley's) mind this Bill did interpret the Law of Agency to the detriment of innocent candidates. In his own constituency (Liverpool), one of the largest in the Kingdom, there were 128 districts. Now, he should be very willing to be liable for the acts of an agent appointed by himself; but this Bill went further, and if a man either volunteered his services, or was appointed by an agent, it would be so governed by the provisions of this Bill that such a person would undoubtedly become his agent. He wished to point out to the Attorney General the very great difficulty the candidate would be placed in in those circumstances. An agent not appointed by himself but by the election agent became an agent. It was very difficult indeed to get a set of men together to act properly as agents. He believed the 120 men who would be appointed under this Bill would very much prejudice a candidate. It was, to his mind, a very serious thing for any gentleman seeking to represent a constituency to feel that his personal honour was at the mercy of any of those men. Although he might not be breaking the law himself, although he might wish to prevent bribery, yet if it was done on the part of one of these men they might disfranchise any one in the House. Therefore, they were all concerned in the Bill. As it at present stood, an act on the part of one of these agents would disqualify a candidate from sitting. This was a Bill to which any Member was subject, but much more was it the case in the instance of a large constituency. He thought there should be no responsibility on a candidate for the acts of those over whom he had no control. It was a very serious matter in deciding the Law of Agency to make a man directly responsible by this Bill for the acts of those over whom he could have no possible control, and he thought they were placing Members of the House in the greatest peril by this provision of the Bill as it stood. It appeared hard that some of the 240 agents or sub-agents should imperil the candidate, because by this Bill the candidate was made directly responsible. These were questions which all of them felt very much, and he should be very glad indeed if the Attorney General could see his way to limit the responsibility of innocent candidates for the acts of thoughtless men, or men for whom they were really not responsible. For his own part, he did not care for strengthening the penalties against the candidates. He would make the law as strong as possible, so strong indeed that men would be afraid to commit a breach of the law or an act of bribery; but he did think they owed something to themselves as men anxious to put down bribery, anxious by the Bill to make bribery almost impossible, and yet at the same time anxious that their own interests might not be imperilled by the conduct of others. This was the point to which he would direct the attention of the Attorney General. If he saw the peril that candidates were placed in by the Bill in its present position, the hon. and learned Gentleman would amend it; and he did trust that when the Bill went into Committee, and Amendments were proposed to limit the responsibility of candidates for acts over which they had no control, he would consider this the main point in the Bill, because he (Mr. Whitley) was one of those who would do his best to put down bribery and corruption. He thought every hon. Gentleman in the House—he was sure that those sitting on the Opposition Benches were as strongly opposed to corruption and bribery as anyone on the Government Benches, and he hoped the time was not far distant when bribery and corruption would be no Party question—when men of every Party would try to put it down. The observations made by his hon. Friends behind him that, because the Bill was introduced by the Government, there should be suspicion with regard to it, he did not endorse; and, for his part, he believed the Attorney General had met those statements. He believed it was an honest endeavour to deal with a pressing and crying evil, and he should be sorry if Members on the Opposition side of the House were to oppose the second reading. He believed they desired it to pass, and, therefore, he hoped and trusted the second reading would be carried, and that when the Amendments to the Bill came to be considered the Attorney General would see his way to meet the requirements of the case in the direction which he (Mr. Whitley) had pointed out.

COLONEL KINGSCOTE said, he was in favour of the second reading, for no one could be more anxious than he was to see a stop put to bribery; but he thought that before the Bill was passed it ought to be in a workable shape, which at present it was not. It appeared to him that the Bill was drawn more for boroughs than for counties. The Schedule of expenses was drawn in too hard a line. In West Gloucestershire, for instance, which he represented, there were 28 polling districts. If the polling agents, sub-agents, and messengers were represented by a moderate sum per day, and then compared with what was allowed for the actual number of voters, the sum required would be a great deal more than was permitted in the Schedule of the Bill. The Attorney General relied greatly upon volunteer work. In towns competent volunteers might be obtained; but in counties men who understood their work properly could not be procured, and if the work was not systematically done it might be less efficient and cost more than the services of those who understood their work and were bound to do it. He trusted these provisions of the Bill would be made a little more elastic in Committee.

MR. RAIKES said, he thought their best acknowledgments were due to Her Majesty's Government for having, even, if rather late in the day, exhibited some practical vigour in their desire to push this question to a settlement. He wished, however, that the three years which had elapsed since the General Election had been employed rather more carefully by the Attorney General and those who acted with him in endeavouring to modify and amend the measure which was now before the House. Still he admitted that the present measure was a decided improvement on the Bill of last Session. Practically the Bill might be divided into three parts. First, there was the part relating to the extending of punishments for corrupt practices; secondly, there was the part relating to the creation and definition of new illegal practices; and, thirdly, there was the Schedule dealing with the question of electioneering expenditure. The whole importance of the Bill was contained, as in a lady's letter, in the postscript. The real and main object of the Bill was rather to reduce the expenditure at elections than to produce any other effect upon them. It was a most laudable object to seek to reduce electioneering expenditure, which was, at present, a great deal in excess of what it ought to be. But, after the terrible process of evisceration to which his hon. Friend the Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) submitted the Schedule, he thought it was a pity that the Government had not more fully considered their scheme, and had not proposed some system for regulating election expenses that was open to less objection. After the exposure which his hon. Friend had made of the inequalities and absurdities of the Schedule, he hoped the Government would not press its precise provisions upon the House. If the Attorney General would incorporate in the Bill the Preamble and some of the provisions of the measure of last year, by which it was proposed to deal with corrupt boroughs, they would have before them in a complete and intelligible form the real mind of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the question of corrupt practices at elections. He should be sorry to accuse the Attorney General of anything like insincerity, as he knew how painful it must be for anyone who sat for the borough which his hon. and learned Friend represented to come forward as the exponent of anything like austerity in dealing with electioneering. He must say, however, that the action of hon. and learned Gentleman in his peculiar position was that of an extremely patriotic Minister, and he hoped if Taunton was to be represented in future, that it would at least be represented by a Minister equally patriotic. Although the Bill did not impose penalties on persons who had been guilty of corrupt practices in the past, he would not now propose to stay its progress on that account; but he submitted to the Government that they were putting the cart before the horse, and that they might find it difficult to get the cart through Parliament when they had not placed the horse before it. The present Government, since they had been in Office, had shown a very laudable and noble animosity against persons committed of corrupt practices. Certain unfortunate men had been dragged before the tribunals and sentenced to terrible penalties. Sentences of exceptional severity had been passed upon the bribers of Macclesfield and Sandwich; but those boroughs had no friends, because nobody of importance could be compromised or injured by any revelations in regard to them. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Home Secretary, with Spartan virtue, should have refused to mitigate the sentences passed on those unfortunate people. The discussions on this Bill would be regarded in the country as perfunctory, and the constituencies would entirely decline to believe in the reality of the debates in that House when no penalty had been dealt out, he did not say to individuals, but to boroughs which had been conspicuous for corrupt practices at the last General Election. Having had himself to give a good deal of attention to the circumstances of those boroughs, and having been examined before one of the Commissions, he had been looking from that moment to the present for some expression of the public virtue of Her Majesty's Government with regard to those particular constituencies. The measure introduced last year with a view to dealing with what were called the peccant boroughs was withdrawn from the consideration of the House before it had been fully discussed. He thought a measure more unequal or unjust had never been submitted to the consideration of Parliament. This year the Prime Minister told them that the question of the peccant boroughs was to be postponed till after the passing of the present Bill. Therefore, they would have passed their Bill without recognizing the political and electioneering offences which had given rise to it. Could it be supposed that any Parliament would act so entirely in contravention of the plain rules of common sense? He desired, therefore, to obtain from the Government some precise declaration that they would, before this Bill became law, give the House an opportunity of pronouncing upon the cases of these boroughs. If the boroughs were innocent, let them be absolved. He believed a good case could be made out for more than one of those boroughs. But if the boroughs were guilty, let the Government show that they were in earnest by dealing with them as if they were guilty. With regard to the present measure, he would comment, firstly, on the provision relating to the modification of the penalties to be imposed on persons found guilty of corrupt practices. Very few persons would wish to make those penalties more severe. But the question with the Government was rather how far they would defend the position they took up in a former Session of imposing on the persons found guilty of any of those practices the greater penalties which they now admitted to be undeserved. Another point to which he wished to draw attention was that the conviction of persons before a Judge at the trial of a Petition was to have the same effect as conviction before a jury. It was a novel principle that the Court which was convened for another purpose, that of inquiring into the propriety of an election, should have the new duty cast upon it of trying persons for election offences and imposing a serious penalty upon them. That was a matter which might well occupy the House in Committee. The better and more effective course would be for the Judge then and there to commit for trial any person who appeared to have been guilty of corrupt practices. That method would be more consonant to justice and the principles of English law than that which was proposed by the Bill. He had already said that the main object of the Bill was to diminish the expenditure at elections. There could be no doubt that elections had become purer, and one of the circumstances coincident with that increased purity had been that, while gross and old-fashioned bribery had gone out of vogue, there had grown up an irregular and illegitimate expenditure which this Bill sought to curtail; but, in curtailing that expenditure, the Government were likely to cause the revival of the older and grosser forms of corruption. The Bill would make it impossible for a man of character to become an election agent. Enthusiastic and imperfectly-instructed persons would act as agents for what they could get, or for nothing; and candidates well knew that there was no more dangerous man than the enthusiastic greengrocer, who indiscriminately spent his half-crowns. There was a danger lest in making elections cheap the House should make them extremely nasty. He was not now under the necessity of seeking the representation of a borough; but the Attorney General would appreciate the danger of employing volunteer agents in the delicate work of managing an election. There were most careful provisions made as to the single agent and the precise number of sub-agents. The provision as to the sub-agents was preposterous. In the constituency which he represented for 12 years—the constituency of Chester—according to the Bill, only 10 messengers and clerks would be allowed. That meant only one clerk or messenger for each polling district. The staff absolutely necessary for such a borough would be at least 100, or 10 to each polling district. He therefore ventured to dismiss the Schedule relating to the number of those officers as absolutely incompatible with the satisfactory working of any election. Besides, while it starved the legitimate machinery of elections by thus limiting the number of persons to be employed within the constituency, it opened an enormous field for persons who were not the agents of the candidate, but the agents of some particular organization. He found nothing to prevent 40 or more of those highly respectable young men from Birmingham who were interested in the conduct of elections upon strong "purity" principles from doing whatever they liked, whether in the name of the hon. Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) or in the name of that organization of which the President of the Board of Trade was at one time, but no longer, so intimately connected. Whatever might be the particular form of political doctrine which they proposed to exemplify in their manipulation of elections, it was certain that "where the carcase was there would the eagles be gathered together." The Bill thus did not deal with what was the growing evil, the cancer of our political system. If, however, the Government failed to deal in some effective way with those agents of central organizations who were not deterred by any penalties, and to make it impossible for persons of that sort to interfere with elections, they would simply be pouring water through a sieve, and placing in a position of danger, and possibly of disgrace, the unhappy man whose ambition prompted him to seek a seat in the House of Commons. It was the men who did the dirty work of those organizations, and who ran no risk, who were bringing discredit upon political life in this country; and in failing to deal with that evil the Bill would fail of what ought to be one of its main purposes.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he should vote for the second reading of the Bill, and would do his best to help in passing it this year. If it did not pass the country would have a well-founded suspicion that the House, and, still more, the Government, were not very much in earnest in the matter. Every year that passed without a good Bill on that subject made it more difficult to deal with the agents of corruption. It was, therefore, most desirable that both sides of the House should join their efforts in carrying out the measure in a sound and practical form. He wished on the present occasion to suggest a few Amendments which he should desire to see embodied in the Bill. But he would first express his satisfaction that a clause to which he had objected in the former Bill had been withdrawn. The former Bill contained a provision for the trying of Election Petitions by a single Judge, and he was glad that that clause had been dropped, as he was sure it would have been a dangerous and invidious position for a single Judge to occupy. Doubts might be thrown upon his impartiality, and it was much better that the responsibility should be divided. With regard to the trial by two Judges, he was at issue with the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler). He had been engaged in seven Election Petitions in the year 1880, and in every one of them the two Judges had taken an active part in deciding those Petitions. But there were two or three matters in the Bill which would have to be altered if it was to make a useful enactment. Among the more objectional features of the Bill were those relating to licensed victuallers. He thought those sections were unfair, and that there was not the smallest occasion for them. They seemed to be only another attempt on the part of the Liberal Party to insure the continued opposition of that trade which they so persistently assailed. He did not, however, intend to repeat his remarks of last year with respect to that matter; but he would call attention first to the 36th section of the Bill, which introduced an entirely new process with regard to Election Petitions, and one the adoption of which he believed would be fatal to the administration of the Law of Election Petitions altogether. That section provided that the Election Judges should have it as their duty, not only to decide whether the election into which they were inquiring was a valid election or not, but they were to sit as a Criminal Court for the trial of everyone who appeared before them, against whom any charge of corrupt practices was formulated, and pass sentences on offenders. Then, again, under Sub-section 7, by the direction of the Public Prosecutor, a barrister or a solicitor might be sent down invested with the powers of a Court of Session, in addition to the powers under the Act, and could imprison for a period not exceeding three months, or inflict a fine of £200. He ventured to say that those sections would either be disregarded altogether, or it would be impossible to carry out Election Petition arrangements. Then, again, the Special Commission appointed by Section 40 would consitute a Court as novel as it was unnecessary, and there could be absolutely no justification for it. Passing, however, from these points, he desired to mention to the House four Amendments which it was his intention to suggest. The first had been brought to his notice by a high authority, and related to the interval which elapsed between entering into recognizances by the parties to a disputed Election Petition and the presenting of the Petition. At present, when an election took place and a Petition was lodged, no recognizances need be entered into until 21 days afterwards. That interval afforded scope for communications and diplomatic overtures between the contending parties, and if the bargain was successfully made the recognizances were never completed. He would suggest that the recognizances should be entered into at the time of presenting the Petition, and then the Court would have a considerable sum of money—£2,000 or so—to deal with according to its discretion, and if the Court saw reason to believe that there had been corrupt practices, it could insist on having the Petition tried out. In the second place, he would limit the inquiry which should take place into what had happened at the then election, and would forbid any inquiry into past offences. That would give those boroughs where there had been corrupt practices a fair start, and was the only way in which they could hope to induce them to enter on a course of electoral purity. It was a mistake to suppose it was desirable to increase the severity of existing penalties; that would only defeat the object they had in view. It was very difficult to get rid of the sympathy felt towards those who committed acts of bribery; and in that view he must bear testimony to the firmness of the Home Secretary in refusing to remit the sentences inflicted on the offenders at Macclesfield and Sandwich. If any persons ought ever to be punished at all, it was clear that such flagrant cases ought not to be passed by unnoticed. But what they wanted in the case of a corrupt election was an immediate inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining how far that corruption extended, and who were guilty of it, and not an inquiry as it was at present got up by the other side for the purpose of unseating the sitting Member. It was often arranged between the two parties that just so much evidence should be produced to unseat the Member, and no more, since neither side desired that the general corruption of the borough should be exposed and an inquiry invited. On one occasion when he was counsel he had asked the Judges whether he should produce further evidence in support of the existence of corrupt practices after a seat had been abandoned by the opposite party, and he had been told that it was not necessary; the issue which the Judges had been sent down to try was determined, and there was an end of the matter. In order to try the Petition, let them send down two barristers as Commissioners to inquire. These barristers ought to have powers to call for papers, and to summon witnesses and examine them. Then let them report to the High Court of Justice whether, in their opinion, the election was a pure one, and ought to stand. Let there be an appeal by either side against their judgment. He believed they would not find there was an appeal in nine cases out of ten, because, after the facts were got at, the man whose seat was assailed would know that it would only be throwing away money to fight. In that way they would save the time of the Judges, and arrive at a solution of the immediate question whether the man elected ought still to retain the seat. He would be glad if he were allowed to make a useful contribution to this legislation in getting the clauses he had thus sketched incorporated in the Bill. It had been said over and over again, and the fact was perfectly evident, that the present Law of Agency was in a terrible condition. It was really shocking the risk a man ran, because it was not only the time and the labour, and might be thousands of pounds spent, but the fact that the man went away from the Court branded with the imputation that he had been trying to bribe a constituency, and liable to be met whenever he appealed to another by placard and denunciation—"This is the man who was turned out for corruption," although there was not a word of insinuation against the man personally, and although, on the contrary, he had striven with all his might to preserve complete the purity of the whole proceeding. It was difficult indeed to frame a definition of agency; but there was a way in which the matter might be dealt with at once. There was a good deal to be said in favour of the Committee of the House of Commons as the tribunal to try Election Petitions, as compared with the Judges. The Judges found themselves bound by strict rules—and they had made those rules stricter for themselves—but the Committees of the House of Commons did give something like equitable consideration to the matters brought before them. Now, could they not get both advantages — the trained intellect of the

Judges, and their reputation for impartiality, together with the equitable power exercised by the Committees? He thought they could. On this point he would like to fortify himself by the opinion of one of their greatest Judges. Lord Bramwell was examined before the Committee of 1875, and was asked this—

> "In general, what is your opinion of the success of the Act of 1868?—I think it has been successful. . . . . I do not know of any decision which you could say was wrong. The most doubtful one that I know of was decided by the full Court of Common Pleas, where they unseated a man. I do not presume to say it was wrong, but it was under very cruel circumstances (the Bristol election petition). As to the election law itself, it has been suggested to the Committee that the law of agency is very harsh upon the candidate. Do you agree in that suggestion?—It is very harsh. Do you see any means of mitigating it without letting in a worse evil?—Yes, there is one thing I always thought ought to be done. . . . I think where there has been bribery or treating by an agent, and the Judge is satisfied that the member was not a party to the act, and is also satisfied affirmatively that the election has not been affected by bribery (I do not mean by that particular act of bribery, but by bribery in general), I think the Judge ought to have a discretion, not to unseat. . . . . If there were an act of bribery by an agent to which the candidate was not a party, and I was satisfied that that was not one of many, the others of which had not reached me, I should like to be enabled to continue the member in his seat."

He would submit to the House an Amendment on the clause providing, in words similar to those of the learned Judge, that where the Judges reported that they were satisfied that the act of bribery proved was contrary to the instructions and adverse to the desires of the candidate, and of his recognized agents, and where they found that the result of the election was not in any way affected by bribery, there would be power to retain the Member in his seat, although at the same time, perhaps, charging him with the cost incurred. They could not treat the case as a frivolous one if the person offering the Petition had proved that there had been one or two cases of bribery; but they might protect the Member elected from the tremendous penalty of losing his seat as well as the costs he had incurred. He was anxious to mention these substantial Amendments on the second reading, because he was only too ready and willing to do what he could to help to get the Bill on the Statute Book in a satisfactory form. He hoped, therefore, that it would be seen that he had made the suggestions he had introduced in a spirit of the strongest friendship to the Bill, and that the Government would see their way during the next few days to give their support to some of them.

Mr. WADDY said, he did not at all agree with the fears of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Whitley) that this Bill would make agency wider than it was at present. The Law of Agency, as it existed, was so loose and wide that he thought the Bill would rather do a great deal towards contracting it, and placing it upon a safer and sounder footing. He did not think this or any Bill could entirely prevent corruption; but he believed it could and would do what legislation had done in times gone by in regard to other matters. It was a very common but a very false statement that they could not legislate people into morality. Legislation tended to form public opinion, and he believed this Bill would tend to form public opinion on the question of bribery and corruption. As long as they found people ready to give extravagant sums, they would find people ready to take them. He very much regretted that there should have been, on the part of one or two Members on either the one side or the other, a disposition to introduce anything like Party, and, what was worse, personal spirit in the consideration of this Bill. But since that was done, it was a remarkable fact that it was done by those who ought, of all others, to have held themselves at the greatest distance from it. They could not expect to do much good so long as they found people ready to give 18*s.* 2*d.* for each vote, as was done at Londonderry at last General Election, or so long as they found people ready to give 14*s.* 10*d.*, as was done at Chester at last General Election. He could not help thinking that these facts and figures might have kept one or two Members from indulging in insinuations and throwing out suggestions.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, it would not be right that the debate should close without some Members sitting on the Front Opposition Bench giving their opinion of the general features of the Bill, and he rose to state that the second reading would have his hearty and his entire support, as well as that of his Colleagues who sat near him. He desired to state also that he thought the Attorney General had done well in accepting a number of the Amendments put down to the Bill of last year. The Amendments that were put down by himself and some of his Friends were not brought forward without great and careful consideration, and it was a satisfaction to them to see the spirit in which those Amendments had been accepted by the Government. In his opinion, the Bill had been greatly improved by them. At the same time, he thought there was room for improvement in one or two parts of the Bill; for he feared that as the Bill was framed there was a great many pitfalls in it to what he might call the really honest candidate, and he should like to see those pitfalls removed as far as possible. The very severity of some of the penalties would probably have the effect of preventing the law from being put into operation, and he would much rather that a summary process had been provided for dealing with those who ought to be punished. It was a happy and a wise feeling in many constituencies that when a contest was over the parties agreed to shake hands and remain friends. But the great evil of the present system was that it gave the losing side, when an election was over, the opportunity to set about presenting a Petition, and the next object they had in view was to see that the tribunal which tried their own cases did not try the cases of their opponents. In most of such cases, they might depend upon it that if there had been bribery one side there had been some on the other also; and he should not be sorry to see means adopted by which an inquiry should always take place all round, under such circumstances. He did not quite understand the new offence of illegal payments, and he thought that was a matter to which they would have to pay some attention. He also thought the clause prohibiting the conveyance of voters to the poll would operate as a disfranchising clause, and they must, to be logical, as the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had pointed out, prevent anyone from driving a voter to the poll in his own carriage. He also thought the 5th clause was very misleading, as it did not tell them what the law was, and he hoped it would be entirely recast; and he would recommend the Attorney General to reconsider the whole question of agency in the direction suggested by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke), and on the lines suggested by Lord Bramwell. He still objected to the great penalty for illegal practices. If a practice was bad in itself, *mal in se,* there was no doubt people might be convinced of it and induced to put a stop to it; but that was not the case where it was a *malum prohibitum.* They were really in some of these matters placing them on the same level as corrupt practices. He now came to the new offence, and there was one question he should like to call the attention of the Attorney General to. An hon. Gentleman behind him had called attention to the 2nd sub-section of the 46th clause, and he would take that as an example. It was to the effect that if anybody used any premises or any part thereof for a committee room or hired it on behalf of a candidate when he knew or had reasonable cause to believe that part of the premises had been engaged or would be required by the Returning Officer as a polling station, he should be deemed guilty of illegal hiring. That offence was by that sub-section put in the same category as illegal practices. As to the Law of Agency, as applied in the Bill, he thought that the willingness of the Attorney General to meet the question showed that he knew how dangerous it was; and he could not help thinking that as there was an equity of law in the 17th section, it would be a very great safeguard if some clause were put in in order to limit the terrible stretch of agency. There was only one other matter to which he would call the attention of the House, and that was the Schedules, and as to that he thought the Schedules of expenses was very much improved. The hon. and learned Gentleman had also greatly improved the Bill by making a distinction between counties and boroughs, for they did not stand on the same footing. If it could be clearly shown that some other figure than that named in the Bill in any particular instance might produce less inequality, he was sure from the way in which the hon. and learned Gentleman had dealt with other parts of the Bill that he would accept it. There was one matter he deeply regretted, and that was that no difference was made between those cases in which there were two candidates standing and those in which there was only one candidate standing. It would be necessary to convince people that if they transgressed the maximum sum set down they would be doing something wrong. But suppose there was a three-cornered constituency, one man spent £510, while the other two, standing together, spent £1,000. They could not convince people that that man should lose his seat because he spent £510, while the two who stood together spent only £500 each. He hoped, therefore, that means might be found to prevent two persons standing together from being able to spend double the sum which a single candidate was allowed to spend. Human nature was human nature, and he feared that means would be found of evading the Act. He could not help thinking that persons from outside would come forward and spend money without the knowledge of the candidate. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) was rather startled by that assertion. But there were persons from Birmingham who did go about the country at the last General Election and spend considerable sums of money. He saw nothing in the Bill to prevent people from Birmingham or anywhere else virtually carrying the election in that way, and yet the candidate would hold his seat because it would be assumed that he knew nothing at all about it. He hoped that would be prevented when the Election took place in 1883 or 1884. Then there was another matter. Suppose a candidate went down and stayed with a friend in the town or county for which he was standing. Naturally the gentleman with whom he was staying would like to ask a good many of his friends to come and stay in his house to meet the candidate. Last year the Attorney General said that hospitality was not bribery; but he would like to know how the line was to be drawn? The Prime Minister at the last General Election went to stay with a noble Friend of his (the Earl of Rosebery), who, very naturally, asked a number of gentlemen to come and see him. A similiar thing was done in his own county. That was quite natural and proper; but what he wanted to know was—would such a proceeding be legally right under this Bill? He did not want to stop the practice, but only that it should be clearly defined and not left to the Election Judges to say whether it was right or not. He sincerely hoped that in a few weeks, when they had taken measures to prevent an innocent man from being caught unawares, that the Bill would become law, and prove a great benefit to the community at large.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, he was sure that those who had charge of the Bill ought to feel well satisfied with the debate which had taken place that evening. The numerous criticisms that had been applied to some of the clauses of the Bill had all been brought before the House with a strict desire and in the full wish to improve the Bill and make it more effective. He would say at once in respect to many of those criticisms, that if he did not notice them in the few observations he had to make to the House, he hoped it would not be thought he was passing them by unheeded. As a matter of fact, he wished to reserve any notice of them until he had had time to consider them—until, for instance, the points in respect of which they were raised were discussed in Committee. He repeated the promoters of the Bill ought to be satisfied with the discussion which had taken place, because, as far as he knew, there was only one speech made in opposition to the second reading of the measure. He had listened to every speaker who had taken part in the discussion, and he believed that, with the exception of the hon. Member for Cheltenham (Baron De Ferrières), who made a very remarkable speech, and the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), no one had done otherwise than declare himself as a supporter of the Bill. His hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Warton) who moved the Amendment, would forgive him if, for one occasion, he put him aside as having made a speech of secondary importance, and if he referred to the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), who, perhaps, would consider he (the Attorney General) was paying him a compliment when he said the hon. Gentleman was not only an opponent, but a bitter opponent, of the Bill. He felt that the opposition of the hon. Member was the only substantial opposition offered to the measure, and if he did not follow him into all the details into which he entered, but only referred to a few topics upon which the hon. Gentleman in his long speech touched, he would, no doubt, be pardoned. The hon. Member had entirely misunderstood the object of the Bill; he had entirely misunderstood the grounds upon which it was based; he seemed to be ignorant of the lines upon which it was drawn. In replying to the hon. Member, he must remind the House of the reason why the Bill had come into existence. When the summer and autumn of 1880 had closed, when the country knew there had been electoral corruption, which seemed to increase as the constituencies grew in size, when it was found that that corruption had been applied to that portion of the constituencies not long existent—he meant those men who had been lately enfranchised, and whose poverty rendered them an easy object to those who wished to corrupt—there was a general feeling that some steps must be taken by the Legislature to prevent the spread of corruption at elections. There was another evil, too, that was disclosed, and which had to be met. The Returns obtained showed the increased expenditure at Elections, an expenditure which also was increasing with the same rapidity and at the same rate that constituencies were increasing; the Returns showed that this was an evil almost as great in its effects as the evils of direct corruption. If the expenditure were to be increased, and were to continue to increase, even if there were no great abnormal change in the way of additions to the constituencies, it was manifest that the effect must be that men of position in the country would be driven to refuse to become candidates at elections. The old influences of a man's name, or position, or worth, were gradually being destroyed by the mere fact of the wealth, and often the unmeritorious wealth, of his opponent. Apart from the fact that extravagant expenditure was so near akin to corruption that it was almost the very father of corruption, it appeared to him, and to many other Members of the Government, that, even if it were not corrupt expenditure, it was necessary to check it, in order that they might maintain the character of the House and the position and character of Members who sat there. He appealed to hon. Members whether they had not all felt regret at the expenditure which, against their will, they had been obliged to incur—an expenditure which did not add either to the strength of their candidature, or any credit to the position which they occupied in the House, but which the mere fashion of constituencies had made it imperative upon them to incur. He had said that the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) apparently was either forgetful or ignorant of the objects of the Bill, because throughout the whole of his speech he clung to the old manner of electioneering. The hon. Member, to use his own words, had said that they could not "work their elections" under the Bill in the same manner as they had done heretofore. All that was admitted, and the hon. Gentleman might not have raised this point; it was to alter the old system, which the hon. Member was endeavouring to show could not be perpetuated under the Bill, that the Bill had been introduced; and he (the Attorney General) admitted that if the hon. Gentleman's case proceeded on the proposition that the Bill was simply to maintain the system that had existed in the past, he at once admitted that the hon. Gentleman was in the right. What was the value of the hon. Gentleman's argument when he endeavoured to show the House that they could not proceed in the future as they had done in the past? Allow him to give one or two instances of the hon. Member's contentions. The hon. Member said they would spend the money that was allowed under their Maximum Schedule, and they would spend it in paying professional agents and solicitors; and he placed before the House the argument that the solicitors who conducted elections would insist upon receiving the whole sum that would be allowed under the Schedule. He (the Attorney General) considered that was a slander upon the Profession of which the hon. Gentleman himself was so distinguished an ornament. He did not believe that the higher class of professional men would necessarily make a demand upon the maximum amount allowed in the Schedule. He appealed to the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory), and the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Whitley), whether that was a true statement of the character of the Profession? He believed that the best professional gentlemen they could have were men who were zealous politicians for their own sakes; he believed there were many solicitors who gave to candidates their labour, and the assistance of their skilled knowledge and ability, simply for the sake of serving the Party which they believed to be right, and that they were as willing to volunteer their efforts as men who did not happen to be solicitors. Was it true that the higher class of solicitors had no regard whatever for their political views? He believed the contrary to be the case. He believed it was the lower class of professional men who had no political opinions, and who sought only to work for their pay; that they were the men who, having no particular political views, sought to obtain the higher amount of remuneration, and that the distinguished men of the Profession to which the hon. Member belonged were the last men to make a bargain, or demand to be highly paid for their services. The hon. Gentleman seemed to feel that election agency could only be conducted by solicitors. He spoke of "Mr. Roger Chawbacon;" and he put forward the proposition that if the agent a candidate had to assist him was not a solicitor they would be left to the mercies of "Mr. Roger Chawbacon." But surely the support which proceeded from a man's zeal was equally as good as that of a man who worked for pay. He did not object to the saying that everyone was worthy of his hire; but he did object to men being employed at elections for political purposes. He could not understand why, in the counties to which the hon. Member had referred, elections should not be conducted, as in many places, solely and entirely by voluntary effort. Let him give the hon. Member and the House two instances in support of what he said. The first case he would mention was that of Hackney, where the two successful candidates combined polled 19,000 votes, with an expenditure of £914. Where were the services of professional men?

Mr. LEWIS: I referred to county constituencies.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James) said, the hon. Member instanced Londonderry, the borough he represented, as a reason why the Bill should not pass into law; and now, under the pressure of the one example of Hackney, he said he referred to counties. He (the Attorney General) would, perhaps, be allowed to carry out the example; £914 was spent in Hackney; but in another Metropolitan borough — Southwark — where fewer than 9,000 votes were polled, £8,000 was spent. So large an expenditure was incurred in Southwark simply because it was the mere fashion and the habit of the place. In the one case there were men to whom the hon. Member referred—professional men, whom he said would be paid, and whom it was the habit of the place to employ and highly pay—but in the other case, that of Hackney, a healthy system prevailed. In Hackney there were men ready to volunteer their work, and his two hon. Friends who sat on the Government Bench polled between them no less than 19,000 votes at an expenditure of £900, which meant volunteer effort only. Now, one word more in regard to what the hon. Gentleman had said; he had spoken tonight as if he were advocating the interests of electioneering agents; and he (the Attorney General) could not, under such circumstances, expect his support of the Bill, which waged war against those very persons. Electioneering agents added strength to neither Party. Let both Parties fight without them. There would be found, in their absence, the real strength of each Party, proved according to the true convictions of those who would then labour and fight. The candidates would then depend on the zeal and enthusiasm of those who laboured voluntarily in the interest of the cause which they considered to be right. An election would not then depend upon the clever trickery of an electioneering agent fighting with all his knowledge against those who would be raw and unskilled in the fight. The two Parties ranged on each side of this question were those who were candidates representing the public, and those who represented the interests of electioneering agents. Might he remind the House of an incident that occurred on the second reading of the Bill on the 25th of April last year? The right hon. Baronet the Member for Mid Kent (Sir William Hart Dyke), speaking from the Front Opposition Bench, made a sincere and earnest speech in favour of the Bill. He spoke as one occupying the position that any man might envy; he had done good service to the locality, and he was prepared to fight the battle both of himself, personally, and of the

Party to which he belonged, by his own worth, rather than by wealth and the tricks of election agency. The hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) rose to reply, and told the House that he had been the agent for the right hon. Baronet the Member for Mid Kent. The hon. Member for Londonderry as strongly and as bitterly opposed the Bill as he had done to-night. The lines were fairly marked out between those two speeches, and between him who opposed the Bill and those who supported it. He (the Attorney General), for one, should take the side of the candidate as against that of the agent. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Mid Kent had very truly stated that it was in the interests of everyone who sat or would sit in the House of Commons to seek to get rid of extravagant and unnecessary expenditure; and he (the Attorney General) thought the hon. Member for Londonderry would forgive him if he said that he believed his judgment would go in the same way if it had not been a little warped by his professional feeling. One word more as to the hon. Member's attack on the Bill. He pursued a course which it was for himself to judge whether it was quite right as a matter of advocacy. People who fought bitterly always fought badly. The hon. Member seemed to forget his situation, for, while disclaiming Party feeling, he did not spare his political opponents. He devoted a considerable portion of his speech to an analysis of the election expenses of the hon. Members whose names appeared on the back of the Bill. He said he assumed, for the sake of the hon. Members themselves, that every expense they were put to was absolutely necessary; that they spent not one farthing more in the Election of 1880 than they were compelled to spend; that the sum they were then called upon to spend they would always have to spend; and then he argued that, inasmuch as they would be allowed by the Maximum Schedule to spend much less than they were bound in 1880 to expend, the House ought to throw out the Bill. He appealed to any hon. Member whether such a contention could for one moment be supported. Was there one Member in the House who had not seen expenditure going on around him which he had to bear, which he had deeply regretted, which he had tried to prevent with as much earnestness as he had at his command, but in which endeavour he had been overborne by those around him, who told him such expenditure was necessary; it was permitted by law, and was incurred by their opponents? It was to protect themselves from foolish and unnecessary expenditure that the Bill was introduced; it was introduced to guard themselves not only against absolute corruption, but against the fact that candidates were being constantly preyed upon by a class of men who delighted in elections on account of the money they might obtain from the candidates. It was by reason of the large expenditure incurred in election contests that many good men were kept out of the House; but the hon. Member for Londonderry seemed to assume that no one was subject to large expenditure unless he wished it, and that everything was spent by the permission of the candidate. With the permission of the House, he (the Attorney General) would refer to certain words which, at the time he read them, struck him very forcibly. They were the words of a Gentleman who was formerly a Member of the House, and whose words would have considerable weight, he believed, with the hon. Gentleman himself. Mr. Alfred Hardy, whom the House would recollect contested one of the Divisions of Yorkshire in May of last year, at the end of an exciting contest made a speech in which he spoke of the expenditure that had taken place in the election. He made use of sentences which expressed a great deal of what he (the Attorney General) was endeavouring to lay before the House. Mr. Hardy said it was his belief that if half the paper, paste, and printers' ink used in the election was saved, and the other half pitched into the sea or burnt, it would be better for the candidate and better for his supporters. He did not suppose that anybody was such a fool as to be influenced by such bills as "Vote for Holden and down with Forster," and "Vote for Holden and the Land League." It was a way he did not approve of. He (the Attorney General) ventured to think that if Mr. Hardy was now a Member of the House he would have been an enthusiastic supporter of the Bill; yet, in the opinion of the hon. Member for Londonderry, such expenditure was necessary expenditure.

When they discussed the Bill in Committee he (the Attorney General) would show to the House there was no greater severity under the Bill than existed under the present law. He apologized to the hon. Member for Londonderry for having interrupted him once because he was stating his opinions pretty generally. The hon. Member, for instance, had said that if an agent paid even for a cockade the candidate would lose his seat; but what, however, the Government were dealing with now was a whole class of extravagant expenditure. If they were going to say there should be a maximum expenditure and no more, there should be some penalty if that maximum were exceeded. If there was not a sufficient penalty attached to the matter, honest men would obey the law, and dishonest men would disobey it. The hon. Gentleman's whole argument went on one proposition, which he stated very concisely to the House. He said that a candidate might not know what took place; and, therefore, he was not fairly liable, and, therefore, he would not be legally responsible. The object of the Bill was, to some extent, to get rid of the existing state of agency, which raised questions difficult to decide. The hon. Member said that a candidate might not know when a particular act took place; but, at the present moment, a candidate who lost his seat lost it probably through acts of which he knew nothing. At present a candidate was liable to lose his seat on account of the acts of some constituted agent, such as a committeeman; and that was an injustice for which he ought not to suffer. The hon. Gentleman said he had a remedy for the evils of the present system, which he would introduce at the proper time. He (the Attorney General) would listen most patiently to any suggestion which the hon. Gentleman could make, or which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) could suggest in Committee. He had already said that every opportunity would be afforded for the full discussion of every Amendment that was proposed, no matter from whichever side of the House it came; and if any Amendment could be suggested to remedy the practical inconvenience that might be shown to arise from the Schedules, they would be gladly accepted. He should fully consider any such suggestions, and accept them as cheerfully from one side as the other. There had been a great deal said by the hon. Member for Cheltenham (Baron De Ferrières) against the Bill, because, as he said, it did not provide for legitimate treating. He (the Attorney General) supposed that when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was speaking of hospitality, he had in his mind the hospitality which the Prime Minister received when visiting a noble Lord in the county of Mid Lothian, and that he meant to instance that as a case of legitimate treating. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chester — he begged the right hon. Gentleman's pardon, he ought to have said the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes)—speaking not very courteously, in some respects, of himself (the Attorney General), made an attack upon the Government for not having disfranchised Chester. Such was the burden of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. There was an Eastern proverb which said—"Cast not dirt into the fountain at which you have drunk;" and he should have thought that the right hon. Gentleman would have spared his late constituents, instead of turning accuser against them, and of reproaching the Government for not disenfranchising the constituency, a portion of which, at least, at one time, gave him earnest and enthusiastic support. The hon. Member for East Surrey (Mr. Grantham) criticized the Schedule of the Bill, and said it could not be supported. He mentioned in detail the expenses that existed in his own constituency, and said it would be impossible to carry on an election under the Bill. It might be, in East Surrey, impossible to carry on an election, as at present conducted, without such expenses. He would like to ask his hon. Friend (Mr. Grantham) if he was satisfied with things as they were in East Surrey, because he saw that the hon. Member and another Gentleman spent £13,000 on their election? Was the money well spent? If he objected to the Schedule of the Bill, did he not object to the account which was presented to him after the last election? Did he not think that much expense would have been avoided if there had been in force some such Schedule as was suggested. He (the

Attorney General) had little more to say now, for this was not the time to enter into the question in detail. The hon. Member for Londonderry said such legislation was demoralizing; that it would have a demoralizing effect upon the constituencies. His argument appeared to encourage bribery, for he sneered at the punishment which would be visited upon any man who accepted a bribe for his vote. He asked if it was possible to punish a man for receiving a bribe? When he heard that argument used by the hon. Member it did not affect him to be told by him that their efforts were demoralizing. Had the hon. Member nothing to say in respect of the demoralization that was now going on in the country, among rich and poor, on account of extravagant and unnecessary expenditure at elections? He (the Attorney General) was perfectly aware how inefficient the attempt he was making was to grapple with all the evils that existed in relation to our present electoral system. Hon. Members might point out one mode of corruption after another, and say the Bill did not deal with this or that. Let them propose to deal with those other forms of evil, and he would do his best to meet their views. He hoped the House would not condemn the Bill because it was not complete or perfect in every respect, which he believed to be impossible. He had set his mind on the work; he had done his best; and he hoped the House would meet the Bill in the same spirit in which it was proposed—namely, as an attempt, without one trace of Party feeling, to remove an evil which was a disgrace to all concerned, an evil which could do nothing but harm to the best interests of the country.

MR. R. N. FOWLER said, that as an Amendment stood in his name, which, by the Forms of the House, he had not had an opportunity of moving, he hoped the House would indulge him while he made a few observations. He wished to express his deep regret that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General, in bringing in the Bill, had abandoned another Bill which was introduced last year for the punishment of certain corrupt boroughs. Those boroughs returned 11 supporters of the Government and only three Conservatives; and it was possible that some people connected with Her Majesty's Government thought it was well that, as this Parliament was getting old, those boroughs should have an opportunity of returning 11 Liberals and three Conservatives on a future occasion. He did not suppose that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General allowed any such feeling to enter into his mind; but he agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke) in what he had said as to the action of the Home Secretary respecting the persons who were convicted of bribery at Macclesfield and Sandwich. He considered the right hon. Gentleman deserved the thanks of the country for the course he took in that matter. It seemed to him that the way to put down bribery was to deal severely with those who were convicted of the offence. The Government would have done well to adhere to the Bill they introduced last year for the disenfranchisement of Sandwich, Macclesfield, and Gloucester. If they were to spare boroughs which were proved to be steeped in corruption, he did not think the country would believe they really wanted to put down bribery. This Bill bristled with penalties, and he feared its effect would be to drive honest men from the House, and to fill it with men who were ready to perjure themselves and to take the risk of swearing that they had conducted a pure election, knowing full well that their election had not been pure. He would heartily support any honest attempt to put down corruption. There were many parts of the present Bill which he should be glad to support; but he regretted that Her Majesty's Government had determined to spare constituencies which were notoriously corrupt, and that the Bill, on the whole, would make it difficult for honest men to enter the House, while dishonest men would find little difficulty in obtaining an entrance.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed for Thursday."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he understood that a large number of Members wished to put down Amendments to the clause referring to agency; and he had to ask that, for greater convenience, the Bill should be committed for Monday.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James) did not think any inconvenience would arise by the Committee being taken on Thursday. Many Amendments to the clause dealing with agency were already put down; and he hoped the Motion he had made would be agreed to.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *committed* for *Thursday.*

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Postponed Resolutions [31st May] *considered.*

(10.) "That a sum, not exceeding £57,263, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he should like another opportunity for bringing on his Motion with reference to Mr. Errington's mission. Perhaps it would be convenient for him to bring it on on Thursday, after the Corrupt Practices Bill?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, if the noble Lord made that appeal he should at once accede to it.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I would press the right hon. Gentleman on the point.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Then let it be Thursday.

Resolution *further postponed* till *Thursday.*

(13.) "That a sum, not exceeding £100,233, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments."

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he should like some explanation from a Member of the Government as to the amount taken under this Vote for Law Charges. As the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade would himself see, these charges had grown very much of late. Early this year there was a Supplementary Estimate for the past year; and now they were asked for £22,550 for 1883-4, as against £18,300 for 1882-3. There appeared to be a growth in every item under the head of Law Charges, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would be glad of an opportunity of giving some explanation to the House upon a matter which was always regarded by hon. Members with considerable jealousy, and so regarded with justice, seeing that if a Vote was once set up, the House appeared to be totally unable to control it, however unsatisfactory the results attending it might appear. There was a legal establishment in the Office. There were items for legal charges in connection with the Merchant Shipping Acts and the Railway Passenger Acts, which were put down without any specification whatever; and it would be well that some explanation should be given upon the matter. The House should know whether the charge was for the legal establishment of the Board of Trade itself, or in respect of fees to solicitors and counsel for the various inquiries which were carried on in connection with the Board of Trade from time to time. This was a question upon which the Board of Trade would be able to give some information. It certainly appeared to him that the charges for inquiries—which were growing charges—were enormous. There was another matter also to which he should like to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. He saw that under the head of the Survey Staff there was a sum for salaries and wages, and also for payments to officers and others, which was formerly paid under this Vote. That occasioned a decrease in the Vote, the whole of these salaries having been transferred and charged on the Mercantile Marine Fund. The sum estimated was sufficient to meet the charge made on the Mercantile Marine Fund—the charge of £40,000 on that Fund was paid out of the money voted by Parliament, and not out of the Fund. The items seemed to be of different amounts, and he should like some explanation from the right hon. Gentleman with regard to them. He should like to know whether, under the new arrangement, which entitled the Board of Trade to charge these expenses on the Mercantile Marine Fund, the sanction of the Treasury was necessary to all payments, or whether the payments were made at the sole discretion of the Board of Trade from time to time?

Looking at the items in respect of the Mercantile Marine Fund, it would appear that large sums were dealt with under this regulation; and it would be satisfactory to the House to know that there was that Constitutional control over the question of salaries that was formerly exercised.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, he should be glad to give all the explanation in his power on the subject raised by the right hon. Gentleman. With regard to the last matter referred to, he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that last Session an Act was passed, called the Merchant Shipping Fees and Expenses Act, which dealt with the purely administrative question—a question not affecting in the slightest degree the responsibility of the Department, but merely arranging for the accounting between the Mercantile Marine Fund and the Consolidated Fund. That did not change the responsibility of the Board of Trade as to consulting the Treasury. With regard to the sum taken from the Consolidated Fund — the £40,000 to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred—that was a sum which, if his memory served him right, was fixed for five years from the date of the Act. It was calculated as being the balance of various accounts under the Merchant Shipping Acts that had hitherto been dealt with by the Treasury. He believed the alteration which had been effected made no difference whatever in the expenditure on the public funds. The right hon. Gentleman also called attention to the growth of the legal charges in the Department of the Board of Trade; and he (Mr. Chamberlain) quite agreed with him that there was no expenditure that was less satisfactory, and that one would more gladly see diminished. However, he did not think the increase was so great as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine. During the last five years the charge had been £17,000 or £18,000 — that was to say, the average per annum had been about that amount. For the present year, however, the Estimate was between £22,000 and £23,000. Of this latter sum about £3,000 was an exceptional expense incurred in connection with Crown Lands. That charge, and others which he could mention, which had been incurred with the sanction of the Treasury, and which had caused considerable expense, were abnormal, and not likely to recur. Then there was a sum of £1,000 for damages awarded against the Board of Trade in cases where the Board had detained ships which it had been subsequently found necessary to release. The sum was one which must, in some form or other, always appear in the accounts. It was impossible that the Board of Trade could undertake the duty of stopping ships which they believed to be unseaworthy —and which was a very important duty— without occasionally incurring damages in respect of the detention of ships which were ultimately shown to be fit to proceed to sea. The real cause of the great expense was on account of the wreck inquiries. These last year cost £18,000, the expenses being calculated on something like 230 or 240 separate inquiries. The average cost of these inquiries, which were not necessarily held in London, but which very often took place in the localities, was only £76, which was certainly not an extravagant sum, considering that the Courts were always assisted by two assessors, and that many witnesses were sometimes called, whose expenses had to be paid. The reason of these inquiries would be found in a Return, of which he had seen a proof copy, which would soon be distributed, giving statistics as to loss of life from shipwreck. The loss of life had increased, he was sorry to say; but the present was not the proper time to go into that question. It had followed that, as the number of wrecks had been greater than formerly, the number of inquiries had also increased. He could not help thinking that these investigations had been very useful. They had thrown a clear light on many of these wrecks; and he did not think that either the House or the country would desire that there should be any stint in regard to them. He trusted the explanation he had been able to give to the right hon. Gentleman would be satisfactory.

Resolution *agreed to.*

REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND) BILL.

(*Dr. Lyons, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Findlater.*)

[BILL 202.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. FINDLATER, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that this was a short and simple measure dealing with the question of granting holidays to a very hard-working, intelligent, and deserving class of men that was in the Registry of Deeds Office in Ireland. By the Act 2 & 3 *Will.* IV., c. 87, s. 1, it was enacted that the Registrar's Office should be kept open from the hour of 10 in the forenoon until the hour of 4 in the afternoon, of every day in the year, excepting Sundays, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, and days of public fast and thanksgiving. There had always been a strong feeling amongst the clerks in the Office that they were exceptionally ill-used, by not having the same number of holidays, half-days, and vacation that were allowed in other Public Departments in Dublin. This Bill had been framed to carry out the very moderate proposals of the Royal Commission as to holidays, and merely added to the meagre allowance given by the Act of *Will.* IV. the two week days after Christmas Day, Easter Monday, and Whitsun Monday, and a half day every Saturday.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Findlater.*)

Mr. COURTNEY said, he did not object to the second reading of the Bill, which was founded on the Report of a Royal Commission; but he thought that before the House went into Committee on it, if the hon. Member would do him the honour of conferring with him, they would be able to introduce Amendments which would more satisfactorily carry out the recommendations of the Commission.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he thought the House was rather in a difficulty with regard to this Bill. The hon. Member (Mr. Findlater) had spoken in such an undertone, and the hon. Member who followed him (Mr. Courtney) had also made his observations so inaudibly, that it had been impossible for anyone who was not sitting close to them to gather what they were saying with regard to the Bill. The House generally did not know the object of the measure, and were unable to form an opinion as to whether it was desirable to support or oppose it. He thought he had heard the Secretary to the Treasury state that the Government proposed inserting Amendments in the Bill; but the Irish Members did not know whether these were Amendments to which they would be able to agree. For these reasons, he begged to move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he hoped the hon. Member would not put the House to the trouble of a division. The object of the Bill was to extend the principle of Bank Holidays in the case of the clerks of the Registry of Deeds Office in Ireland. At a later stage the hon. Member would be able to see the provisions of the Bill. He (Mr. Chamberlain) hoped the hon. Member would not think it desirable to persist in his Motion.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that after the explanation he had received from the President of the Board of Trade he would not press his Motion. He had, however, thought it desirable that the House should know something about the measure, as the hon. Gentleman who moved the second reading had not seemed to think it a subject in which the Irish Members had any concern, or in which they took any interest. After the extremely lucid explanation of the right hon. Gentleman he begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Friday.*

CORN SALES BILL.—[Bill 95.]

(*Mr. Rankin, Sir Joseph Bailey, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Biddell, Mr. H. T. Davenport, Mr. Williamson.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. RANKIN said, he begged to move the second reading of this Bill; but at that hour—12.40 a.m.—he would not enter into detail upon it. He would tell the House as briefly as he could its object. His reason for introducing it was to get rid of the state of chaos which at present existed in regard to weights and measures for the sale of corn. A great many of the so-called measures by which corn was sold were weights and not measures at all, and varied considerably in almost every town. There were about 40 weights and measures in common use by which wheat was sold, 15 of which were weighed bushels, varying from 58½ lbs. to 80 lbs.; in like manner there were 22 for barley, and 24 for oats. It was needless to dwell upon the inconvenience which arose from such a state of things, as it must be patent to everybody. A man might buy corn in one town, and, desiring to purchase elsewhere, might go to another town and commence dealing under the impression that the measures in use were the same as those adopted in the town he had left. He might base his calculations upon that belief, and he would find that he had been mistaken, and considerable confusion would ensue. He could give many examples of different measures; but, considering the lateness of the hour, he would refrain from doing so. The principles of the Bill were—First, uniformity; secondly, weight, and not measure; and, thirdly, that the cental, or 100 lbs. weight, should be the system adopted in corn sales. It was very possible to make a bushel weigh different numbers of pounds; it was easy to fill up a bushel so that it might weigh more or less as the case might be. Weight, therefore, was by far the more convenient method of dealing with the matter. The general opinion of those who were interested in the trade, of those who were best able to form a judgment, was that the cental, or 100 lbs., was the most convenient weight to adopt. The two stock objections that were urged against the cental were that the weights now in use would be altogether useless, and that the sacks now employed would be also useless. Both of those objections were of little avail. New weights would not be required, because the old weights of 56 lbs., 28 lbs., and 4 lbs., if taken together — namely, three 56 lbs. one 28 lbs., and one 4 lbs., weights would make up 200 lbs. In the same way the sacks now in use could easily be made to hold 200 lbs., 225 lbs., or 250 lbs., as required, and according to the grain put into them. He had heard the tithe collection mentioned as a difficulty in the way of the Bill. As a matter of fact, the tithe collection presented no difficulty at all, because by last year's Corn Returns Bill a bushel of wheat was legally fixed at 60 lbs. weight, of barley at 50 lbs. and of oats at 39 lbs.; and to reduce any of those weights to their value in proportion to the cental merely required a proportion sum. It was well, perhaps, that he should inform the House that 22 out of 47 Chambers of Agriculture who had answered his letter relating to the Bill had passed resolutions in favour of the adoption of the cental, or 100 lbs. weight; 13 other Chambers had passed resolutions in favour of a uniform weight, without specifying the cental; nine had not considered the question at all; but he was informed by the Secretaries of several of them that they were generally in favour of a uniform weight, and three Chambers only had passed resolutions against a uniform weight. He was informed that amongst millers the feeling in favour of the cental was even greater than amongst farmers. Millers Associations had passed resolutions in favour of the Bill, and a large number of independent millers and merchants in all parts of the country had expressed approval of the measure. Up to the present time 28 Petitions had been presented in favour of the Bill, while only one had been presented against it. It would be well known to most hon. Members that a great effort was made in 1878 to get this measure passed, and that the great consensus of opinion at that time was in favour of the adoption of one uniform weight—namely, the cental. The cental was now in use in the chief grain port of the country—namely, Liverpool; and there it had been found to work extremely well, the opposition springing almost entirely from one class—the small dealers —but at that late hour he would not dwell upon their objections. He merely introduced the subject in the expectation that it would receive the attention of the authorities; and he hoped the Government would see their way to take up the measure themselves. He was led to believe last year, from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, that he was not altogether opposed to the principle of the Bill. He hoped they would hear from the right hon. Gentleman to-night that he was still in the same mind; because he was fully persuaded that the measure would be greatly welcomed by farmers, millers, merchants, and, in fact, by the majority of the persons engaged in the trade. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Rankin.*)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he was sorry the hon. Member had not had the opportunity of bringing the Bill forward at an earlier period of the evening, when it might have been more fully discussed. He did not wish to question the statement the hon. Member had just made, that when he did him the honour to speak to him on the subject he expressed himself personally in favour of the adoption of a uniform weight. He also said, however, that nothing could be more undesirable than to harass trade by insisting upon uniformity unless the trade was in favour of it. He also told the hon. Gentleman that he was anxious to receive proof that the trade, the persons chiefly concerned, were practically unanimous in desiring that this change should be made compulsory; and he was now bound to say that he had received evidence which went directly in the contrary direction. He had received Memorials from various important bodies, including the members of the London Corn Exchange, protesting against anything like a compulsory alteration of the present system. They had no objection to make the cental a legal weight; but they saw that, in the present state of trade, nothing but the greatest possible inconvenience would result from making one single weight compulsory. The experience of the Board of Trade was all in the same direction. He remembered that a good deal of evidence was given before a Committee which sat on Weights and Measures some years ago with respect to bushels and some other weights; and it was shown that weights which had been made illegal by Act of Parliament were, nevertheless, in constant use in certain districts. Under the circumstances, he could not to-night assent to the second reading of the Bill, although he would promise the hon. Member that the subject was one which the Board of Trade would not lose sight of. The Board of Trade would be glad, when opinions in favour of the proposed change was riper, to give whatever support to it that was in their power. They did not think that, at the present time, public opinion was ripe for the change. He gathered from what the hon. Gentleman himself had said that he had raised the question more for the purpose of discussing the question than anything else. If that was the hon. Gentleman's view, he would be glad to find that he would be willing, on the present occasion, to withdraw the Bill, and to rest satisfied with the promise which he (Mr. Chamberlain) was now pleased to give, that the matter should certainly continue to receive the attention and consideration of the Board of Trade. If the hon. Gentleman went to a division he should be obliged to vote against him.

Mr. WHITLEY said, he was sorry to hear the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, because he was under the impression that the feeling of the trade was unanimously in favour of the change. He had received strong representations that the feelings of the corn merchants of Liverpool was favourable to the adoption of the cental; and he was led to believe that not only farmers, but the members of the trade generally, approved of the proposed change. He was told that in Liverpool the cental had worked exceedingly well, and that the traders there thought it a matter of the greatest importance that there should be a uniformity of weight. He confessed he had hoped to receive a favourable answer from the President of the Board of trade. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would allow the Bill to stand over for a month, in the hope that, in the meantime, the opinion of the trade might be ascertained.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT said, he did not think it would be wise for his hon. Friend (Mr. Rankin) to persevere in moving the second reading in the teeth of the strong speech of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it would be very undesirable to adopt a uniformity of measure such as was proposed, if, in reality, there was a strong feeling against it. He had hoped to hear the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade say he would consent to the second reading, on the understanding that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, in order that they might have ascertained what was the result of the Act passed in the last Parliament. He would now move the Adjournment of the Debate; and, in the interval, the President of the Board of Trade would, doubtless, receive a deputation on behalf of the promoters of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. J. G. Talbot.*)

MR. O'SHEA said, he thought it would be advantageous that some time should be given for an expression of opinion, which he ventured to think would be found in favour of the Bill.

MR. RANKIN said, he should be most happy to adopt the suggestion of his hon. Friend (Mr. Talbot); but he must say that, in order to save the time of the House, he had refrained from quoting the large mass of public support which he had received in favour of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman could hardly believe the support to the Bill which had come from all parts of the country; but, if desired, he should be glad to lay it before the President of the Board of Trade.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* 2nd July.

LAND TAX ASSESSMENTS (APPEALS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, Bill to amend the Law respecting Appeals from Assessments under the Land Tax Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, Mr. DAVEY, and Mr. GREGORY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 213.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 5th June, 1883.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Gas and Water Provisional Orders * (76); Water Provisional Orders * (77); Stolen Goods * (78); Pawnbrokers * (79).

Second Reading—Cathedral Statutes (58).

Committee—Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) * (31).

CATHEDRAL STATUTES BILL.—(No. 58.)

(*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that substantially the same Bill, bearing the same title, was passed by their Lordships last Session, but was lost, because the other House had not time to consider it. It was desired to pass it first through the other House this Session; but the Member in charge of it was so unfortunate in the ballot that the attempt had to be abandoned. Therefore, the Royal Commissioners, on whose Report the Bill was founded, acquiesced in the alternative of again introducing the Bill in this House, in the hope that it would be passed by their Lordships, and sent down to the Commons in time for it to be considered and to become law. The Bill had been altered in some respects, in order to make certain points more clear and to obviate objections that were urged on a former occasion in this House. Among the special instructions to the Cathedral Commissioners were these two — that they should devise a convenient method of altering, from time to time, Cathedral Statutes, and that they should make a separate Report upon each Cathedral. It was soon found that each separate Report would consist mainly of a proposed new body of Statutes; and this was stated in the first Report of the Commission presented a year ago. Up to this time three such Reports had been laid before Her Majesty, and by Her Majesty's Command before Parliament; seven more were very nearly ready; four more were well advanced, and would probably be presented before the end of the Session; considerable progress had been made with others; and it would, perhaps, take about 12 months more to get through all. The Dean and a representative Canon of each Cathedral were constituted co-ordinate Commissioners, and had been taken into counsel in dealing separately with each Cathedral. The Cathedrals were so different in their original foundation, geographical situation, and relation to population, that it was impossible to lay down a general rule that would apply to all. It was necessary that some method should be devised for giving legal effect to the bodies of Statutes which the Commissioners had prepared; and that was the object of the Bill. In existing Statutes—at least, in those of the New Foundation — power was reserved to the Queen to alter them from time to time. It was thought that this power should be continued, but that, instead of merely saying it should exist, a definite process of exercising it should be laid down. It was proposed that there should be a Committee of the Privy Council, and that it should have the power of considering Statutes laid before Her Majesty by the Cathedral Commissioners while they existed; and that afterwards it should be in the power of each Dean and Chapter, with the approval of the Visitor, to lay before the Committee of the Privy Council any new Statutes or alterations that might be thought desirable. It could scarcely be urged now, as it was last year, that this Bill was a leap in the dark, because there had been laid before Parliament several Reports which might be taken as samples of the rest. In 1853 Her Majesty issued a Commission to some very notable men, and that Commission presented an exceedingly able Report. It recommended, among other things, that an Executive Commission should issue for the purpose of giving new Statutes to the different Cathedrals in accordance with that Report. The Commission to which he had been referring presented its Report and died; and its Report virtually died with it, because there was nobody to take it up. The present Cathedral Commissioners wanted to make it as sure as they could that there should be some result of the labours in which they had been engaged. They had been working very steadily and diligently for a long time; and they would be exceedingly sorry if, after all, no good result should be achieved. It was for that purpose that they desired to pass the present Bill into law. The Cathedrals of England were in three different conditions. Some had no Statutes at all, and there was a general feeling on the part of the Governing Bodies of those Cathedrals that they ought to have them; and they would be very glad to have some such machinery as was now proposed for the purpose of giving them Statutes. The second class of Cathedrals comprised those of the new foundation, which owed their existence, as Cathedrals, to the action of King Henry VIII. These had Statutes, but they were, to a great extent, antiquated; and there was no practical power of changing those Statutes at the present time and adapting them to present wants. He believed that the Governing Body of this class of Cathedrals almost unanimously accepted the proposal that some machinery should be devised to enable them to amend their Statutes. The third class, to which St. Paul's, London, belonged, consisted of the Cathedrals of the Old Foundation. The Petitioners, whose Petition had just been read, claimed that they had a right at the present time to alter their Statutes with the help of the Bishop of the diocese. That was a legal question on which he would not venture to pass an opinion; but if the Cathedrals of the old foundation really possessed the power they claimed, he maintained that they ought not to have it. It was said that the Dean and Chapter, with the Bishop, had the power of altering their Statutes. This Bill did not propose to take from them that power; but it provided that before a Statute could acquire the force of law it should go before a responsible tribunal, which would give to all persons interested notice of the intended change, and would hear them on the subject. He thought it was manifest that some such tribunal ought to exist, and that it ought not to be in the power of one particular portion of a body to make or alter rules—possibly to the injury of other members of the body—without any publicity being given to the transaction and without bringing the proposal before Her Majesty in Council. He had not great faith in galvanizing dead bodies into life; but he did not believe the Cathedral Bodies were dead. There had, no doubt, been periods of sleepiness and, perhaps, even of suspended animation; but there was great life in the Cathedrals at the present time, and he believed a helping hand, given in a friendly way, as Her Majesty's Commissioners were desirous of giving their hand, would be a very great assistance to them in doing the duty which they were desirous of doing. The Commissioners desired primarily to revise diocesan life. They did not want the extreme parts of a diocese to say that they had nothing to do with the Cathedral. Both with regard to the services and to the sermons preached within it the Cathedral ought to take the lead, and to exhibit the life of the diocese in its best and highest form. A great deal might be done incidentally in this direction. They could not force men by means of new Statutes; but they might indicate what was desired and expected from a Cathedral, and then they could leave public opinion to work. In conclusion, the right rev. Prelate moved the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2." —(*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle.*)

THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH: My Lords, after the earnest labour of my right rev. Brother in the cause of Cathedral reform, it may seem ungracious in me to raise any opposition to this Bill. But I must say I very earnestly wish that my right rev. Brother would not press this Bill to a second reading to-night in this House. The reasons that I have for making this suggestion to my right rev. Brother are not merely, and are not mainly, the objections which I take to certain provisions in the Bill, although I do take very strong objections to some of them, and although I do desire to lay those objections before your Lordships. My objections to the passing of the Bill through this House are of a somewhat larger kind; and they refer rather to the conditions and the circumstances surrounding this Bill, and, indeed, surrounding every attempt made in this House within the last few years at Church legislation and Church reform. In the first instance, we have rather to deal with that than with the details of the Bill itself. I myself entertain objections to any further attempts in this House at Church reform or Church legislation, and I take this opportunity of laying these before your Lordships. Now, my Lords, let us observe the circumstances and conditions under which this Bill appears in this House. In the first place, my right rev. Brother has told you that this Bill is the result of a Royal Commission appointed at the instance of this House. In the next place, he has quite correctly told you that it is a Bill which very largely interferes, in two important particulars, with the powers and Prerogatives of the Crown; by the appointment of a Committee of the Privy Council, and by the proposed *quasi*-veto of both Houses of Parliament. In these respects the Bill limits the power which the Crown formerly had of dealing with the Statutes of Cathedrals of the New Foundation. In the third place, this Bill deals with very large and very important interests. It deals not only with the internal government of all our Cathedrals, but also with the relations of those Cathedrals with the diocese; and it deals with the dioceses themselves. It exceeds the power given to the Commission. It is a Bill very large in its scope, touching the most important interests of the Church of England, and affecting even the Prerogatives of the Crown. Such a Bill ought not to have been introduced by a private Member of this House, however eminent. A Bill dealing with such a subject, and especially one dealing with the Prerogatives of the Crown, should have been introduced, if at all, upon the responsibility of the Ministers of the Crown. The Bill, if it was to be introduced, should have been a Government measure, or, at least, brought forward with the distinct promise and assurance, not only of the support of the Government in this House, but also in another House, where the fate of Church Bills is not always so prosperous as it is here. I trust I may be pardoned if I claim this at the hands of the Government, not as a matter of favour, but of right. There is still in this country such a thing as the union of Church and State. As to whether or not that union is desirable, different persons have different opinions. No one will deny that as long as that union exists it implies mutual service and aid on both parts. In any matter in which the Church seeks for a reform of her Statutes, she has an established right, arising out of that union, to ask for it from the State. The point at which the restraint and power exercised by the Crown impinge most upon the Church is in this very matter of reform. We have no right to alter a line or letter of our Statutes without the consent of the Crown. Some think that to be an unfair restraint—I am not one of them. If it has restrained the liberty of the Church at large, it greatly protects the liberty of the individual members of the Church. But for such restraint, we might have had the majority turning out the minority more than once in past years. Upon this point of the alteration of the Statutes the State does restrain the Church more than upon others. If my right rev. Brother were to attempt to alter the Statutes of Carlisle, or I those of Peterborough, we should soon be corrected by the present eminently Constitutional Ministry, which has always sought to keep the Church in her proper place. But if that right exists on the part of the State, then it involves a correlative right on the part of the Church, whenever she desires the alteration of her Statutes to apply to the Government of the time being to effect such alterations. Now, if I may presume to describe the attitude of the present Ministry towards such applications by the Church, I would say that it is an attitude of silent and apparently comtemptuous indifference. I do not say that they are not actuated by an ardent desire for the reform of the Church. But they have not manifested that desire, except in the case of the Burials Bill, in which it so happened that the reform was clamoured for by the enemies of the Church and deprecated by its friends. If, however, the assistance of the Government in this matter may be rightly claimed in this House, infinitely more may it be claimed in the other House of Parliament. In this House it is still, happily, possible for a private Member to bring in and to carry a Bill. This House is the last refuge of more than one remnant of Constitutional liberty. But it is a matter of notoriety that, in the face of the democratic despotism which now dominates the Parliamentary Institutions of this country, no private Member in the other House has a chance of carrying a Bill. Certainly, as regards ecclesiastical legislation, it is absolutely impossible for any private Member to carry a measure seeking reform in the Church. There exists in the other House a considerable number who are united in this one thing, if in nothing else—that no measure, if it be intended for the spiritual and moral efficiency of the Church, shall, I will not say be read a second time, but even allowed a hearing for a second reading. Again and again have Bills of this nature gone down from this House; but they have been prevented from obtaining even a decent hearing. The motives for this course are transparent. One motive is to make the hand of the State as heavy as possible on the Church, and so to disgust Churchmen themselves that they will cry out for separation, it being remembered that when the wife seeks the divorce the husband generally manages to do what he likes with the dower. Then, again, you cannot make a spiritual and moral reform of the Church without strengthening the Establishment. Every abuse is a weakness to the Establishment, and that is why the Church's enemies desire to perpetuate abuses in the Church. When Churchmen ask for the removal of these abuses and the reform of these evils, the champions of them are not Churchmen, but the more earnest Members of Nonconformity in the House of Commons. Their policy was well expressed in the amiable prayer of a well-known Dissenting minister, some years ago, who solemnly and piously prayed that the Church of England might be worse than she is, in order that she might stink in the nostrils of the people. As to the injustice or cynical immorality of such a policy I have nothing to say. But this policy exists, and is being steadily and ably carried out. Whenever the Bill of the right rev. Prelate reaches the other House—if it does reach it—it will encounter the opposition of two classes of persons. One class will ask this one question, and this only—"How may I, by my speech and vote, best injure the Church of England?" The opposition of the other class will be not less earnest; and their question will be—"How, by my vote and speech, may I best injure the Christian religion?" The struggle is perfectly hopeless, in the existing condition of Parliamentary life and Parties, against such an alliance as this, unless such a Bill as this receives the support of the Leaders of the Government in that House. It has not the slightest chance of reaching a second reading, unless the Prime Minister were to rise in his place, and, turning round to his supporters, say — "Gentlemen, whatever may be your opinion as to the merits or advantages of the existing union between Church and State, while that union exists, it ought to be fairly and justly dealt with on both sides. Destroy it if you like, and if you can; but while it exists, deal honestly with it." But the Prime Minister will say nothing of the kind. He will see the Bill strangled by those who call themselves his followers, and over whom he still exercises a considerable amount of Party influence. That being the case, my Lords, it being a positive certainty that the Bill will be thus strangled, it is as well to face plain facts. I have never been able to learn the art of make-believe, and I think it is always better to deal with facts; and it is an undoubted fact that the Church of England is not in Parliament strong in proportion to her decided numerical majority in this country. The Church of England numbers some two-thirds of the population of the country—for the assertion that it numbers only one-third is simply ridiculous—and yet this strength is not anything like fairly represented in Parliament. And why? The Church of England in Parliament, and especially in the House of Commons, is politically weak, for a reason which is highly creditable to her—namely, because she is politically neutral. She takes little or no part in Party politics. She tries to do good to the whole nation, and not to a portion of it only; and consequently, in her assemblies, she is not given to pass resolutions in favour of the proceedings of this or that Ministry. The Church of England has not yet earned the dubious and unfortunate compliment from any Prime Minister that she is the great backbone of his Party. She has higher and more noble aims than that, and the consequence is that she cannot bring to the political market her alliance for sale to any one Party. The result is that she is somewhat lightly regarded by one Party, and is not, perhaps, quite so strongly supported by the other as she might be. She suffers somewhat in the same way that a neutral country does which is placed between two contending States, the armies of which overrun it in turn. Her position is this. Because she will not make a bargain and a political compact with either Party, and because she will not offer her alliance solely and exclusively to one Party, she suffers from the armed neutrality of one Party, and derives but little assistance from the cautious and guarded friendship of the other Party in the State. That must continue to be her position, and I should be sorry if she were to exchange it for any other at the cost of her independence and her higher and more noble aims. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I make no imputation whatever upon the motives of the Government in relation to this question. Neither do I make the slightest imputation against the motives of those who are her lukewarm friends. Their action is the fault, not of themselves, but of their unhappy political necessities. But, depend upon it, the weight of the Government will not be given in support of the Bill in the other House, because the Government, in the presence of its "great backbone," dreads the spinal irritation which is induced in a man by a perpetual quarrel with that part of his body. The Government will not, dare not, support the Bill. That being so, what I wish to put to my right rev. Brethren is this—What is the use of continually passing in this House well-considered and well-matured measures for the reform of the Church, and in the true interests of the Church, when we know perfectly well that they will be strangled in the other House of Parliament with the cheerful acquiescence of Her Majesty's Government? I submit to my right rev. Brethren that it would be better and wiser for us not to subject the Church of England and this House to the perpetual humiliation of having to go hat in hand to the other House, and praying to be allowed, for pity's sake, to remedy any existing defects in the laws of the Church. Those who are the supporters of the Church of England may well accept the position as it stands, which is by no means an unfavourable one. Politically, we are placed in this position. We are desirous of remedying every real abuse and defect that exists in the Church, while those who are the enemies of the Church are desirous of seeing those abuses perpetuated. Those who are opposed to the reform of the Church are not the Churchmen, but the political Dissenters. If the Church of England continues to neglect Party politics for spiritual objects, she will in, the end, be the gainer, not only spiritually, but politically. The political power of the future in this country will lie with the masses; and the Church of England, which devotes herself to labouring among the masses, without intriguing with political Parties, will, in the end, prove the most powerful. The force that moves nations in the end, and in the long run, is the spiritual force; and in the end, and in the long run, the spiritual Society will prevail over any number of political Clubs. If, therefore, Dissenting religious Bodies choose to transform themselves into political Clubs, the result will be that they will lose that which the Church of England is rapidly gaining—the affection of the masses by whom the fate of the Establishment, and of other political institutions too, will before long have to be decided. Believing, therefore, that it is far wiser for us to accept facts and to face our present position as it is, and not to press on always to meet with humiliation, I earnestly entreat my right rev. Brethren to hold their hands, and not to attempt to force on Church reforms in Parliament, but to try and work within our existing limits. Those limits are not so confined but that we can do great and noble work within them. Let us compare the present position of St. Paul's, and of Westminster Abbey, and of our other great Cathedrals, with that which they occupied 30 or 40 years ago, and we shall see what may be done within her existing limits to gain the affections of the masses. Therefore it is that I press upon my right rev. Brother not too hastily to seek to press this Bill through your Lordships' House. I am afraid, however, that no arguments of mine will induce my right rev. Brother to withdraw his Bill. But I think that if I can succeed in showing to your Lordships that this is a very bad Bill, I may do my right rev. Brother an indirect service by securing for his measure a few votes from among the more earnest and pious political Dissenters of the other House. This Bill really consists of two Bills, entirely different in principle, and entirely different in result. The first part of it proposes to deal with the Cathedrals from above by means of regulations which are to be pressed upon reluctant Bodies. That is a proceeding by way of gift and compulsion. Under it the Commissioners are, to a great extent, pressing upon the Cathedral Bodies certain very large and theoretical and experimental reforms, which will be reluctantly accepted by those Bodies. The second part of the measure provides that the Cathedral Bodies, moving from below, shall have power of themselves to propose new Statutes, and thereby, of course, to repeal the new ones they have just had forced on them by the Commission. Therefore, we are to have reforms descending from above, and counter reforms rising from below. Then the Statutes are to be laid upon the Tables of both Houses for 12 weeks before they become law, and the result will be that your Lordships' time will be occupied in discussing some 26 different little Acts of Parliament in the shape of Cathedral Statutes. That is not a very pleasant prospect; but there is more than this. These Statutes are to lie on the Table of the other House, leaving it open to any Member of that House to move the rejection of any clause, or any line in any clause. We have heard a good deal of "veiled Obstruction." Would your Lordships consider for a moment the infinite possibilities of veiled Obstruction thus presented to any obstructing Members of the other House, if there be any such. It fatigues my imagination even to picture to myself the results of the introduction of these 26 Acts of Parliament, containing about 1,000 clauses, to lie for 12 weeks on the Table of the House of Commons—it being open to any Member of that House to raise a debate on any clause, and on any line. These Bills will be received with a positive shriek of welcome in the Lower House, with their infinite opportunities for Obstruction. I hardly like to use a ludicrous image on such a question; but I can only liken the arrival of these Bills in the House of Commons to the arrival of some poor little boy—some chubby little creature—just escaped from the custody and care of his parents, or sisters, upon the playground of some large school, where all the naughty and rude spirits gather about him to draw his hat over his eyes, to pull his hair, and practise other little schoolboy amenities upon his person. Imagine these Bills brought upon the playground of the House of Commons. Imagine, for one moment, the Leader of that Party, which, it seems to me, is incorrectly and unjustly described as the Irish Party, in that House taking one of these Bills and distributing the clauses among the Members of his Party, much as an experienced stage manager distributes the characters in a play, each favoured actor having his respective part. Suppose the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) taking that part which refers to dress and deportment and vestments; another—let us suppose the hon. Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) taking up questions of precedence, which I have seen is in some of these Statutes, between Deans and Archdeacons, on the ground that those nice questions of precedence and personal honour might, perhaps, lead to breaches of the peace. Imagine, further, the Leader of that Party crossing the House of Commons and asking the junior Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh)—who by that time, perhaps, may have obtained a vote and voice in the House of Commons —to move the rejection of a clause which deals with what he may regard as the too frequent administration of the Holy Communion. I ask nothing about the effect of all this on the feelings of the Church, because the time has long passed when the feelings of the Church are much considered in modern legislation; but I ask you, Members of the Government here present, how you will relish this prospect of infinitely prolonged, absolutely interminable Obstruction to every one of these clauses? That consideration alone seems to me quite conclusive. And, observe, it is entirely unnecessary. The introduction of Parliament into this matter is purely gratuitous. Parliament until now had given to the Crown the power of dealing with the alteration of Cathedral Statutes, and in so doing had amply secured that control of the State which I admit should be exercised over the Church so long as Church and State remain united. But my right rev. Brother is not satisfied with this, but goes out of his way to invite the interference of the House of Commons. The House of Commons is not anxious to meddle with Cathedral Statutes. It knows extremely little about the internal details of Cathedral government; but when he invites the House of Commons to interfere, and asks if they will be kind enough to come and pull our Cathedrals about, I think he will find the House of Commons disposed to take him at his word. When he puts up an invitation to stop and ring the bell, common politeness will induce the House of Commons to stop and do it. He would have done much better if he had not brought in this entirely unnecessary consent of Parliament between the Crown and the Cathedrals. These Statutes, moreover, are much wider in their scope and more far-reaching than appears from the speech of my right rev. Brother. For instance, one deals with the establishment of a Diocesan Council for the discussion of grave matters affecting the welfare of the dioceses, and it proposes that the Bishop should invite to it not only the Deans and Archdeacons, but the Dean of the Cathedral, the Minor Canons, and the Master of the Grammar School. I have great respect for Masters of Grammar Schools; but I cannot see that the presiding over 20 little boys in the Cathedral precincts is to make him a fit person to advise the Bishop as to the government of some remote village in his diocese. I merely mention this, in passing, to show that these reforms are not small, that they are theoretic, that they are experimental, and would lead to most undesirable and almost interminable complications in the internal affairs of the Cathedrals. For these reasons, because I believe this Bill to be too experimental, too theoretic, and too ambitious, as well as unfortunate as regards the time of its introduction; because I believe it will lead to a most undesirable intervention of Parliament between the Crown and the Cathedrals; because of the infinite opportunities for Obstruction in the way of legislation which it presents to certain Members of the other House; and because it will tend to disturb, to confuse, and, therefore, to enfeeble the Church, instead of strengthening and reforming it—I will presume not to move the rejection of the second reading, but to appeal earnestly to my right rev. Brother to consider whether, under the circumstances of the case, it is desirable to press to a second reading and carry through the House a Bill which I firmly believe cannot become law.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, the right rev. Prelate who has just sat down having made an appeal to the Government, I may venture a few words. It does not appear to me to be difficult to meet the appeal. The right rev. Prelate, I understand, opposes this Bill. At the same time, he blames the Government for being themselves unwilling to undertake a Bill which he described as not only unnecessary, but mischievous. And he also urges how undesirable it is to add anything which might interfere with legislation going on in the House of Commons, the success of which, I suppose, therefore, he ardently desires. Although the right rev. Prelate says that he has great difficulty in trying to make believe, I really think he was too modest on this occasion, because it requires some effort to imagine that his speech was intended to convince your Lordships of that which

I trust is the case with the Church of England generally, whatever exceptions there may be, that she is starting now on the idea of entirely separating herself from any Party feeling or Party bias. I must say that in the speech to which we have just listened the right rev. Prelate managed not to confine his sneers entirely to the House of Commons or to the Liberal Party; but he administered some counsel, in a milder form, even to the Party so well represented on the opposite side. The right rev. Prelate, however, contradicts himself most completely. He thinks the Bill thoroughly bad, and yet he calls upon me to explain to your Lordships why Her Majesty's Government refrain from supporting it. In the beginning of his speech the right rev. Prelate declared that he would not, if he could, let the Bill pass through this House, because it was certain to be rejected in the other House, and at the end he contented himself with appealing to his right rev. Brother to abandon it, giving as a reason that the Bill was of a character which would tempt the House of Commons to intermeddle in the interests and institutions of the Church. It is under circumstances like these that the Government are asked to explain why they have not themselves taken up the Bill.

The Bishop of PETERBOROUGH: Perhaps the noble Earl will allow me to explain. The noble Earl fails to observe that I said that the Government should take up this Bill if they approved of it. I was not so absurd as to suppose that the Government would do this, whether they approved of it or not. What I did say was, that the Government should condescend to have an opinion on the subject one way or another.

Viscount CRANBROOK said, that as he had had the honour of acting upon the Commission of which the right rev. Prelate was also a Member, and as he had had the advantage also of acting for three years in conjunction with, and under the guidance and superintendence of, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, he thought their Lordships must be surprised at the tone taken with respect to the work of that Commission. He should not occupy much of their time in discussing the Statutes of the Commission. If they came before the House as, indeed, they were now on the Table in respect to some of the Cathedrals, and their Lordships thought proper to call attention to them, it would be in their power to do so. The Bill was not founded upon any of the new notions of which the right rev. Prelate who had strongly opposed it had spoken; but it had followed the course which had been taken in reference to the University Statutes under the Commission that inquired into the Universities, and no such obstruction had been met with in the House of Commons on those matters as that which the right rev. Prelate had urged as a reason why their Lordships should not send the Bill to the other House. In fact, the Statutes of the Universities were laid one by one before the Houses of Parliament, and, so far as he was aware, there had been but little discussion on them in either House on any occasion. Therefore, if they could judge by precedent, they might fairly conclude that the same thing would take place with respect to the Cathedrals. No one could be more desirous than he was that the Government should undertake a measure of this description for giving effect to the proceedings of the Royal Commission. Every effort was made that the Bill might be in the hands of the Government. But everybody knew that the Government had been overwhelmed with business both in this Session and in the last, and they did not feel that it was very likely that the Government would take upon themselves the labour of carrying the Bill through. But they gave it their support, in that House, at all events. On no occasion had they voted against it, and it was read a second time last Session, and passed through Committee with their assent. Besides this, he might also state to their Lordships, in reference to the Commission itself, that when two vacancies occurred the Prime Minister added two members to it—Lord Blachford and Sir Walter James. Could it be supposed that the Prime Minister, in adding those names instead of allowing the Commission to die a natural death, was doing that which was a mere farce, and that he had no other purpose than that the Commission should not fulfil its object, or should not have any object at all? He would say this plainly—that he himself would never have sat on the Commission except with the hope that something would be done by and through it, and as nothing could be done without some means of applying to Parliament in order to obtain the necessary powers, the present Bill was introduced. In fact, if they were not to have a Bill of this kind, the labours of the Commission would be thrown away. There were certain Cathedrals that had no Statutes, and to which his right rev. Friend adverted in his opening speech; and, besides, it seemed clear that Cathedrals of the New Foundation had no power to alter their Statutes, unless empowered by Act of Parliament, and he very much doubted whether the old Cathedrals had the power to act as they alleged with due regard to the Prerogative of the Crown and the laws of the country. They had assumed powers, no doubt, but whether they had the power of altering their Statutes to the extent that was claimed was very doubtful. He contended that there were no grounds for the extreme fears which the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Peterborough) had expressed in respect to the Bill, either as to the way it would be dealt with in the House of Commons, or as to its character. There was nothing in it of which their Lordships need be at all afraid. It was one which would bring about no great revolution; but one that would enable the Cathedrals to reform their Statutes from time to time, according the necessities of the case; and he trusted that their Lordships would not be led to this conclusion —that although they had found the necessity for reform in this matter, yet, because the Bill might be thrown out in the House of Commons, or because there might be impediments to the discussion of the Bill in that House, they should sit still and do nothing—should refrain from sending their opinions to the House of Commons, and endeavouring to get them enforced there as they had a right to expect.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I hope I may be allowed to say a few words on this Bill. The Cathedrals of the Church of England can be made efficient, and I believe it is the desire of the laity that they should be. Their power for good is great, and greatly hindered. I cannot believe that that desire and that power can be set at naught. I venture to speak on this subject, not because I think your Lordships will be carried away by the eloquent and amusing, but far too ingenious speech of my right rev. Brother (the Bishop of Peterborough), but because I have been for many years a student of Cathedral history and of Cathedral Statutes. I have lived in the heart of a Cathedral, and I have been able to see what desire exists within the Cathedrals themselves, and what is their power to do good even now. But I can bear witness to the fact that that desire and work are very much impeded. There are no details before your Lordships, and there are none likely to come before you. The wisdom of this House will perceive that the minute question to which the most rev. Prelate alluded is a question of convenience, which must be settled one way or another. It surely must be settled on the spot. The real issue seems to me to be a simple one. The Crown is very largely spoken of, in many bodies of Statutes, as having abundance of power to legislate; but it all ends in language, and all that this Bill does is to furnish the instrument by which the Crown can do that which, in the forefront of every body of Statutes, it is said the Crown shall do. Some Chapters do not even know whether they have rules. Some have none. None know whether they can make new rules. London claims to have the power of making them, and has made Statutes which have worked efficiently. Still, it is not known whether they are legal. I may mention—though it is a trivial matter—that in another Cathedral the other day a verger had to be appointed, and a rule was discovered by which the whole Chapter had agreed to appoint vergers in a certain way. A new Canon had been appointed, in the meantime, who objected to that mode of proceeding; and they consulted a learned counsel on the point, and were told that the value of that rule, made 12 years before, was nothing. Again, in 1840, an Act was passed very important to Cathedrals, and that Act is said to have conferred powers upon them; but it only, in very large terms, gives the power of making provisions for Minor Canons. It ought, I think, to be remembered that in 1852 a similar scheme to that now before the House was recommended, which would do for Cathedrals exactly what the body proposed in this Bill would do, and a Commission was appointed; but the results of the labours of that Commission never passed into law. I will not say that in every detail I would accept any single body of Statutes; but I do not feel that I ought to stand upon any difficulty whatever in any of the Statutes when the important thing is to remove mere formal hindrances to efficiency. The Cathedrals should be the centres of good works of all kinds in the dioceses. They can provide in themselves means to be at the service of every parish in the diocese; they can give instruction to the middle classes, and greatly benefit the Clergy—in fact, they have resources for many things which, once the floodgates were lifted, would pass on in a powerful stream of good works. This Bill only asks your Lordships to give the Cathedrals leave to work, for they can devise excellent plans if allowed to do so. The Bill is elastic in every way. It simply provides that work may be done, and also that if, in the future, anything in the scheme is found to work wrongly, it may be rectified by means of the proposed body. I hope very earnestly that this Bill will pass.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK said, it was only fair to say that three years ago he had had the conduct of a Bill for the regulation of the Church, through the House; and he would say that in no single case had there been the slightest evidence that the House was indisposed to treat the Bill fairly. The mode in which the Business of the Commission had been conducted had been to exclude altogether the Bishop of the diocese. He thought that was greatly to be regretted. The great object of the Commission had been to bring the authorities of the diocese and Cathedral into close relation. Their Lordships had been told that the period of darkness was past, and that they had on the Table three sets of Statutes which would serve to show the manner in which the proceedings would be conducted. But he would like to point out a few points in some of these Statutes. In the Statutes of Truro there was the greatest minuteness as to where the Bishop should have his chair. But when he turned to the Statutes of St. Paul's he was obliged to remark that they were really not Statutes at all. In them there was a perpetual reference to ancient customs, which sent them to archæology. That meant litigation. He therefore ventured to express an opinion that it was highly desirable that all the powers should be exactly defined in the Statute. He was extremely anxious to see Cathedrals made more useful. On the whole, he thought there was a great improvement; and even if the Statutes would produce, not a perfect system, but a great improvement, then they ought, he thought, to vote for the Bill as he should do. Surely their Lordships should not timidly refrain from doing what they considered right and proper in the matter because it was thought that some harm might happen to the Bill in "another place."

THE BISHOP OF LONDON explained that the Statutes of St. Paul's, which had been before the Commissioners, were only supplementary Statutes, supplementary to a considerable number of very ancient ones; and the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's bore in mind the fact that for 1,000 years their Statutes had been from time to time modified, enlarged, and amended by the Chapter, with the assistance of the Bishop. Archbishops of the Province had attempted to impose Statutes on St. Paul's, and they were always rejected. Wolsey had provided a set of Statutes for St. Paul's, and they were set aside. At St. Paul's they had, at least, the custom of 1,000 years. He did not himself agree entirely with the prayer of the Petition that he had presented; and he should think the Cathedrals might be well satisfied by the statement of the Chairman of the Royal Commission that they could revise their Statutes if they chose to take the risk, or they could take the safer course, and act upon the new machinery for revising them. For his own part, he thought that the machinery provided by the Bill would enable Cathedrals to become more useful; and he did not fear that the Statutes which would be framed would be interfered with by either House of Parliament.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE would like, before the Motion was put, to observe that it had been said by the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of York) that there was a little complaint to be made as to the action of the Commissioners. The fact was this. The Commissioners were those named in the Commission, and also the Dean and one selected Canon of each Cathedral, and the Commissioners had no power to call in anybody else with whom to consult; but as soon as they had provisionally arranged the Statutes they sent a copy of them to the Dean and Chapter, and also to the Bishop of the diocese for their consideration; and he thought the Commissioners could not have acted more wisely or properly. As to the speech of his right rev. Brother near him (the Bishop of Peterborough), it professed to deal with facts, though, in reality, it contained few facts, but was full of imagination, and was intended for persons outside that House, as well as those within it. His right rev. Brother had gone into details, but had not dwelt upon the principle of the Bill; and as to the terrors which he had referred to in "another place," he was not going to be frightened by them. He knew the difficulties which the Bill might meet with in the House of Commons as well as his right rev. Brother, but he also knew that the Bill, as it was proposed to be introduced there, had names of Members of both political Parties at the back of it. It was not a Party measure, and he had such a belief in the justice of the House of Commons as to have no fear of the result when the House should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon it. With regard to the difference between the Statutes of various Cathedrals, the observations of the right rev. Prelate supplied the explanation, which was that it was one thing to deal with a new Cathedral, and another to make Statutes for an old one. If the House did not think it desirable that Statutes should be laid on the Table, he would willingly accept such an Amendment. He could not, however, accept the advice of his right rev. Brother to withdraw the Bill, but would tender a piece of advice in return. He wished very much that his right rev. Brother would withdraw his speech, which, while it would not damage the Bill, might do much harm outside the House, and might raise feelings that were more easily excited than allayed.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

STOLEN GOODS BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR asked leave to bring in a Bill to amend the the law respecting the Recovery of Stolen Articles; explaining that it was, with a few Amendments, the measure which had passed their Lordships' House last year, except that the portions relating to pawnbrokers had been withdrawn and incorporated in a separate measure.

Bill to amend the law respecting the Recovery of Stolen Articles; and for other purposes—*Presented* (The LORD CHANCELLOR); read 1ª; and to be *printed.* (No. 78.)

PAWNBROKERS' BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Pawnbrokers' Act, 1872,—Was *presented* by The LORD CHANCELLOR; read 1ª. (No. 79.)

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 5th June, 1883.

The House met at Two of the clock.

MINUTES.]—WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee—Resolution* [June 4] *reported.*

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*) — *Third Reading* — London, Chatham, and Dover Railway.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Consolidated Fund (No. 3) *.

Ordered—First Reading—Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 4) * [214].

Second Reading—Local Government Provisional Order (Highways) * [193]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) * [194]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) * [199]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) * [200]; Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) [190].

Select Committee—Report—Parochial Charities (London) * [No. 185].

Committee—Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment [5], *debate adjourned.*

Report—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) * [172]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) * [158]; Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (Extension of Time) * [181]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [143].

Third Reading—Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [168], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

THIRD READING.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. PULESTON said, he found that this Bill had been referred to a Committee as an unopposed Bill. He had placed a Notice upon the Paper in reference to it; but he found that it was impossible for him, under the circumstances, to proceed with his Amendment, seeing that the Bill was unopposed, and the Chairman of Committees would have no power to insert other clauses. He had also conferred with the hon. and gallant Member for Dover (Major Dickson), who happened to be a Director of the Company; and he had stated to his hon. and gallant Friend that he should not proceed with his Amendment. As he had also stated to other hon. Members of the House that he should not go on with it, it would not be competent for him to move the Amendment now, and he should not do so. It was right, however, that he should say the remarks made by the Chairman of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, and some of his over-zealous friends in the Press and elsewhere, in reference to the matter, had rendered it difficult for him to maintain the decision he had come to, to withdraw the Amendment. At the same time, as he considered there was no other course open to him, he should do so; and it was not necessary that he should reply to the remarks of the Chairman of the Company, further than to say that they had no foundation whatever, and he hoped that the hon. and gallant Gentleman would himself be the first to see the propriety of withdrawing statements which were utterly unfounded and unbecoming, and in violation of the Privileges of that House.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

WINDSOR, ASCOT, AND ALDERSHOT RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be taken into Consideration upon Thursday."—(*Viscount Folkestone.*)

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, he must oppose the Motion, on the ground that it was unnecessary to interpose further delay with the sole object of enabling certain hon. Members to oppose this small Bill, and perhaps, in the end, succeed in destroying the Company promoting it, when the object of the opposition was simply to put pressure upon the larger lines of railway. He thought it was a most unnatural mode of attack upon a railway simply projected as a local line, in order to enable a railway to be constructed between Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot. He begged to move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "upon Thursday," in order to insert the word "To-morrow,"—(*Sir Gabriel Goldney,*)—instead thereof.

Question put, "That the words 'upon Thursday,' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 37; Noes 73: Majority 36.—(Div. List, No. 116.)

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill, as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

VACCINATION ACTS—PROSECUTIONS —BRISTOL.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that Mr. C. J. Neale was, on the 24th instant, fined by the Bristol magistrates six pounds and costs for the non-vaccination of six of his children, he having previously paid about ninety pounds in fines and costs for the same children; and, whether he will issue a circular similar to that addressed by the Local Government Board to the Guardians of Evesham in 1875 in deprecation of repeated prosecutions?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, in reply, said, that he was not in a position to state the exact amount of the fines which had been inflicted in this case; but he believed they were of considerable amount, as Mr. Neale had been frequently summoned for non-compliance with the law. The Local Government Board were now considering whether they would send to the Bristol Guardians a Circular similar to that sent in 1875 to the Evesham Guardians in deprecation of these repeated prosecutions.

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX ON FOREIGN INVESTMENTS.

MR. MACFARLANE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If, on further advice, he adheres to the statement that the case of William Hilton, of Hemel Hempsted, decided in the year 1808, is a precedent in favour of the claim to charge Income Tax upon profits which are not imported into the United Kingdom, or if it is a fact that the case of William Hilton, decided on appeal by the local Income Tax Commissioners, is a precedent against such a claim, and that such decision was never appealed against by the Board of Inland Revenue?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Sir, I have looked very carefully into the two cases which I quoted in the debate on the Motion of the hon. Member to amend one of the clauses of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill. The case of Cankrien, which occurred in 1808, is perfectly clear. He claimed not to be assessed on certain profits made abroad; but his claim was disallowed, and the tax was paid. The case of Hilton, in 1806, was as follows. He had paid the full tax in 1804 and in 1805; but I find that in 1806 the Local Commissioners relieved him from the tax on certain profits made abroad, and desired the particulars as to the year 1805 to be transmitted to the Board in London, with a view to his being allowed a repayment. The Board declined to do so, replying that they were—

> "Not aware that the Commissioners have any authority to remit the duty;"

and adding—

> "Every trader living in Great Britain is answerable for the whole profits of trade arising in another country."

I find, however, that the Board had at that time no power to dispute a remission actually made by Local Commissioners. But as to the law there is no question, the words being that the tax is to be levied on—

> "The annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person residing in the United Kingdom from any kind of property whatever, whether situate in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and for and in respect of the annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person residing in the United Kingdom from any profession, trade, employment, or vocation, whether the same shall be respectively carried on in the United Kingdom or elsewhere."

PREVENTION OF CRIME (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—EXTRA POLICE AT BALLINALOUGH AND KILTULLY.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there is any necessity for still retaining the extra police force in the townlands of Ballinalough and Kiltully at an expense of £41 3*s*. per month over a limited and not very prosperous district; and, whether a police hut, the maintenance of which for a month and a-half has been about £72, is erected at less than half a mile of the village of Kiltully, where there is a police barrack?

MR. TREVELYAN, in reply, said, that the proclamation under which the extra police were employed in the districts referred to was revoked by the Lord Lieutenant on the 22nd of last month. The barracks at Kiltully did not afford sufficient accommodation for the men; and it was on this account that it was necessary to erect a hut for them in the locality.

ARMY—ROYAL WARRANT, 1882—PENSIONS OF OFFICERS' WIDOWS.

COLONEL ALEXANDER asked the Secretary of State for War, with reference to paragraph I. of Article 1008, of the Royal Warrant of 1882, for Pay and Promotion, If he can state what is the amount of income which would preclude the widows of officers of each rank from receiving pensions?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: Sir, as this is a question of finance, perhaps my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for South Ayrshire will permit me to reply for the Secretary of State. The definition of "wealthy circumstances" in Sub-section 1,008 of the Pay Warrant, which relates to the pensions for widows of deceased officers, is governed by "a scale of means," which has been drawn up to insure uniformity in the practice of the War Office in awarding such pensions. The actual amount of income which would preclude the widow of an officer in any rank from receiving a pension has always, I think, been regarded as confidential, for reasons which my hon. and gallant Friend will appreciate. The rules governing the amount of income to which I alluded may be varied at any time; and their application is strictly within the discretion of the Secretary of State. It is not, therefore, in my power, nor do I think it would be desirable, to publish them.

LAW AND POLICE — THOMAS JONES, A CONVICT.

Mr. STEWART MACLIVER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been called to the case of Thomas Jones, a convict tried at Exeter and sentenced to 15 years' penal servitude, for assaulting a warder at Dartmoor; whether he will direct an inquiry into the conduct of the deputy governor which was censured by Baron Huddleston; whether, pending the inquiry, he would remove the convict to another prison; and, whether an examination into the mental condition of the convict will be made?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, that this matter had been carefully investigated; and he had directed an inquiry into the conduct of the Deputy Governor which had been censured by Mr. Baron Huddleston. The convict had been removed to another prison, and a medical inquiry into his mental condition had been made. It had been found that, although there was no absolute insanity, the man was of a low type.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION (SUB-COMMISSIONERS)—GALWAY.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Sub-Commissioners at Galway refused to hear forty-two cases, because the tenants had changed their solicitor in the period between the originating notice and the time fixed for the hearing of the case; and, whether the Sub-Commissioner is justified in refusing to hear cases between landlord and tenants because of a disputed claim with a third party?

Mr. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have received a Report from the Land Commissioners, from which it appears that, after much discussion, the cases were adjourned, because the tenants refused to pay the solicitor whom they had first retained, and who was entitled, under Rule 36, to claim his costs before the cases were proceeded with, and the tenants had not given the notice of change required by the Rule. The action of the Sub-Commission was justified under the Rule mentioned. The cases have been again listed for the present sittings, and will be disposed of within the next few days.

IRELAND — THE BOWLING GREEN MILLS (GALWAY) COMPENSATION CASE.

Mr T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he is willing to reconsider the claims to compensation from the Treasury of the proprietors of the Bowling Green Mills; whether, in the inquiry into the grievances complained of by the Galway millers, the case of this mill was excluded, as Colonel Smith held that he was precluded from going back to a period anterior to 1871; whether, by the action of the Board of Works, Miss Burke, the head landlord, has been deprived, without any compensation, of a rental of sixty-three pounds; and, whether he is ready to carry out the promise make to Miss Burke's representative that the whole question would be submitted to arbitration?

Mr. COURTNEY: Sir, the case to which this Question refers is a very complicated one, and impossssible to explain within the limits of an Answer. It has been repeatedly considered by successive Secretaries to the Treasury, and it could not now be re-opened. It is possible that Miss Burke has suffered some loss in connection with these mills, although I can say nothing as to its amount; but this is a case where loss must be suffered all round. The Exchequer has been a heavy loser. In the last three years £1,500 has been written off in respect of these two mills alone, besides other sums previously remitted. No promise has been given to re-open the question.

BOARD OF TRADE—THE COMMITTEE ON LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS.

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is true that Sir James Douglas, having been excluded by the Board of Trade from acting on the Committee on Lighthouse Illuminants, on the ground of his having a direct interest in the matters to be investigated, was afterwards appointed a Member of the said Committee; whether, about the same time, the brother of Sir James Douglas and Doctor Hopkinson, Optical Engineer, who is in the employment of Trinity House, were also appointed to the said Committee; whether the proceeding of the said Committee practically came to a dead lock; whether, in consequence of the constitution of the Committee, Professor Tyndal retired; whether the Commissioners of Irish Lights, after having made strong remonstrances as to its constitution, have withdrawn their representatives from the Committee on Lighthouse Illuminants; and, whether he will have any objection to place before the House, in addition to the Papers he has already promised, the whole of the Correspondence between Professor Tyndal, the Board of Trade, the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and the Commissioners of Irish Lights, which has taken place since the inquiry was first instituted in 1881, and also the proceedings of the Illuminants Committee, up to the time of its last sitting on the 18th instant?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Sir, the hon. and gallant Member seems to be misinformed as to some of his facts. This Committee, although nominally appointed by the Board of Trade, consists chiefly of representatives who have been selected, at the request of the Board, by the several lighthouse authorities. It was originally proposed that both Sir James Douglas and Mr. Wigham should be excluded from voting on the Committee, as first constituted, on the ground of their having pecuniary interest in the matters to be investigated; and they were, consequently, not regarded as Members of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee, early in the present year, represented that this had led to complications tending to hinder the progress of the arrangements for the experiments; and asked, in addition, that the Committee might be enlarged, as the small number of Members, and the distance from London at which some of them resided, caused a difficulty in obtaining a quorum. The Board of Trade consequently agreed that both Sir James Douglas and Mr. Wigham should be Members of the Committee, and that each of the three Lighthouse Boards should be represented by one of their own body and by their engineer. Mr. William Douglas is the Engineer of the Irish Board, and is a brother of Sir James Douglas, who is Engineer to the English Board. Dr. Hopkinson was added to the Committee, as having given special attention to the electric light and its most recent developments; and I am informed that there is no ground for the suggestion that he is in the employment of the Trinity House. Mr. Vernon Harcourt was to represent the Board of Trade. All the Members were to be on an equal footing as to voting; and as the names of Members voting were to be recorded, any interest which individual Members might have would be duly weighed. I have before stated that, to my regret, Professor Tyndal retired in consequence of his dissatisfaction with the constitution of the enlarged Committee. Since the enlarged Committee have commenced their deliberations, the Commissioners of Irish Lights have made to the Board of Trade two complaints of the proceedings, in the last of which they intimated that they would withdraw from the experiments. These complaints have been referred to the Committee for their observations, which have not yet been received. I cannot think that it is advisable that the proceedings of this Committee should be published piecemeal. All the Correspondence in my Department—112 letters—which has taken place since the inquiry was first instituted in 1881, up to the day the House rose for the Whitsun Recess, has been printed and circulated.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, that, without the slightest wish to say anything against Dr. Hopkinson, he would wish to know whether Dr. Hopkinson did not manufacture the whole of the optical apparatus for the Trinity House?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: That is not the case. He is the scientific adviser of Messrs. Chance, Brothers, glass manufacturers in the neighbourhood of Birmingham; and Messrs. Chance were the contractors to Trinity House.

Mr. LEA asked whether the labours of the Committee had concluded, or would conclude by the close of the Session?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I think it is extremely improbable. What I hope is, that the Committee will continue its work, and the Irish Lights Commissioners will not withdraw from the Committee; and if then the experiments are carried out they will necessarily involve a considerable time.

INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—BABOO SOORENDRO NATH BANNERJEE.

MR. MACFARLANE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, who has been sentenced to two months' imprisonment for contempt of Court in Calcutta, is the same person who was dismissed from the Bengal Civil Service, in 1874, for conduct which Sir George Campbell, then Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, described as "dishonest and fraudulent;" and, whether the same person has been appointed an honorary magistrate in Calcutta?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Yes, Sir; Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee is the person who was dismissed from the Bengal Civil Service on the recommendation of the Government of India by the Secretary of State in 1874; and it appears from *The Calcutta Gazette* that last September he was appointed an honorary magistrate in Calcutta.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked whether Bannerjee was not a person of great influence amongst his own race and creed?

MR. J. K. CROSS: I believe he is a gentleman of very great influence.

MR. ASHMEAD - BARTLETT inquired whether this person would be empowered, under Mr. Ilbert's Bill, to try Europeans for criminal offences?

MR. J. K. CROSS: I am unable to reply to that Question.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked whether it was not the case that Mr. Ilbert's Bill would not in the least degree affect the jurisdiction of honorary magistrates in Calcutta; and, whether, as a matter of fact, honorary magistrates sat in jurisdiction on Europeans quite independent of that Bill?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Certainly; that is so.

POST OFFICE—POSTAL SERVICE (SCOTLAND).

MR. CRAIG - SELLAR (for Lord COLIN CAMPBELL) asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is the case that an application for alterations in the postal service of Campbeltown was seven months under consideration; whether such delay is not uncommon in connection with the Post Office inquiries in Scotland; whether such delays result from permitting no changes to be made by the Post Office Department in Edinburgh without the sanction of the Postmaster General; and, whether he will take into consideration the question of establishing a more expeditious system of inquiry and supervision in Scotland?

MR. FAWCETT, in reply, said, it was the case that this application had been some months under consideration. The proposal involved a considerable outlay of public money, and it was necessary to carefully investigate the subject. He did not think there had been any unnecessary delay, nor did he think any advantage would be gained from the change in administration suggested.

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACT, 1879—"THE QUEEN *v.* TAYLOR AND BOYNES."

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked Mr. Attorney General, If he is satisfied that the conduct of the Public Prosecutor in regard to the question of the prosecution of Peter F. Taylor and E. S. Boynes was right, both in matter and in manner, and that the Public Prosecutor has, in this and other cases, sufficiently fulfilled the functions for which he was appointed under the provisions of 42 and 43 Vic. c. 22, and the rules made in accordance with that Statute; and, if he has received any additional information causing him to modify his statement that it was "difficult to disregard the presentment or recommendation made by the Grand Jury," since the Public Prosecutor has been permitted wholly to disregard that recommendation?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES), in reply, said, that, as regarded the first part of the Question, he hoped his hon. Friend would forgive him if he declined to express any opinion as to the "manner" of the Public Prosecutor in any individual case; but as to the substance of the Question, he had received an explanation from the Public Prosecutor, in reply to a letter which he had written, which was of such a nature that he saw no reason to interfere with the discretion which the Public Prosecutor had already exercised in the case in deciding that it was not a case in which he ought to conduct the prosecution. The whole matter of the performance of the duties of the office of Public Prosecutor was one of great delicacy, and his position was not of a very satisfactory nature. His right hon. and learned Friend the Home Secretary had already appointed a Departmental Committee to inquire into the position occupied by the Public Prosecutor, and to see whether any improvement could be made in that position, and to report to the House.

MR. R. H. PAGET asked whether the Attorney General would lay on the Table a Return showing the number of applications made to the Public Prosecutor to interfere in criminal cases, and the result of such applications?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, a Paper had already been printed which gave a good deal of information; but a Return of the applications—many hundreds in number—would involve great expense. There would be no objection, however, to present the general results of the action of the Public Prosecutor if a Return of them were moved for.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE HALF-PAST TWELVE O'CLOCK RULE—BLOCKING.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN wished to put a Question to the Speaker upon a point of Order. On Wednesday last there was a Bill upon the Order Book of the House, called the Sites and Places for Public Worship (Ireland) Bill. That Bill was not proceeded with, and as the Clerk at the Table stated that he had received no instructions with regard to it the Order was dropped. In the list of Public Bills issued on the following Monday, the Bill appeared as a dropped Order. But early that (Tuesday) morning, about 1 o'clock, or thereabouts, he was informed that an application was made to place the Bill upon the Order Book again, and permission was given; the consequence being that the Bill appeared on the Order Books of the day for this evening. What he wished to call particular attention to was the fact that Notice of opposition had previously been given to the measure, so as to prevent its being brought on after half-past 12; but it now appeared upon the Paper without that Notice of opposition, because no opportunity had been afforded to Members who objected to the Bill to place their Notice of opposition upon the Paper again. He wished to ask the Speaker if the Bill could be taken after half-past 12, he (Colonel King-Harman) having now given a distinct Notice of opposition to it?

MR. WARTON said, that, before the Speaker answered the Question, he wished to say that he had also opposed the Bill. He had carefully looked through the list of Bills issued on Monday, and he found that this appeared as a dropped Order; and, therefore, he had not renewed his Notice of opposition to it. But if this sort of practice were to be allowed to go on, it would be in the power of any hon. Member to profess to drop a Bill, and then, by some private Notice unknown to the House, to revive it and place it upon the Paper again.

MR. SPEAKER: This Bill was appointed for to-day in the ordinary way, by a Question put from the Chair; and the proceeding is quite regular. The point raised by the hon. and gallant Member is, no doubt, one of great importance. At the same time, I am bound to interpret the Rules strictly, and in accordance with their literal meaning; and, having regard to the Standing Order, I am bound to say that this Bill is no longer blocked, and as it is no longer blocked, it may be brought on after half-past 12 o'clock to-night.

MR. GIBSON said, the matter was one of considerable importance. He understood that under the old Rules, if a Bill were dropped, and were afterwards revived, the block was revived with it. [*Cries of* "No!"] He had asked the question, and made an inquiry; and he was given to understand that the block lasted until it was withdrawn by the Member who put it down. The block, unless it was renewed, simply died; and in the case of a blocked Order there was nothing to prevent a practical evasion of the Rules of the House. A Member might drop his Bill, and then put it down again without a block; and although it might have been blocked, not by one Member, but by half-a-dozen, it could be brought forward without any Notice of opposition to it—a palpable evasion of the instructions of the House. The consequence of this might be that a Member, seeing that objection was entertained to his Bill, might quietly allow it to become a dropped Order until the end of July or the beginning of August, when every Member who took an interest in opposing it had left the House. He would then be able to revive the Bill, and get it run through without opposition. Surely the House ought to have some power of guarding itself against what would be a great violation of the decencies of legislation. And if, through some oversight, a Bill was now placed in this position, he ventured to ask the Speaker if it would not be more in accordance with the convenience of the House, as well as with the proprieties of legislation, that if it were desired to revive an Order, after it had once been dropped, that course should be taken with distinct and open Notice to the House, so that there should be abundant and reasonable Notice given to the House in order to prevent what might be—he would not say a trick—but what might be used in an extreme case as a trick, and what might often cause surprise.

Mr. RAIKES said, that, before the Speaker answered the Question, he wished to put a further Question. The Standing Order made on the 18th February, 1879, as amended on the 9th of May, and 17th and 20th of November, 1882, was as follows:—

> "That, except for a Money Bill, no Order of the Day or Notice of Motion be taken after half-past Twelve of the clock at night; with respect to which Order or Notice of Motion a Notice of Opposition, or Amendment, shall have been printed on the Notice Paper; or, if such Notice of Motion shall only have been given, the next previous day of sitting, and objection shall be taken when such Notice is called."

He understood that this, being an Order of the Day, did not fall within the express terms of this Standing Order; but he would venture to ask the Speaker whether, having regard to the evident intention of the House, in making express provision for Notices of Motion only to be taken, of which such Notice of Motion should have been given the next previous day, his hon. and gallant Friend would not be in Order in taking objection to the Order of the Day being proceeded with, and asking the Speaker to rule upon it?

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot say that the hon. and gallant Member would be in Order, because the Standing Order applies solely to Notices of Motion. It does not apply to Orders of the Day; and therefore I should not consider that the Bill, being an Order of the Day, comes within the operation of the Half-past 12 o'clock Rule. I do not know how this inconvenience can be remedied, unless, when the Order of the Day is called on, it is proposed that such Order of the Day be postponed. The House knows that an Order of the Day can be moved by any Member of the House; and an Order becomes dropped when no Member makes a Motion thereon.

Mr. GIBSON asked if it was possible to arrange that Notice should be given of the intention of an hon. Member to revive a dropped Order, by such Member going to the Table and giving the Notice just before the Motion that the House should adjourn? In that way a dropped Order would be revived in a formal manner. He would ask, with due deference, whether it would not be within the competence of the Speaker to require that some more reasonable Notice should be given of even a day?

Mr. COURTNEY wished to remind the House that in the last Parliament a similar question arose in regard to the application of the Twelve o'clock Rule. It arose in the course of a Bill promoted by his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council (Mr. Mundella). The Bill had become a dropped Order, together with a Notice of opposition, which had been given by the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell). It was, however, revived without the Notice of opposition. When the Bill came on, the Speaker commented upon the course which had been taken; and on the strength of his observations, on an appeal being made to his right hon. Friend, he did not press the Bill that night. That showed that the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gibson) was wrong in supposing that there had been any change in the mode of procedure, or any modification of the Rule. It was quite evident that when the Bill was revived the block was not revived with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should be quite ready to comply with the instructions of the House; but, at the same time, I should not venture to insist upon Notice being given of the revival of a dropped Order, without receiving instruction to that effect from the House.

Mr. WARTON said, he had no wish to dispute any question which arose out of the Speaker's ruling; but he would ask, for the information of the House, whether, when a Bill appeared on the list as a dropped Order, something might not be done to make it still competent for an hon. Member to renew his Notice of opposition, so that the Bill should not be revived without the block? If he saw standing in the list of Bills which were dropped Orders, a Bill against which he had given Notice of opposition, could he also put down the Notice of opposition on the chance of the Bill being revived upon some future day?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. and learned Member would be in Order in giving Notice of opposition to a Bill that is dropped.

MR. W. H. SMITH wished to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. It was quite evident that, in the existing state of things, it was possible for a Rule, which was intended for the protection of the House, to be evaded by an hon. Member in charge of a Bill. It was quite possible that a Bill might be dropped intentionally, and revived again the next day, with the Notice of opposition which originally stood against it having been got rid of. He did not say that that course would be taken, but that it was quite possible for it to be taken. He, therefore, wished to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, who was responsible, in a great measure, for the conduct of the Business of the House, to take the matter into his consideration, with a view of preventing any future irregularity. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would propose such an alteration of the Rules as would, at all events, secure fairness between all Parties. If it was in the power of an hon. Member to give Notice of opposition to a measure, and prevent the Bill thus opposed from being taken into consideration after a certain hour of the night, then it appeared to him that that Notice should live for the same length of time after the Bill was restored to the Order Book, as it would have done, if the Bill had not become a "dropped Order." If, for instance, the block remained against a Bill for a week or 10 days, then the Notice of opposition should live for the same time. He understood that the reason for allowing the block was to secure that any measure brought forward should receive consideration at a proper hour of the evening.

MR. GLADSTONE said, he thought that all who had heard the conversation must be of opinion that there was clearly a block at present which required to be touched in some way or other, in order to prevent evasion and the dropping of a measure to get rid of opposition. He was of opinion that they ought not to encourage such a practice; but they ought, on the contrary, if possible, to prevent it. Then, in regard to the proceedings of that night, he thought they had had an admirable precedent afforded by the judicious conduct of the Speaker in the last Parliament, when the right hon. Gentleman pointed out the inconvenience of proceeding with a Bill which had been dropped, and then suddenly revived, without the Notice of opposition being revived with it. In that case the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill felt that, under the circumstances, he could hardly persevere with the measure. With regard to the suggestion that Notice should be given before reviving a dropped Order, that might be a fair suggestion, if it were applicable only to those Orders which were dropped artificially, so to speak, and intentionally; but he was doubtful what its effect might be with regard to Orders that were dropped accidentally from the unexpected interruption of the Sitting of the House. As to the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) that the block should be made to adhere to the Bill, notwithstanding the Bill becoming a dropped Order, as long as the Bill continued on the Order Book it appeared to him that it deserved consideration; and he should be willing to ask the aid of the Speaker, and of the other Authorities of the House, with a view to see what arrangements could be made.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE wished to ask a Question on a point of Order. He understood the contention to be that a dropped Order was not a dead Order, but a living Order in a certain sense, though in a state of suspended animation. He wished to know whether there was any Order of the House on the subject, or whether it was simply a usage which had grown up, that the Notice of block should disappear from the Paper on the Order being dropped? If that were not so—but the Notice of opposition still possessed a relative and satellite life—it would be very easy for the Speaker to deal with the question, and to direct the printers to print with the dropped Order the Notice of opposition which had been given to it. That might easily be done unless there was a special Order to the contrary, of which he was certainly not aware.

Mr. GIBSON desired to say a word in regard to what the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said. Although it was a very cumbrous way of overcoming the difficulty, the matter might be met in this way. A Bill was not dead when it became dropped, but was in a state of suspended animation; and it might be revived by the method which had been adopted in this particular case. Supposing, then, the analogy was followed which was applied to the Adjournment for the Whitsuntide Holidays, the period during which the Bill remained suspended should be excluded from the period that would count against the block, and then, when the Bill was revived, the block would revive with it. That would be one way of dealing with the difficulty. He would only remind the House that the last Adjournment for the Whitsuntide Holidays lasted for more than 10 days; and the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair very wisely decided that the block placed against certain Bills should extend over that period. From the necessities of the case, and for the convenience of the House, the Speaker was compelled to exclude the days comprised in the Holidays. The same convenience might suggest that the period covered by the suspended animation should be also excluded from the operation of the block. That might be one mode of getting out of the difficulty. The only other mode which occurred to him would be still more cumbrous and did not commend itself to his mind in the same persuasive way—namely, provided that inasmuch as a Bill was not dead, but only in that extraordinary position with the power of being revived, it should be competent for a Member to give also Notice of block, with the same power of reviving it in the event of a dropped Bill being revived. He admitted that that would not be a very convenient mode of dealing with the matter, but still it could be adopted; because, if a Bill was not dead and might be revived, then the objection which had been made to it might be revived with it.

Earl PERCY said, that, with regard to what had fallen from the right hon. and learned Gentleman, there was a great difference between an Adjournment of the House and a dropped Order. The Adjournment for the Whitsuntide Holidays was a certain quantity. They all knew how long it would last, and could calculate how long the block would last; whereas, in the case of a dropped Order, the Notice naturally expired, and unless an hon. Member was constantly on the watch for the dropped Order being revived his block would be suspended. That was an entirely different case from the Adjournment for the Whitsuntide Holidays.

Mr. ANDERSON asked whether it would not be something in the nature of a trick for any Member intentionally to allow his Bill to become a revived Order in that way? Would that not be something in the nature of a trick which no hon. Member would resort to? It was quite clear that the proper thing to do, in the case of a Member wishing to revive a dropped Order, was to provide that the dropped Order should be revived in exactly the same position it was in when it was dropped with all its disabilities attached to it.

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. M. BROOKS said, the first four Questions upon the Notice Paper were in the name of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray); and as the hon. Member was not present he wished to put the first of these Questions to the Postmaster General. The Question stood in the following terms:—

> "To ask the Postmaster General, whether he will afford the House an opportunity of discussing the terms of the new Postal Contract for conveying mails between London and Dublin, tenders for which are to be sent on or before 11th of July next?"

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR wished to ask the Speaker if it was in Order for an hon. Member to ask Questions standing in the name of another hon. Member without having, in the first instance, obtained the permission of the hon. Member who had placed the Question upon the Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been the general practice of the House—and the House has always concurred in that practice—that no hon. Member should put a Question standing in the name of another Member unless requested to do so by that Member. Therefore, the Question now proposed to be put by the hon. Member for Dublin (Mr. M. Brooks) cannot be put, except by the indulgence of the House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he would not have noticed it, if he had not understood that the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) was in London; and the Question might very well stand over until to-morrow, when the hon. Member would be in his place.

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, the Question is of so much public interest that I am quite ready to answer; and I think it will be convenient if I answer the hon. Member for Carlow's four Questions together. In answer to the first Question, I beg to say that full opportunity will be afforded to the House of discussing the terms of the new Postal Contract as soon as possible after the tenders have been received. In answer to the second Question, I may say that my attention has not been drawn to the advertisement to which the hon. Member refers; but that, inasmuch as the London and North-Western Company, equally with the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, are bound, under the contract still in force, to effect the conveyance and delivery of the Irish mails within a specified time, the interests of the Public Service appear in this matter to be sufficiently protected. With regard to the third Question, it has been assumed that whatever contractors may, after the expiration of the present contract, be employed to carry the mails between Holyhead and Kingstown, the London and North-Western Railway Company will afford facilities for passenger traffic by the mail trains, and in connection with the mail boats. But, in order to avoid any misconception, there is no objection to state that it will be made a condition of any contract for the conveyance of the Irish mails between London and Holyhead that passengers shall be carried by the mail trains, and that through booking arrangements shall be made between the London and North-Western Railway Company and any contractors for the sea service. With reference to the fares to be charged by the London and North-Western Railway Company, the hon. Member is, no doubt, aware that these fares cannot be raised above the maximum rates specified in the Acts of the Company. He is, no doubt, also aware that litigation has taken place on the subject between the Dublin Steam Packet Company and the London and North Western Railway Company. Under these circumstances, there seems to be some difficulty in interfering with the ordinary course of the law. But the matter shall be carefully considered, with a view to securing, as far as possible, that no inconvenience is caused to passengers. In answer to the fourth Question of the hon. Member, the terms of the tenders for the new contract contemplate the contingency of the new contractors for the sea service not being ready to commence on the 1st of October; and in view of such contingency steps have been taken, as the public advertisement will show, to provide for a temporary service until such time as the contractors can commence the full service.

MR. GIBSON: As this question attracts great interest and also considerable uneasiness in Ireland, particularly in reference to the closing words of the right hon. Gentleman, I would like to be quite clear as to when this matter is be brought under the notice of Parliament for discussion. The date for receiving tenders was the 11th of July. Now, we all know that a discussion brought on in Parliament in August, when, I hope, we will be all thinking of going home, is not likely to be a very lively discussion, or to be attended with very great advantage to anyone. What I would like to know is whether, when the Government selected July 11 as the date for receiving the tenders, was it with the intention that the discussion should take place while there was a full attendance of Members?

MR. FAWCETT: Sir, I am free to confess that there is considerable difficulty in fixing the particular date for receiving tenders. I recognize, on the one hand, that we ought, if possible, to secure a proper discussion before the House will become empty. But I feel, on the other hand, that if too short a time were fixed for receiving tenders, intending contracting parties would say that they had no reasonable opportunity of making tenders. And, therefore, after careful consultation with those who were practically acquainted with the subject, we came to the conclusion that in order to secure the advantages of anything like open competition the

11th July is not too early a date. The only assurance I can give the House is this—that the very moment the tenders are received, not an hour shall be lost in giving them most careful consideration, and coming to a decision as rapidly as possible. And as soon as that decision has been come to, although I have no authority to state what the Business arrangements of the House may be, I think I am not going too far in saying that my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister, recognizing the importance of the subject, will do all in his power to allow the subject to be discussed as early as possible.

Mr. M. BROOKS said, he desired one word of explanation. The fact was, he had prepared a Question of similar import to that standing in the name of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray); but as he thought he would have no opportunity of putting it to-day he had not placed it on the Paper.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—WEST CLARE RAILWAY.

Mr. KENNY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If his attention has been called to the following remarks reported in *The Clare Examiner* as having been made by Mr. Richard Stackpoole, J.P., at the County Clare Presentment Sessions, held at Ennis, on Tuesday, May 22—

> "Mr. Stackpoole,—As I see it is the wish of the people I will sign it (*i.e.*, the contract for the Ennis and West Clare Railway) when I see my co-directors. We took the greatest possible trouble in this matter. We had an interview with the Lord Lieutenant, and went to London and saw Mr. Childers, who said the contract was an immoral one."

Whether it is a fact that the right hon. Gentleman has used the expression attributed to him; and, if so, whether he has any objection to state the grounds upon which he based the assertions?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Childers): Sir, I have to say that in the long interview which I had with the Directors and officials of the West Clare Railway I do not remember that the word "immoral" was used by myself, or by anyone else, as applicable to their contemplated contract. The facts, as stated to me, were as follows:—The Railway would be 26½ miles long and be constructed on the 3 feet gauge, and its cost in cash would be about £150,000. I was informed that by the Act under which it was proposed to be constructed, the capital was to be £255,000, of which £95,000 were to be ordinary shares of little value, £75,000 shares, the interest on which would be guaranteed by certain baronies, and £85,000, debenture capital, to be lent by Her Majesty's Government. The contractor, whose name was not disclosed, would take the whole shares, guaranteed or not, and the amount lent by the Government. I said on behalf of Her Majesty's Government that I would be no party to an arrangement of this kind, but that if the capital was to be £150,000—that is to say, £100,000 share capital guaranteed by the baronies, and £50,000 loan capital—I would favourably consider any recommendation by the Irish Board of Works to lend the £50,000 on the usual terms.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked, Whether the Chief Secretary for Ireland was ready to state the course the Government proposed to adopt with regard to the Labourers (Ireland) Bill, which was placed on the Paper for to-morrow?

Mr. TREVELYAN said, that in the remarks which he made on Wednesday last he named a fortnight as the minimum time which would be required for the Government to agree upon the Amendments, which were of so important a nature that they would amount to something like a reconstruction of the Bill on certain points. He understood that the hon. Gentleman named to-morrow with the intention of postponing the Bill for another week, if he (Mr. Trevelyan) desired it. Any obstruction placed in the way of the Bill by a private Member had been done on his own responsibility, and, no, doubt, for very good reasons, but without the approval of the Government.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that an hon. Member, with characteristic meddlesomeness, had put down a blocking Notice; and he wished to know from the Chief Secretary whether the Government intended to adopt any such course towards the Bill?

Mr. TREVELYAN said, the Government did not intend to take that course, and he rather protested against the hon. Member's description of the blocking Notice. He could very well understand, as this was an extremely important Bill, some hon. Members putting down such a Notice from a desire that the Bill should receive the very fullest discussion. There was a distinct understanding the other day that if the Government saw its way to adopt the Bill, with certain Amendments which he would propose, the Government would be quite satisfied to take it very late at night. The hon. Member who put down the blocking Notice might not have been aware of that proposal on the part of the Government. But that was the course which the Government wished to pursue with regard to the Bill, and they would use their influence with other hon. Members in order that that course might be adopted.

MR. BUCHANAN asked the Chief Secretary if he would allow the House to see the Amendments which he intended to propose, and give opportunities for full discussion?

MR. TREVELYAN replied, that he considered this Bill as of very serious importance. In the present state of Business they would be obliged to take it very late at night. The only Irish Bills which the House had considered this Session had been taken late at night, and the discussion was ample, and conducted in a business-like manner. Whatever hour the Labourers' Bill came on, the Government intended it should have full discussion.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that if he might enter into an undertaking, he would frankly co-operate with the right hon. Gentleman in any course he might adopt to further the Bill. He asked whether by that course he would be precluded from bringing it on late at night?

MR. TREVELYAN: The hon. Gentleman will consult his own duty in the matter.

MR. BUCHANAN inquired if the Chief Secretary would place his Amendments on the Notice Paper before Committee stage was reached, so as to secure an adequate discussion of the Bill at that stage?

MR. TREVELYAN: Yes; certainly.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, that while he was very anxious to see the Bill carried, he certainly did not understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that he would take the Bill at a late hour. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER interposed, and the hon. Member, being out of Order, resumed his seat.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS SCOTLAND) BILL.—[BILL 190.]

(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL said, he thought that if Scotch Members were inclined to complain of the manner in which Scotch Business was transacted in this House, they would have a grievance on the present occasion. A most important question had been raised, affecting the whole agricultural interest of England and Scotland. One would suppose, in common fairness, that the question relating to Scotland would have been given the same prominence as was given to the same question respecting England. But that had not been the case; for whereas the English Agricultural Holdings Bill was put down as the first Order upon a Government night, the Scotch Bill was only put down as the second Order last night. Scotch Members were kept waiting in uncertainty until a comparatively late hour, and now the Bill was almost flung at their heads without a word of explanation from the Government. Therefore they approached, or might approach, the consideration of this measure in a very unfavourable mood, as they had no official knowledge of the provisions of the Bill. They would be referred, no doubt, to a great deal that had been said in the promotion of the English Bill as applicable to this measure; but, for his part, he thought it would have been a preferable mode of procedure if one Bill had been devised for the two countries, with such variations in the clauses as might be called for by the difference in the laws of the two countries. He was glad, however, to have an opportunity of considering the Bill, even at this comparatively late period of the Session. Any remarks as to the details of the Bill which might suggest themselves to hon. Members would, he thought, be better deferred for discussion in Committee. Therefore, the few remarks he should offer for consideration would refer rather to the general principles involved in the Bill, and its general effect upon land tenure in Scotland. He supposed that among the many promises entered into by candidates for Parliamentary honours at the late General Election, none flowed more glibly from the tongue, none commended themselves more to the honest judgment of those who made them, and none were more acceptable to those who heard them, than the promises made to support a measure to secure the farmer in the outlay of his capital, and to give compensation for unexhausted improvements. Agriculture at that time was, perhaps, at the depth of depression. The sympathies of every class of the community had been extended towards the farmers, and any practical means of relieving them, consistent with prudence and expediency, had been discussed and considered by every class of the community. As was usual in times of perplexity and difficulty, there had been a plethora of advice. A host of plans had been suggested, and some that seemed to many of them to have a very small practical bearing upon the question at issue. Advantage had been taken of the state of matters that prevailed to recommend the abolition of long-established customs, which had not been thought inimical or deleterious to the farming interest. But even those of them who could not approve of the movement for abolishing the Law of Primogeniture or the Law of Entail, not seeing how farming was to be affected by the abolition of these laws, had thoroughly agreed that, if a sound measure could be provided to protect farmers against loss, to prevent landlords gathering where they had not strawed, they were all of one mind and one voice in promising their support to a measure of that description. He supposed there never was an abstract proposition made which commanded such universal consent as that a farmer should have reasonable security in the outlay of his capital, and that his improvements should not be confiscated either by the landlord or by the incoming tenant. It was only when the question came to be practically considered and discussed that its magnitude, its complexity, and its innumerable dangers and perplexities loomed upon them. He recognized in this Bill, as drawn by the Government, an honest, and in many respects a skilful, attempt to deal with a most complicated question; but he would ask the leave of the House to point out one or two directions in which he thought it might be improved, and one or two respects in which he was bound to say he thought it objectionable. Of the many suggested improvements connected with this question of compensation for unexhausted outlay, the plans proposed grouped themselves into two classes. The first, which been ably propounded and supported by many attractive arguments, was that of mulcting the landlord of a proportion of any increased rent obtained at the beginning of a new lease; and the second group of plans based the proposed compensation on the ground of the tenant's original outlay. It seemed to him that the framers of this Bill had adopted neither of these plans. The 1st clause proposed that the compensation should be in proportion to the benefit received by the incoming tenant. There was no reference whatever to the original outlay by the old tenant. He thought a little consideration would show that this was not a practicable or a fair proposal. The compensation of the old tenant should surely be based upon the original sum of which he was out of pocket by the original improvement, and diminished by so much as the improvement had ceased to be of value. As to mulcting the landlord of a portion of any increase of rent which might be obtained on account of the rise in value of the farm, he thought Government had done well to abandon that suggestion. Although he thought it would probably have turned out in the end to be less costly to the landlords, as a class, than either the present proposal of the Government, or the second alternative he had mentioned—namely, basing it on the original outlay of the tenant—still it would be so difficult to discriminate between the rise in value caused by the improvements of the tenants and by other circumstances which constantly affected agriculture, that it would have ended in a very complicated state of things. What he wanted to impress upon the Government was this—that it was most important that Clause 1 should be altered so that no compensation should be awarded to any tenant greater than his original outlay. He did not suppose that any respectable tenant would ask or expect that; but very often under the proposed clause it would be granted. He would give the House an instance that affected himself. Some years ago there was erected on a farm on his property some buildings which cost £270. The agreement was that the tenant was to be compensated at the end of the lease. That agreement was modified upon a new lease being entered into by the tenant continuing the occupation of the holding and of the buildings, and the compensation was deferred till the end of another lease of 19 years. Well, the tenant died, the lease continued, and when the second lease came to an end compensation by arbitration had to be undertaken, and he had to pay his tenant, or rather his tenant's representatives at the end of the lease, whatever sum was put upon the buildings by the arbitrators. Now, if hon. Members would remember that the original outlay was £270, they would, perhaps, be inclined to attach some weight to his objections to this clause when he told them that he had to pay £500, and the ground upon which arbitrators went was that these buildings could not be erected now at a less cost than £500. It was true they were erected for £270 originally, but they had nothing to do with that. They had only to look and estimate what the cost would be if undertaken now; therefore, he had to pay nearly double the original outlay to the representatives of the tenant. That he did not think was fair. Well, there was another point which specially applied to the Scotch Bill. Farms in Scotland were generally held under leases of, as a rule, 19 years. This Bill was made to apply to existing leases, and that without respect to any conditions that might exist under these leases. For instance, the operations under the 3rd part of the Schedule — manuring and the use of feeding stuffs — although they might have been, as they frequently were, stipulated for and agreed to by the tenant in the lease, without compensation, still, under the Bill, that was to be set aside, although in fixing the rent it must have entered into the calculations—that was to be set aside, and compensation awarded under this Bill. Surely the right hon. and learned Gentleman who was in charge of the Bill had sufficient practical knowledge of the management of land to know that nothing was more common in the past—and it was still very common in Scotland—than the granting of improving leases. A farmer takes a farm at a certain rent, which is fixed with due regard to certain improvements which he undertakes to carry out. Now, was it right that a lease of the description should be affected and altogether set aside in this way by this Bill? He thought not; and he thought the Bill would be made not less valuable to those who would benefit by it, if some modification were made in this respect. Another point to which he should like to call attention seemed to him a very important one. That was as regarded drainage. He thought it was pretty well acknowledged by those who were most interested in agriculture that it was not worth while undertaking drainage, unless it was to pay at least 10 per cent, and for this reason, that it was not a permanent improvement; and if they undertook drainage which was only to pay 6½ or 7½ per cent, then at the end of 22 or 25 years they only got back their capital, with the interest, and no more, and very probably the work had to be done over again. Therefore, they were not a bit richer or better off at the end of 22 or 25 years than they would have been had a tile never been put into the ground at all. He thought, therefore, that when they limited the landlord to charging his tenant 5 per cent upon an improvement of this description, they were putting the figure too low, especially when a limited owner could obtain money for the purpose at a much greater outlay. But it might be said, if a landlord chose not to conduct this operation, then the tenant might do so. This was very good. It was a very proper proposal; but he thought it should be made under certain restrictions. He thought the power should not only be given, but it should be required, that all drainage executed by the tenant, for which the landlord had to compensate him, was to be executed under the inspection and with the approval of an Inspector appointed by the Inclosure Commissioners. He thought there would be an advantage to both classes from this provision. The farmer would have the advantage of the direction of the Inspector, and the landlord would be satisfied that the work was done in an efficient manner. Therefore, he thought, when they imposed the condition in the Bill upon the execution of drainage by tenants and compensation by landlords, they would be doing no more against the interests of one class than already existed in relation to another class. But perhaps the most difficult question that was attempted to be dealt with by this Bill was that of compensation for unexhausted manures and feeding stuffs. There was no time limit provided for it, and yet it was well known that no manures were perennial, and some of them were of a decidedly ephemeral character. There was no condition made for the landlord satisfying himself that manures and feeding stuffs used should have been of a proper character, and should have been kept in the holding when the tenant flitted. It should be left to the arbitrators to decide whether the manures, of which they saw the results and which results might very well be confounded with the results from other operations, had been of a proper description, and whether there was really any value remaining from them. He failed to see how arbitrators, unless they were gifted with something approaching to second sight, could be expected to discriminate in questions of this nature; therefore, he would ask, would it not be well to insert a clause empowering the landlord to give notice to his tenant that he required to be satisfied as to the nature of the operations to be carried on under the 3rd part of the Schedule; that the tenant should give the landlord every facility to visit the holding, and to take samples of the manure and feeding stuffs, which should be submitted to a competent analyst, and the analysis should be taken into account in fixing the amount of compensation to be awarded? He might be told that this was an undue interference with the tenant. Well, the whole Bill was an interference; it was an interference with landlords, and he thought tenant farmers must expect to be interfered with also, as it could not be an interference altogether in one direction, and he was prepared to prove that benefit would accrue to the tenant from that very interference. Farmers were liable to be imposed upon, and the most worthless trash was foisted upon them in the shape of manure, and they had to pay through the nose for it. He had the last number of *The Transactions of the Highland Agricultural Society*, and in it there was a Report from the Strathearn Agricultural Association of the manures submitted to analysis by the purchasers and the sellers. He was told that the Report had had the effect of alarming the agriculturists of the district so much, and was making them so careful as to the kind of the manure, that the sellers of the manures were about to bring an action for libel against the Highland and Agricultural Society. He knew not how that might be; but the manures were sufficiently startling. For instance, in one kind of manure mentioned—bone manure—that was analyzed, the price charged for it was £8 10*s.* per ton, and the value put upon it by the analyst was £4 per ton. There were several instances of that sort; in the case of turnip manure, the price charged was £7 10*s.* per ton, and the value put upon it by the analyst was £5 5*s.* per ton. Now, if a clause such as he proposed were included in the Bill the tenant would have the advantage of analysis and a guarantee as to the manure, and the landlord, on his part, would be satisfied as to the nature and the mode and kind of application of the material for which he had to compensate his tenant. Of course, the intention of the Bill was to protect tenants against grasping landlords; but it would only be fair if the Bill was extended so as to protect landlords against fraudulent or dishonest tenants; and unless some provision was inserted to enable landlords to satisfy themselves in the direction he had mentioned, there would be a door opened to all sorts of imposition by indigent or unscrupulous tenants. They had heard a great deal during the debates on the Ground Game Act as to the terrors of a *Dominus contractus*. The landlord was assumed to be the *Dominus contractus* in that Act, and now they were going to make another. They were going to make the tenant absolute master of the situation, and deprive the landlord of every defence against him. There was one aspect of the Bill which he thought had escaped the attention it deserved. In Scotland their agriculture had always been distinguished for the system of leases. After this Bill was passed into law there would be no reason whatever for a continuance of this system. The object of a lease was that the tenant should enjoy absolute and undisturbed possession of a holding for so long a time as would secure him a reasonable return for his outlay. If that reasonable return was to be secured to him by this Bill what reason existed for continuing the lease? Looking at the position of the tenant farmers of Scotland at the present time, compared with that which they occupied 50 or 100 years ago, it would be seen that leases had been distinctly advantageous.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR: To the landlords?

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL replied, that they had undoubtedly been advantageous to the landlords, and it would not be without regret that he would see the good old custom of leases departed from. It was an advantage to the farmer in this respect—that it gave to the Scotch farmer a position of independence that had been altogether unknown under the English system. Of course, this Bill was another step in the direction taken by the Ground Game Act of 1880. It was another interference with contract, and as such he regretted it. As was pointed out in Mr. Auberon Herbert's letter the other day in *The Times*, the word "child" was to be written in large letters on the back of the English farmer—"under State protection, and not allowed to make his own contracts." He thought that was very much to be regretted, because many of the farmers with whom he was acquainted resented this as an interference with independence and self-respect. There was an idea prevalent among Members of the Radical Party that a tenant was conferring a great benefit upon his landlord by taking his farm. He could not conceive how anybody practically acquainted with agriculture could adopt that view. He should recommend to them the perusal of a pamphlet by Sir John Lawes, published in 1881. In summing up the results of his experience, he stated—

> "When we come to the application of results given in the foregoing 35 pages of the general agriculture of Great Britain, it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that in most cases profitable agriculture involves the slow but continuous exhaustion of the soil—an exhaustion from that state of virgin land in other countries which British agriculture has to meet in competition."

Therefore, so far from the benefit being all conferred by the tenant upon the landlord, in the very vocation which he pursued upon the property of the landlord he was deteriorating his property inevitably and unavoidably. He knew that many hon. Members regarded this Bill and the English Bill with indifference, because they really enforced stereotyped customs which were prevalent on the most liberally-managed estates; but he thought the history of the last few years must have been in vain if they did not perceive that no sooner would this Bill pass into law than attempts would be made to carry legislation further. This Bill, as soon as it became an Act, would be used as a lever further to alter the relations and regulations of land tenure in this country. He knew that his hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) approved of this Bill. The hon. Member told him of the established custom which had long prevailed in his county. That bore an immense resemblance to arguments which were used in favour of the Irish Land Act. If he remembered aright, in 1870 certain customs which had grown up in certain parts of Ireland were established by law all over Ireland, and they were told that that measure was final; but it was far from being so. It must not be supposed that he grudged support to this measure. He thought, on the whole, it was a tolerably successful attempt to deal with one of the most difficult problems that had ever been presented to any Government; and it was in the faith that it would not be made the basis of further legislation, and because of the respect shown therein for certain principles which he had been taught to hold in honour, that he would give the Bill his cordial support, although, at the same time time, reserving to himself the right to amend it in Committee; and he trusted that the motives of those who had framed the Bill would be carried out—namely, that it would result in the increased development of the land industry, in whose prosperity the whole welfare of this country was so much wrapped up.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he thought it was very evident, from the Bill which they were now considering, that the Government did not sufficiently realize the justice of the complaints of farmers or the necessities of agriculture, which the Bill was intended to meet. It was quite true that much of the present depression was due to the bad seasons of the last few years; but it must be remembered that the state of agriculture eight years ago was such as to demand the intervention of Parliament, and the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875 was the consequence. That Bill, it was now generally admitted, had proved inadequate to meet the necessities of the case. During the last eight years the position of agriculture had been still further aggravated. New countries had been opened up, facilities for transport had greatly increased, and the British farmer had now to meet a much more intense competition from abroad than formerly was the case. On the other hand, and from various causes, principally from the deterioration of the soil and the decrease of capital, the British farmer was in a worse position to meet the competition. If, therefore, legislation was necessary in 1875, it was much more necessary now, and if the Agricultural Holdings Act had failed to meet the state of matters which then existed, a much more comprehensive and efficient measure had now become necessary.

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL: It did not apply to Scotland.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, the hon. Baronet had reminded him that the Act of 1875 did not apply to Scotland; but, practically, that did not affect the argument. Although the Agricultural Holdings Act applied to England and not to Scotland, the state of agriculture in England was worse than in Scotland. It was quite true that agricultural depression greatly prevailed in Scotland; but it had not got to that extent that large portions of land had gone out of cultivation, as in the case of England. Almost every Member who had addressed the House upon this subject dealt with the question of compensation for tenants as if it were to benefit tenants only, and as if the farmers were asking something at the expense of the landlords. Compensation for improvements would, undoubtedly, be a great advantage to farmers; indeed, it was his case that compensation to farmers for unexhausted improvements was indispensable to the successful carrying on of the business of farming. But the question was of far greater importance to the landlords than to the tenants in these times. It was not now with the farmer a question of more or less profit, but whether he could carry on the business of farming, pay any rent, and make a living? If he found he could not make a living, the farmer would take his capital to other lands. That was a course that was hardly available to the landlord. It was quite true, as the First Commissioner of Works suggested the other night, that the landlord might farm his own land; but he did not observe that that suggestion was received with anything like approval from the other side of the House, and those who knew anything about the matter would have little difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the experience of the right hon. Gentleman in the direction of his suggestion was very slight. It seemed to him that the experience of the last five years ought to have convinced the landlords of both England and Scotland that there was something radically wrong in the conditions under which a farmer held his land. The symptoms certainly had been very decided. They had had unpaid rents, unlet farms, and large deductions from the rents where landlords were successful in re-letting their farms, and in some instances a large amount of land had gone out of cultivation. It was cultivated neither by the tenants nor by the landlords. This applied to England, where the symptoms were more intensified than in Scotland. Then there was the disappearance of tenants' capital, shown by the decrease in the numbers of cattle and sheep during the last eight years, and this decrease began to take place before the bad seasons came upon them. Under these circumstances, it appeared to him that it should be the anxiety of landlords to offer inducements to tenants to make that expenditure on the land which was absolutely necessary to meet the growing competition from abroad. What did the farmers demand? They asked, in the first place, for freedom of cultivation; and, in the second place, for security of capital. By freedom of cultivation the farmer desired the opportunity of cultivating the soil in the manner which his experience told him would be the best and most profitable. He desired to have the right to grow such crops as he found to be most advantageous, and to sell his produce in the market which he found the best. Security of capital meant that the tenant should have the right to reap such return as the soil might yield for the expenditure of his capital and skill on the soil, and if he was deprived of that right, that he should receive full compensation for the increased value of the holding to his successor. These were surely no unreasonable demands. These were the conditions on which every manufacturer carried on his business, and they were no less necessary to the farmer. Farmers demanded nothing which was the property of the landlords. The question which they had to consider was, whether the Bill gave that freedom of cultivation and that security of capital which was necessary? If the Bill failed in inducing farmers to increase their expenditure in raising the fertility of the soil, it would fail in its main objects. There had been heard very little during the discussion of the public interest in the cultivation of the land. He wished to point out that the interest of the farmer and the interest of the public were identical. The object of both was that the land should yield the maximum of produce. This Bill was spoken of as embodying a new principle—that the tenant should be entitled to compensation for unexhausted improvements left to benefit a successor. That was the basis of the Act of 1875; and if a declaration of principle had been sufficient then, the failure of that Act would not have necessitated new legislation now. But what was the use of declaring a principle, and at the same time declaring that the principle should not be applied? But they were told that there was a difference between this Bill and the Bill of 1875, in this respect—that the present Bill was compulsory. He admitted that it was, to a certain extent, compulsory. It went as far as the Amendment which in 1875 he had proposed to the Agricultural Holdings Bill, and that was to make the provision in respect of the 3rd Schedule of that Bill compulsory. If that policy had been adopted at that time, he did not say that agricultural depression would not have existed now, but the state of matters would not have been so bad as they were, and they would have got some experience of the operation of such a measure, and would have found out whether it was sufficient to induce the farmer to make improvements. Although this Bill was, to a certain extent, compulsory, the difference between it and the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875 was not very great. He thought the Government would admit that, so far as the 1st part of the Schedule was concerned, the provisions of the Bill were entirely permissive, because the Bill would have no effect without the consent of the landlord. It was of importance to consider some of the improvements which the Government thought the tenant should not make without the consent of the landlord. One of those improvements was the reclamation of waste land. The Government thought the tenant should not be at liberty to reclaim waste land unless the landlord gave his consent. He could not help thinking that that was a very extraordinary position for the Government to take up. What possible harm could arise to the landlord if his tenant did improve the waste land? If he did so it would be at his own expense and risk? Then there was the erection of labourers' cottages. This had been a question of great importance among farmers for many years, and some years ago a Bill was brought before the House, endeavouring to provide that a tenant might erect labourers' cottages, and obtain compensation at the end of the lease. He felt that a great responsibility attached to farmers in respect of the dwellings which labourers occupied; but, after the declaration on the part of the Government, that the tenant should not be at liberty to erect such cottages without the consent of the landlord, there would be sufficient excuse for the farmers to avoid incurring the expenditure themselves. The Government ought to have at least made provision to enable the farmers to make as decent accommodation as they could for the labourers, and so remove one of the scandals which affected very seriously a good many districts of Scotland. It struck him as very strange that this Bill seemed to be framed upon the idea that if it were made an effective measure, farmers would enter on a wild and reckless expenditure. He did not know what farmers had done to raise such an expectation. It seemed to him that the landlord had full security against any reckless expenditure on the part of his tenant, if the landlord only paid such compensation as he would receive from a successor. As regarded Part II. of the Bill, he was ready to admit that it was, to a certain extent, compulsory. Provision was made whereby, if the landlord, upon notice given, did not execute drainage, the tenant might do so at his own expense, and claim compensation at the end of the lease. He did not like very much this notice on the part of the tenant to the landlord. He thought such an improvement would, practically, always be carried out as the result of a conference between the landlord and the tenant, as the tenant would never be anxious to invest money in permanent improvements if the landlord would advance money at a moderate rate of interest. But this provision was very much better than the 1st part of the Schedule; and it would be a very great improvement to the Bill if the Government would give the tenant power, on giving similar notice, to make all improvements which he might desire and consider profitable under the 1st part of the Schedule. That was to say, if the tenant thought the improvement desirable and profitable, he should be bound to give notice to his landlord, who would have power to carry out the same, and to charge the tenant 5 per cent on the expenditure; or, if not, the tenant would carry out the improvement himself, and claim compensation at the end of his lease. Before the Bill passed through Committee, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would provide some simple means of determining what was a fair and reasonable agreement, so that there would be no room for dispute at the termination of a lease when the settlement came to take place between the parties. As regarded Part 3 of the Schedule, so far as he had been able to make out, the provision amounted to this—that an incoming tenant should be bound to pay to a waygoing tenant such portion of his expenditure on manure as could be ascertained to remain unexhausted in the soil. That was an extension of the present system that prevailed throughout Scotland. At the present moment an incoming tenant had to pay a waygoing tenant for the manures which remained on the holding; and if he understood the intentions of the Government aright, this principle was to be extended so far that there was to be paid, in addition to the manures which were not applied to the land, also such portions of the extraneous manure which had been applied to the land as were still unexhausted. That was an application of the principle of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875; but the basis of settlement was completely different, and he was not at present prepared to say whether he should not prefer the mode of settlement provided for by that Act. The broad provision in the Bill looked fair and equitable; but he thought there would be much more difficulty in carrying it out. This he would say in favour of the Act of 1875—that both the outgoing and incoming tenants had a better idea of what they were to receive and what they were to pay than was possible under this Bill. The Bill endeavoured to engraft on the Scottish system a part of that custom which obtained in considerable portions of England. He thought that was something in the nature of an experiment; but he was quite willing to recognize the compulsory character of that part of the Bill, and that it would be of considerable advantage to certain tenants. He had very considerable doubt whether the Bill would have the effect of inducing farmers to lay out much greater expenditure on manures, and thereby increase the fertility of the soil. This system of payment by Schedule for individual improvements was, in his opinion, altogether inadequate to meet the present necessities of agriculture. The fertility of the land must be largely increased before the farmers of this country would be able to meet competition from abroad. One of the great advantages of the 19 years' lease in Scotland was that it had induced the farmers to increase the fertility of the soil, and have a much larger stock of manures in it than had been the case in England. They saw the result in what had taken place in the two countries. In England, when bad times came upon farming, a great many farmers at once became submerged. Farming became unprofitable more quickly because there was not a stock of manure in the soil, and farms were either unletable, or in some cases going out of cultivation. The Scottish farmers had found out that a 19 years' lease was long enough to induce an energetic young man to enter on a course of improving, and much too short to enable him to reap the benefits of his improvements. In order to see how increased fertility had to be compensated for, let them consider what took place in a 19 years' lease. According to usual experience, farmers had to enter upon a farm in a poor condition, and with the soil much exhausted. It was necessary largely to increase the quantity of manure in the soil so as to produce crops which would pay. This was a very slow and expensive process. It required not less than from five to 10 years to get a farm into fair condition. During all this time the improving tenant was making large expenditure, and seven or eight years at least would elapse before his liberal expenditure began to repay him, and if the farm was in poor condition, he would find that he had sunk £3 to £5 per acre in the soil. He did not know anything in the Bill that would do much to stimulate that large investment of money; and if the Bill failed to induce the farmers to do so, he thought that, so far as the public were concerned, it failed in its main object. He admitted that freedom of cultivation was a difficult subject; but, still, he thought the Government ought to have gone, and he hoped they would still go, a step in that direction. It was absolutely necessary, to give farmers confidence, that they should have freedom of cultivation. On the best managed properties in Scotland, under the most enlightened management, farmers were now getting freedom of cultivation. He himself, under an enlightened management, 20 years ago, got full power to farm as he thought proper, and he believed the landlord had had no cause to regret giving that liberty. What Scottish farmers complained of was this. They were bound to a strict rotation of crop, and if from any accident the crop failed, it was not lawful for them to replace it by another crop. They could not change to any extent the rotation specified in the conditions of the lease. There was almost invariably a clause which provided that for every acre cropped out of rotation the tenant should pay a pactional penalty of from double the rent up to £5 or even £10 per acre. The landlord could exact this penalty altogether irrespective of damage done to the farm. This was unfair and unnecessary, and it was only unscrupulous landlords and agents that took advantage of it to oppress a tenant quitting a farm. What the tenants of Scotland were prepared to accept was this. They wished free cultivation, leaving it always open to the landlord to claim damages for any deterioration of the farm. It was, unfortunately, the case that few landlords or agents had yet realized the fact that the most profitable crops to the tenant were also the most profitable to the landlord. There was another grievance of which Scottish farmers complained, of a subsidiary character, no doubt, but in some cases of very great importance, and that was that they had no power of assigning leases. It would be a very great advantage, and give great confidence to farmers, if they had power to do so under certain circumstances. At the present time the tenant could not assign a lease under any circumstances without the landlord's consent. There was another exceptionally arbitrary power possessed by landlords, in the fact that the tenant could not dispose of his lease by testament. According to the law of Scotland, the landlord had the power of refusing to accept any tenant except the heir-at-law. The farmer could not leave his lease, however much his improvements might be, to his widow without the landlord's consent. He had known cases in which this had given rise to considerable hardship. He thought it would be no violation of the landlord's rights if the power of assignment and of bequest were made by this Bill the right of every tenant under proper safeguards. Looking at the Bill as a whole, it was certainly not such a measure as the tenants of Scotland had a right to expect, particularly after the declarations made by the Prime Minister and other Members of the Government. If these declarations had been implemented, the Bill would have been highly satisfactory to the tenants of Scotland. These pledges, as they were understood to be, had certainly not been fulfilled in the measure before the House. No one doubted the intentions and the goodwill of the Prime Minister, or his desire to carry out and fulfil the expectations which he thought he was fully justified in saying were encouraged at the last General Election. He could only assume that the Prime Minister had not been able to carry out his generous intentions of doing justice towards the tenants of Scotland and England. They had heard a great deal of protection being desired for the sitting tenant. His great objection to the Bill was that it did not protect sufficiently the removing tenant. If it had sufficiently protected the removing tenant, it would have done a great deal to protect also the tenant who desired to remain in his holding. What the tenants looked for was not a measure on this basis of compensation which proposed that every improvement should be dealt with by itself; but they desired, and it would have been much better for the landlords to have granted, a measure which would have secured to the farmer compensation on the basis of the increased value of his holding as a whole so far as that was due to his improvements. The improvements of the farm might be due to very many causes—to improved manuring, or to superior cultivation. The system of compensation by Schedule in the Bill put off the tenant with the least compensation that could possibly be granted to him. If a farm were, during a tenancy, increased in value 10*s.* per acre, and if 5*s.* per acre of the improvement was due to the tenant's own industry and skill, he was fairly entitled to be compensated in respect of the increased value due to his exertions when he was turned out of his holding. If such a measure had been introduced, he was confident that the farmers of Scotland would have accepted it as a settlement of the question for an indefinite period. A very considerable amount of uncertainty would prevail under the Bill, and it might operate very differently in different parts of the country, according to the arbiters appointed. So far as existing tenants were concerned, the Bill would be a advantage to them. Tenants who were anxious to give up farming, would see that in this Bill they would have a certain amount of compensation for unexhausted manures, to which at present they were not entitled. These farmers were quite justified in giving the Bill their support. But this did not give very much hope for the revival of agriculture. In fact, it seemed to him that the Bill, as it stood, would rather hasten the breaking down of the system of tenure under which farmers were now struggling to carry on their business. That system of tenure was altogether too artificial and too unnatural to resist the strain of free competition from abroad to which it was being subjected. If they were to make the most of the land—and they would have to make the most of it if farming was to be carried on and rents to be paid—the farmer must have such security as would induce him to apply his best energies, and all the money necessary, to the cultivation of the soil. The Bill, unless very materially amended in Committee, would greatly disappoint the farmers in Scotland. The Scottish farmers were law-abiding, industrious, and loyal. They had done as much as the tenants of Ireland to improve their holdings. If he was not mistaken, the increase of rental in Scotland between 1850 and 1875 had been two-thirds more than in any other part of the country. The Scottish farmers thought they were entitled to be dealt with no less liberally than their Irish brethren. They had looked forward to have some security of tenure, or at least full compensation for their improvements. The tenants in Ireland did not get fixity of tenure because of their historical connection with the soil, as they were told by the First Commissioner of Works. Their historical connection with the land was as great in 1870 as in 1881, and it was only by means very unfortunate for Ireland and for the credit of Parliament that the Irish tenant was able to get fixity of tenure in 1881. The tenants of Scotland had no desire whatever to imitate the policy of the Irish; but they intended to contend for their just rights. It was their intention, he believed, to continue this loyal, peaceful, and Constitutional agitation, which was now organized, until they secured that which they thought was justly their due. The Bill had been received with some satisfaction by the farmers of Scotland; but it was rather on account of what it might be made than from what the Bill really was. They had not abandoned the hope that very considerable amendments would be made in Committee; and he should be happy to co-operate with the Government in making the Bill worthy of a Liberal Administration, and to some extent, at least, redeem the pledges which farmers in Scotland understood to have been made.

MR. ORR-EWING said, he should not have trespassed on the House on that occasion but for the statement by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) in the debate on the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill, that, with the exception of Mr. Auberon Herbert, no public man had pronounced in favour of freedom of contract, as against compulsion. That was a very strong statement to come from the Government Bench. He (Mr. Orr-Ewing) had no doubt the right hon. Gentleman had read the letter of that veteran Whig Statesman, in which he called the right hon. Gentleman to account for this great departure from the great principles that used to guide the Liberal Party, and he should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman, whether he intended his observation to extend to all future legislation, or to confine it only to the Bill before the House, or to the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill? If he intended to apply that observation to all future legislation, it was one of the most dangerous and unfortunate principles ever announced by a Government to the House. If it applied only to the present Bill, what was peculiar to the relations between landlord and tenant, that they required such exceptional legislation? He (Mr. Orr-Ewing) believed freedom of contract to be the only principle on which business of all kinds could be conducted; and legislation which interfered with that principle must be injurious to the interest of the parties so interfered with. He, therefore, regretted that such a Bill as this had been thought necessary for Scotland. He did not blame the present Government more than the late Government. Both had endeavoured to deal with this question on what he believed to be false principles; and, indeed, there were independent Members on both sides of the House who, Session after Session, had been tinkering with the question. Under the old system of freedom of contract—of men dealing with men as rational, independent beings—farming had been conducted in Scotland in a way superior to that known in any country in the world. Notwithstanding a barren soil and a poor climate, they had, in Scotland, perhaps, the most intelligent, the most energetic, hard-working, and independent tenantry that would be found anywhere. They required no such legislation as this in order to make bargains with their landlords. They were as fit as the landlords to know what was best for their own interests, and, as a class, they had hitherto been fairly successful. No doubt, during the last seven or eight years, with very wet, cold, sunless seasons, bad crops, and bad harvests, and enormous importations of agricultural produce from every quarter of the world, grain-growing farms had been most unprofitable. Of course, that unfortunate state of matters must be dealt with. Some remedy must be found; but, in his opinion, the only way in which it could be properly dealt with was by an arrangement between landlords and tenants themselves. They understood better what arrangements it was necessary to make to overcome a state of matters arising from causes over which they had no control. In Scotland, the relationship between landlord and tenant had hitherto been of the most cordial description. The best evidence he could give of that fact was to state, what he believed would be accepted by every Scottish Member, that long leases were generally renewed by members of the same family, so that the same family remained in possession from generation to generation. So that there was a feeling of sympathy between landlords and tenants in Scotland, and landlords were ready to recognize losses sustained by bad seasons, and to give a helping hand by a reduction of rent, or delay in payment. But, of recent years, a set of busybodys, few of them agriculturists, or belonging to the agricultural class, but political agitators from the manufacturing towns, had stepped in, and perambulated the country organizing societies, and stirring up class against class. At one time it was the farmers against the landlords, and at another the labourer against the farmer. Such conduct he strongly condemned, in the interest of both tenant and landlord. It was very strange—and he did not know whether it had occurred to any other Scottish Member—that that agitation had only taken hold on one part of Scotland—that was, in the North and North-East. In the West and South-West it had no effect whatever, and his belief was, that was owing to the fact that in the West and South-West the tenant farmers were constantly coming in contact with commercial and mercantile men, and, in that way, they derived a better idea of political economy, and had more confidence in themselves in dealing with business matters. It was amusing to watch the action of these agitators. At one time they assumed the character of the friends of the people in the towns; at another as the friends of the farmers; and at another as the friends of the agricultural labourers. In the large towns they urged the reform of the Land Laws in order to attract more capital into the farming interest, and, by producing a larger crop, cheapen the price of food; but, considering the fact that already the farming of this country was so superior, that they grew more than double the quantity of cereals per acre than was grown in any part of Europe or America, that was rather absurd. These agitators also desired to remedy the Land Laws, with the view of giving tenants fixity of tenure. That had been acknowledged by the hon. Member who had just sat down, the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay); and when they addressed the labourer they wanted the Land Laws reformed in order that the labourers might have better houses, larger gardens, and larger wages; and they pointed to the wages received by the artizan classes in the towns and cities. Sometimes in England those agitators had been so successful in their agitation that they had managed to bring about more than one strike; and it was remarkable that such strikes had always been agitated for at the most difficult season of the year—the harvest. Such was the tortuous course of those self-constituted friends of the agricultural classes. Was it not strange that many of these agitators, who carried on this work in the pretended interest of the working classes, were large employers of labour in our towns and populous districts, in some instances employing thousands of men, women, and children, who were living in miserable houses, to which the sun's rays seldom penetrated, and from which disease was rarely absent? Yet these philanthropists, who were so deeply interested in the improvement of the condition of the agricultural labourers, with whom they had nothing to do, took no steps whatever to provide better houses for the workpeople by whom they were making their money. He believed the most degraded and neglected and most miserable class of people in this country were the working people in the large towns; and yet nothing was done for their amelioration. They might send Commissioners to Skye and to Lewis, and those beautiful Highland districts, where there was not one-tenth part of the misery which was to be found within a stone-throw of this House; but such a thing as a Commission of Inquiry into the dreadful condition of the vast population around them was not to be thought of. The people in Skye, though they might be poor, had always a healthy atmosphere, and surroundings which elevated the mind, and sufficient food to keep them in health. The hon. Member who had just spoken had given a very gloomy view of the condition of agriculture. With that he (Mr. Orr-Ewing) could not agree. His own opinion was that dairy farms, sheep farms, and breeding farms were paying remarkably well; and in his own part of the country he had not known a farm which had been let to a new tenant which had not brought the same rent, or a little higher. He was not aware of a single dairy farm which had not brought at least the same rent, and some had brought more. Last year was one of the best for sheep farming which had happened in his day. The hon. Member for Forfarshire had also drawn the attention of the House to the different condition in which he said farmers and manufacturers were placed with regard to improvements. He (Mr. Orr-Ewing) was afraid, however, that the hon. Member was not so conversant with the position of manufacturers as he was with agriculture, for he (Mr. Orr-Ewing) could assure him that the law with regard to improvements was the same in both cases, and that if a manufacturer chose to lay out money in extending or improving his manufactory he got nothing allowed for it at the end of his lease. It was not his (Mr. Orr-Ewing's) intention to vote against the second reading of the Bill. He sincerely hoped it would be successful. He might be mistaken; but he confessed he had great doubts of its being found of much benefit to the farming class. What he feared most of all was that it would create many dissensions, many appeals to the Law Courts, and much bad feeling between landlords and tenants, who had hitherto been on the most friendly terms. He had no doubt some amendments would be effected in the measure, and he thought it was necessary that some improvements should be made. There was no provision, for instance, for such a case as his own. He was now about to let his land, which was in most excellent order—perhaps there was none in much better order in any part of Scotland. What provision was there in the Bill with respect to the incoming tenant? Was the latter to pay him (Mr. Orr-Ewing) for improvements he had made in the last three or four years? Again, what was to be the evidence of the condition of the land 19 years hence? It might now be worth 50*s.* an acre, while perhaps at the end of the 19 years it might not be worth 20*s.* an acre. In a case of that kind, what was to be paid to the landlord for deterioration? All that showed what a dangerous thing it was for the Government to interfere with matters which ought to be settled by private individuals alone. It was impossible to foresee all the evil effects of the Bill. He believed that the only way in which farms could be let was, as he had said at the outset, by freedom of contract; and the only way in which business could be properly conducted was by man meeting man and dealing with the matter for settlement on business principles. Only on these principles could the agriculture of the country be maintained.

MR. M'LAGAN said, he thought he was in the House of Commons discussing the Agricultural Holdings Bill for Scotland; but, listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Dumbarton (Mr. Orr-Ewing), he had been transported to a meeting of the Social Science Association, in which, no doubt, a very interesting subject was being discanted upon with very great eloquence—namely, the social condition of the people; and he had not heard a word either in favour of or against the Bill, excepting one remark on which he should like to speak. His hon. Friend found fault with the Bill in so far as it interfered with freedom of contract. He was as much in favour of freedom of contract as any man in that House; but they must remember that freedom of contract had been tried on this subject in England, and they must remember further that the hon. Members who represented the agricultural interest on the other side of the House had come forward and said that it had failed in England, and that they were prepared now to try another plan. They must further remember that the Legislature of this country had placed one of the contracting parties in this freedom of contract in a far more advantageous position than the other, and that there could not, therefore, be true freedom of contract. For that reason, he was prepared to waive his opinion in favour of freedom of contract so far as this Bill was concerned. His hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) said this Bill had not proceeded upon the proper principle—that was, in so far as compensation was given for the value of unexhausted improvements to the incoming tenant, while it ought to have been given to the outgoing tenant for unexhausted improvements.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he had not said that. What he said was, that the settlement which would be satisfactory to the farmer would be compensation, based upon the increased value of the holding, so far as that increased value was due to his improvements.

MR. M'LAGAN said, he was quite prepared to take it on that footing; but his hon. Friend should consider that there were two ways of putting this question. So long as agriculture was prosperous and rents were rising, it was evident he would receive the improved value. But what had been the case during the last two or three years? They found that the land, instead of rising, had been decreasing in value. In considering this question, there were the interests of four parties to be taken into account—the interests of the incoming tenant, the outgoing tenant, the landlord, and last, but not least, the public; and all these had been taken into consideration in his view in this Bill, and would be more or less benefited by it. The Government were to be congratulated on the introduction of the Bill, for two reasons—first, on account of the basis on which they had laid the compensation for unexhausted improvements—namely, that the incoming tenant should pay for what was value to him; and, secondly, for the elasticity of the Bill. He thought that a most important consideration. Let them take, first, that the incoming tenant should pay for what was value to him. It was quite just, when they compelled a man to pay for a thing, that they should make the law such that he would receive value for what he paid. That was the principle of the Bill. If they deprived the incoming tenant from knowing what was in the soil, it was but just they should have arbitrators, who were likely to know that he was getting value for his money. The Schedule system which was in use in Lincolnshire was, he thought, productive of much harm. He found in some parts of the district, where the Schedule system had been adopted, it had led to fraud, and had, in fact, stereotyped a system of agriculture which was most detrimental. But this was quite different to the Bill introduced by the Government; and he thought the Government should be congratulated on having solved a difficulty, in having the compensation based upon the value which the incoming tenant got of the money he paid. Not only were they to be congratulated on that, but also upon the elasticity of the Bill. The provisions of this Bill did not dictate to the agriculturists of the country any system of farming which they were to pursue over the whole country, and which would stereotype in some cases perhaps a very bad system of farming; but the provisions of the Bill gave every farmer scope for the exercise of his energy, his skill, and his experience. The Bill allowed him to adopt such systems of farming as were best adapted for him and the particular district. He believed the effect of the Bill would be to lead to the advancement of all, and on that point he differed from his hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire, because there was no doubt that this Bill, if carried out in its entirety, or with such amendment as might be made in Committee, would be calculated to do very much good. Indeed, the hon. Member for Forfarshire had given very strong instances why a tenant farmer ought to receive compensation at the end of his lease. He was sorry to say that the hon. Member had missed the object of the Bill altogether in giving these instances. There was no doubt that, at the present time, when a farmer entered upon a farm he generally entered upon an exhausted farm. He had to lay out a good deal of money in bringing it into condition, and it would require perhaps seven or eight years to improve it. When he left the farm, it was necessary and just that he should receive compensation for his unexhausted improvements. That was the present system; but the object of the Bill was to prevent that in future, and to enable a farmer to keep his farm in condition right up to the end of the lease, and then the incoming tenant paid so much money on entering on the farm which was in a good condition, and not in a done-out farm, and, consequently, the instances given were quite beyond the question. Coming to the 2nd clause of the Bill, he found that a tenant under a lease, at the present time, was to receive compensation for unexhausted improvements, under the 3rd Schedule. He must say that must be made with very great caution. Indeed, the instance taken by his hon. Friend the Member for Dumbarton, was a case where a tenant would scarcely be entitled to compensation at the end of his lease. The tenant might have entered on his farm in a very high condition, and to keep up the farm he must buy every year a good deal of extraneous manure. It would be unjust to say at the end of the lease, when the farm was in high condition, that in such a case the tenant should receive compensation for the unexhausted manures. It was well known that they could not keep up the fertility of the soil without purchasing a large quantity of cake, corn, or manure. It would be a question at the end of the lease, when this Bill come into operation, whether the tenant was entitled to compensation on all the purchased food and manure which were absolutely necessary for keeping up the fertility of the soil in the state in which he got it from the landlord. He did not object to compensation; but he saw that there would be considerable difficulty, and perhaps injustice, when a question came to be decided some years hence under the 2nd clause. As regarded the 3rd clause—that which referred to the 1st Schedule—he could not say he agreed with all in the Schedule. In fact, when the Schedule system came into operation, he thought it was absolutely necessary to have a neutral party to decide between landlord and tenant. He did not see how it could be done otherwise. He was not going to advocate a Land Court for Scotland; but he thought it would be necessary to have some authority to apply to, when landlords and tenants differed, such as on the question of roads and bridges necessary for the proper work of the farm, and supply of cottages for the labourers. Then as regarded the 2nd Schedule, dealing with drainage, the tenant had to give notice from the landlord whether he should perform drainage or not, and if the landlord did not perform it, the tenant might do it himself, and claim compensation. He should be inclined to place that in the 1st Schedule, because if they had such a neutral authority as that referred to above, it would be of great advantage. It should be in the power of the landlord to have it in his power to consult some proper individual as to whether the farm should be drained or not. The hon. Member for Forfarshire said the tenant should be allowed to improve waste land. He (Mr. M'Lagan) knew some farms in Scotland where there was a good deal of waste land used for winter feeding; but in one case the landlord got an improving tenant, who improved the waste land, and the result was that he depreciated that farm, in so far as he had not winter food for his sheep. These were points that every now and then occurred, and they ought to be provided for in the Bill. As regarded the 3rd Schedule, there were certain points that he thought should be put into the 2nd—such as boning, claying, and limeing the land. He could not sit down without referring to the comparison which had been made between the Irish and Scotch tenants. He was surprised to hear that any hon. Member in the House, much more his hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire, who understood agriculture so well, represented that the position of the Irish tenant and the Scotch tenant were similar. He (Mr. M'Lagan) was pretty well acquainted with agriculture throughout Scotland, and he must say he knew very few instances indeed where the permanent improvements had been made by the tenants. Here and there it had been done; but, as a rule, it had been done by the landlords. He did not wish to depreciate the great energy that had been shown by the tenant farmers, because he thought they were as much entitled to the merit of the increase of rent as the landlords were; but they should not praise the one at cost of the other. He knew instances where tenants had improved very largely indeed, and had, unfortunately, been turned out of their farms; but these were the exceptions to the rule. Then, as regarded the sitting tenants, he really wished the Government would see their way to solving the question. He knew it was a difficult question; but he knew many instances where the tenant had had his rent raised upon his own improvements, and if that could be avoided it should. It would not be so bad in the case of Scotland, where they had leases. But in England it must be serious, where they had no leases. Where they had no leases, it was necessary to have some provision for the sitting tenant. In Scotland, where they had leases, there would not be the same difficulty; but, at the same time, it would be advisable if some plan could be devised by which the sitting tenant could be compensated for his improvements. He would conclude by again congratulating the Government on the introduction of the Bill. He thought that it was an honest attempt to solve the question, and he must say that it had been solved in a much better way than he expected it to be; and, instead of making carping speeches, and putting down carping Amendments, they should all put their shoulders to the wheel, and endeavour to make the Bill as good as they possibly could. For his part, he should give all the assistance he could to the Government. He believed this was a turning point in agriculture, and that the effect of it would be to improve agriculture, and to increase the national wealth.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said, the speech they had just listened to from his hon. Friend (Mr. M'Lagan) had been very different, both in tone and temper, from that of the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay). His hon. Friend had pointed to some Amendments in the Bill, which were in the direction of making it plainer, and guarding against possible misconception, or even fraud, and the like. But the hon. Member for Forfarshire pointed to Amendments of a very different kind. In fact, as he (Mr. Dalrymple) understood the hon. Member, the support which the hon. Member gave to the Bill was only given upon the condition of its being transferred into a very different one indeed. He (Mr. Dalrymple) took comfort, however, in the belief that it was not at all probable that Her Majesty's Government would follow the lead of the hon. Member—at least, if they had any desire to pass the Bill. He heard, with surprise, the reference made by the hon. Member for Forfarshire to the case of Ireland, and was glad that his hon. Friend (Mr. M'Lagan) took the opportunity of deprecating the notion that there was any real analogy between the case of the tenants of Ireland and those of Scotland. He (Mr. Dalrymple) should have been ashamed, if he had anything like the the knowledge of the farmers of Scotland which the hon. Member for Forfarshire had, to have attempted any comparison between the two cases. But that was the sort of language which was used by the hon. Gentleman, and those like him, when they met their tenant contituents in Scotland. They said—"Look at the favours which have been showered on the Irish tenants. You are a far more law-abiding class than the Irish tenants, and you do not get half as much." But there was one thing they left unsaid, and that was that the respective cases were of a totally different kind. He ventured to say that, whatever might be said by the hon. Gentleman who professed to speak with so much confidence, the great majority of the tenant farmers of Scotland would repudiate the notion that their circumstances were similar to those of the unfortunate tenants of Ireland. He would not attempt to enter into the details of the measure, as it was not opposed on the second reading, and it was quite obvious that the discussion of details must be deferred till they were in Committee; but would merely say that he should deprecate extremely anything which would seem to throw discredit on the system of leases which had been prevalent in Scotland so long, and of which, till lately, they were in the habit of expressing themselves as being proud. He could not believe that any circumstances which had occurred in reference to agriculture in Scotland, notwithstanding the sharpness of competition, bad seasons, and so forth, had in any way thrown discredit on the system of leases; and he should look upon it as a retrograde step if they gave currency for a moment to the idea that they drew back from the admirable system of leases which had prevailed hitherto. He trusted that care would be taken when the Bill was in Committee to guard against fraud in reference to some of the manures which were likely to be employed. He confessed he did not understand how it was to be positively discovered whether such things as bones, for instance, had been really used upon the soil. It might happen, he believed, that a man, who was disposed to behave in a fraudulent manner, might produce a bill for bones, lime, and so forth, which he professed to have purchased, and there would be no means, so far as he (Mr. Dalrymple) knew, of ascertaining whether they had been inserted in the soil. For the purpose of defeating fraud in respect of such matters, it would be important that that there should be arbitrators of a respectable kind; and it was plain that the arbitrators would have to be appointed from quarters that were above suspicion, as, otherwise, he was afraid, room would be left open for fraud. He would now leave the discussion of the Bill to others more immediately affected by it than himself, only desiring to make one further remark of a general kind. He wondered why it was not thought possible to deal with this measure relating to Scotland together with that relating to England in one Bill. He believed there was no such difference between Scotland and England in this matter, as there was between different parts of England; and, if it was not for the fantastic and ridiculous custom of dealing separately with Scotch matters, he believed that that would have been done in the present case. Was it, or was it not, a separate measure from the English one? If it was the same, then, he said, it might have been dealt with at the same time. If it was a separate measure, then, he said, it ought to have been prefaced by an introductory statement by the Government. If it was a different measure, it was a most unseemly and irregular practice that it should have been introduced for second reading without any statement on the part of the Government. They were all familiar with the somewhat disjointed condition of the management of Scotch affairs. He was not one of those who reflected, in the least degree, upon the old system. He had not, and never had had, any jealousy of what was called the bureaucracy of the Lord Advocate. He believed the old system answered very well; but what did not answer now was the absurd and fantastic and uncertain management of Scotch affairs. He was not reflecting for one moment upon the Law Officers of the Crown for Scotland, who were able and distinguished officers; but it was a ridiculous circumstance that the names on the back of this Agricultural Bill should be the names of the Law Officers of Scotland. Perhaps that was the reason why they had no introductory statement; because he put it to the House whether it was likely that the Law Officers of the Crown in Scotland should be especially qualified to discuss questions like those of the improvements to which the consent of the landlord was required, or improvements to which that consent was not required? It required a perfect spasm of the mind to conceive the notion of the Law Officers of the Crown sitting down to consider, critically, questions as to boning land with undissolved bones, and questions connected with claying, liming, and marling. It was no reflection upon the Law Officers of Scotland; but it showed how exceedingly disjointed and strange was the arrangement of Business connected with Scotland. All that might have been avoided, if there had been one Bill for England and Scotland, with such separate clauses as were necessary to meet the case of Scotland. He regretted that that course of procedure had been adopted on the present occasion, as he knew of no subject which should less be treated separately than the question of land. He could not see that there were any questions involved in this Bill that would have been at all inappropriate in a general measure; and he must repeat his regret that the opportunity was not taken to introduce a measure applicable to the whole country. It was of the greatest importance that, when it could be done, there should be general legislation for the whole country; and he could not imagine a subject more suited to such treatment than that which was now before the House.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR): Sir, I wish, in the first place, to thank the House for the manner in which the Bill has generally been received. I think the discussion has been highly satisfactory; and, although there have been certain criticisms of such a nature as one might have expected on a matter as to which there are considerable difficulties, and large and well-known differences of opinion, yet the reception of the Bill has been decidedly favourable on the whole. I do not propose to go into any general discussion of the Bill, because I think it has been very fully and satisfactorily discussed already; and I only propose to follow the course which has been adopted by previous speakers, and to make some remarks upon the main points with which they have successively dealt. I may, in the first place, say, with respect to the criticisms of the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Herbert Maxwell), and the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple), as to the Bill for Scotland having been brought in separately from the English Bill, that we still think there are good and valid reasons for that course. The English Bill made reference to the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875. There was no corresponding Act for Scotland. The English Bill imports, by reference, a not inconsiderable portion of that prior measure; and it would have been inconvenient that that course should have been followed in the Scotch Bill, for, from beginning to end, it contains phraseology and deals with many matters of which we have no knowledge in Scotland. It was surely very much better, when we had to make an entirely new Bill for Scotland, without a predecessor like that of 1875, that the Bill, although it is founded upon the same principles as those expressed in the English Bill, should be a separate measure, so that the Scotch tenants and the Scotch people should not require to go outside their Bill, and that they should not be bewildered or embarrassed with phraseology or subjects with which they were not acquainted. I can scarcely imagine any kind of Bill which it is more appropriate, or, indeed, more essential, should tell its own story, and not any other story, than a Bill addressed to the class of persons who are mainly interested in the present measure—namely, the agricultural tenantry of Scotland. I need, therefore, I think, say nothing more in justification of the course which, after due consideration, we thought fit to follow, and which we still think was the right course. There has been, I hope, no undue claim upon Parliamentary time in following that course, because no one who has listened to the discussion to-day will say that it has been at all thrown away. What I have already said affords also a sufficient justification for the course I followed in not making an explanatory speech in introducing this Bill. It was from no want of respect to the House, but simply for two reasons, the first of which was that, when I asked leave to introduce this Bill, I stated it involved the application of the same principles which are contained in the English Bill. The second was that there is no Amendment, and no block upon the Bill today; and I believe that, according to the Rules of the House, if I had spoken at the beginning, I should not have had the power of offering any explanation, or making any answers to the criticisms which have been passed upon the Bill. Well, the first hon. Member who spoke was the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigtonshire (Sir Herbert Maxwell); and he, while approving of the Bill as a whole, made certain observations upon particular portions and provisions of it. In his first point, the hon. Member seemed to indicate dissatisfaction with the measure of compensation which is proposed by the Bill. I do not think, however, while he enumerated three measures as possible, that he greatly preferred either of the other two to that which has been adopted. I submit that the measure which has been adopted is the most just of all measures, if it can be practically carried out. It is the value of the remanent improvements to the incoming tenant. That is an asset of the outgoing tenant. It is the thing which he would have enjoyed if he remained, and which he leaves when he goes. Therefore, whether there may, or may not, be difficulties in assessing the compensation, I can hardly imagine that anything in its general expression can be more just than to define the measure of compensation as it is defined in this Bill. The only substantial objection which I understood the hon. Member to state to this measure was that it might possibly give the tenant a larger sum in name of compensation than the amount which he had laid out. It is possible; but it will not often happen, because most improvements will have so far exhausted themselves, and it will be in exceptional cases only that the value of the asset of the tenant, which he would have enjoyed if he had remained, and which is his to sell when he goes out, will be more than he paid for it. But I would ask, if the remaining value is more than he expended, why ought he not to get compensation for it? [Sir HERBERT MAXWELL: That is what I object to. What has he got to sell?] The hon. Baronet may object to it; but a thing is always worth its price—that is, what it would bring if sold. The value to the incoming tenant of the outgoing tenant's improvements is treated by the Bill as a thing for which he is entitled to be compensated; and it is a form of expression which does not inaccurately describe it to say that it is a thing for which he has to get a price. [Sir HERBERT MAXWELL: Tenant right.] No; it is not tenant right, with great deference to the hon. Member. I simply put it in this way. It is no objection whatever to say that, in very rare, though possible cases, this remanent improvement may be worth more than it cost; because if the additional value it gives to the land is really and is *bonâ fide* the result of the tenant's expenditure, and does not invade or encroach upon any increment of value belonging to the landlord, it is truly an asset of the tenant, and should be valued accordingly. Therefore, the first criticism which the hon. Member passed upon the Bill is, I venture to say, not well founded. He next made some remarks in regard to improving leases. I understood him to convey that there are, in Scotland, long improving leases, and that the making of improvements is often the consideration for a low rent, which is agreed to be taken throughout the lease. We are quite familiar with such improving leases in Scotland; but I do not see how there is any observation which arises from the existence of these leases against this Bill. But if you find, as is the case in a proper improving lease, that there are certain obligations laid upon the tenant—say, for the reclamation of a certain area of waste land, or the execution of other specific improvements—and that his rent is fixed in consideration of these things, I do not see on what ground the tenant could make a claim for them. He had undertaken to make the improvements in respect of a diminished rent; and he is thus, by his bargain, compensated for them. That is just one of the fair agreements at the commencement of a lease which is left untouched by the Bill. No injustice, therefore, will be done by the Bill in the case of improving leases. They will stand on their own proper basis. The next matter with which the hon. Member dealt with was that of drainage, and he had various objections to the provisions in regard to that subject. There was one point he made which, I am bound to say, does appear to me to have something in it. He said it would not pay the landlord to execute drainage with a return of only 5 per cent; and I rather think that observation would be, speaking generally, well founded. At all events, the common stipulation in Scotland is for payment of a somewhat higher rate of interest. It must be noted, however, that this provision is only introduced into the Bill as one of three alternatives; so that if any particular landlord does not think that his land is of such a character that the drainage would be so enduring as to make 5 per cent a fair return, he has two other alternatives. He can either allow the tenant to execute the drainage works, with the liability to pay him for what residue of advantage may remain on his quitting the holding, or the landlord and tenant can make a reasonable agreement in regard to the manner of executing the works. We are all familiar in Scotland with agreements of this kind; and although the hon. Member for Buteshire seems to be of opinion that the Law Officers of the Crown know nothing about agriculture, I venture to think that we are not altogether ignorant of it. Possibly, we may have been in the country sometimes, and we may know a little about the matter otherwise. But we are all familiar with cases in which the landlord and tenant do execute drainage works by joint and reasonable arrangement. We sometimes find that the tenant executes the carriages, and the landlord provides the tiles. Again, we know that one of them undertakes to cut the tracks of the drains, while the other makes some other contribution to their execution. When three alternatives are given, two of them certainly reasonable, I do not think any landlord could complain of unjust treatment if he accepted the alternative of executing the drains and charging 5 per cent interest, when he had the other two to fall back upon. The other point that the hon. Member made with regard to drainage was, that it should be done under inspection. He suggested that drainage executed by the tenant should be under inspection, and the kind of inspection he proposed was by an Inspector of the Inclosure Commissioners. We think it is very much better, as far as possible, to dispense with the introduction of public functionaries between landlord and tenant—a view which, I believe, is largely shared on the other side of the House; and the introduction, unless it was clearly necessary, of a person from the outside to see work done, the execution of which the landlord could watch, would be a step in a direction which I did not expect to hear proposed from the quarter from which the criticism has come. There would be no advantage to the tenant in the drainage work being executed in an inefficient manner. In the first place, it is his interest to have good drains, because they are for the benefit of the holding of which he reaps the profits; and, in the second place, he knows that he will only be compensated at the termination of his tenancy for any residue of his improvements which may then remain effective. If he does not leave any residue, he will not get any compensation, so that he has every sort of stimulus to make his drains in the best way; whereas, on the other hand, the landlord, having the power of coming on the ground and seeing what is done, may make suggestions, or take any notes which he pleases, for the purpose of preserving evidence, to be adduced when the question arises, how the work was carried out, whether judiciously or injudiciously. [Sir HERBERT MAXWELL: *Ex parte.*] No; the proceedings of the arbitrator will not be *ex parte.* The landlord observing, and the tenant executing, I venture to say that part of the hon. Member's criticism was not well founded. The next part of the Bill dealt with by the hon. Member was the 3rd Schedule; and his objection was that provision is not made for notice being given, so that the landlord should have an opportunity of analyzing the manures that were proposed to be put in the ground. I know that is a point in regard to which there is some difference of opinion, and which deserves fair consideration; but, upon the whole, the view taken by the Government is that it would not be reasonable or beneficial to either party to require antecedent notice in the case of manures. It would be a very vexatious provision upon the tenant if, in cultivating his holding, and possibly putting in his manure hurriedly, when the weather suited, he had always to send a notice to the landlord, under penalty of losing any compensation for the manure, if it proved to be beneficial. It would be putting too much upon him in the busy period of the spring husbandry; and in the not improbable event of his neglecting to give notice his just claim would be cut off. And I must point out, further, that if there is any defect of evidence with regard to the character or quality of the manure it would be the tenant who would suffer. He would require to prove his case, to prove that he made an improvement of which a certain residue remained to be valued, so that if there was any defect of proof it would fall upon him. It would, therefore, be only natural that he would take care, in his own interest, to use manure of good quality, some part of which would remain in the soil at the expiry of his tenancy. It has been suggested that, in some instances, fraudulent devices might be resorted to. Of course, such things are possible; but I am bound to say that, knowing the tenantry of Scotland well, I should not anticipate that anything of that kind would be other than of the most exceptional character. On the whole, we see no reason to alter the view in which this Bill was framed, that the ordinary operations of husbandry should be allowed to be carried out in the proper time, without going through formalities that would always be vexatious, and which might sometimes lead to injustice. The next hon. Member who spoke was my hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), and his observations were in a direction diametrically opposed to the criticisms which I have just now been dealing with. On the whole, he recognized the Bill as a distinct advance, and as conferring no small benefits on the tenant; but he thought that, in some of its particulars, it did not go far enough. The first two points which he made were these—first, that the Bill did not provide for freedom of cultivation; and, secondly, that it did not afford, in his judgment, a sufficient inducement to the tenant to embark his capital in the soil. I understood his practical proposal on the first point was of this nature. He said that in Scotch leases there were frequently stipulations providing that, in the event of the land being miscropped, there should be a pactional rent paid for it. Undoubtedly that is true; but what did he propose? I understood his proposal to be that, by an Act of Parliament, those clauses should be cut down, and a declaration substituted that only the actual damage sustained should be allowed. That, as it appears to me, would be a very strong measure indeed. It seems a violent proposal to say that, where two persons have deliberately agreed on an additional pactional rent, in the event of something being done which they contracted should not be done, the Legislature should deny the effect of that agreement. In regard to the next criticism of my hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire, in which he said there was not adequate security given for capital, I understood him to object to the principle of enumeration by way of Schedule. He contended that the whole improvements made by the tenant without specification should be submitted to arbitration. Now, Sir, no doubt the proposal so stated has an air of great fairness and great plausibility; but I am afraid that what we should have to consider is—is it practicable? If you put the question so much at large, as simply to say that you are to compare the condition of the farm at the beginning with its condition at the end of the lease, without having reference to special items of improvement, you would raise a question of the vaguest and widest kind. There are many improvements, in a sense, which are really only works done in the execution of the tenant's duty, such as tilling and cleaning his land. These are points which it is suggested should be put into the Schedule, and made subjects of compensation; but I venture to say that these are simply ordinary agricultural operations, which it is the duty of the tenant to perform, both for his own interest and the interest of the holding. The theory of this Bill is, that where a man has done something beyond ordinary husbandry, something capable of definition, of proof, and of ascertainment, which adds to the value of his holding, he should be paid for it by way of compensation; and we think the proper and just mode is to schedule the items of improvement in the way we have done. Whether the Schedules would be better for being remodelled, or added to, or excepted from, are matters for discussion and determination in Committee; but on the general principle that scheduling is the right way, and that compensation should be given only for specified and definable items of value added by the tenant, we are disposed to adhere to the view presented by the Bill. The next criticism of the hon. Member for Forfarshire related to the requirement as to improvements contained in the first head of the Schedule, that they should be made with the consent of the landlord. Now, there is a great difference between works of the character there dealt with, and those things which are, like manuring, necessary for really getting the full advantage and benefit from the farm. You have building houses and doing things which alter the subject of letting; and it would be a very strong thing to say that where a man takes a holding under a contract, he should, without the consent of the lessor, be allowed to alter the character of the holding. Upon that ground we maintain that it is proper to distinguish between improvements which would alter the character of the holding, and improvements as to the propriety and necessity of which no two intelligent men could differ. Drainage, which occupies the 2nd Schedule, stands in an intermediate position between improvements for which we propose to require the consent of the landlords, and the third class of improvements, such as manuring, for which neither notice nor consent is required. And the reason for that distinction is this —that manuring and the like are necessary operations. Drainage may also be a necessary operation, and so it is allowed without consent; but then it is an operation of a much more important and extraordinary character; it is not a thing done every seed time—it is a thing done, probably, once during the currency of a lease; and notice is necessary to enable the landlord to say, first, whether he will do it; secondly, whether he can agree with the tenant in regard to it; or, thirdly, whether he will allow the tenant to do it, and submit to pay compensation; and I may add, fourthly, to obtain and preserve evidence as to how it was done. All these things seem to justify the placing of drainage in a separate category. With regard to what was urged by the hon. Member for Forfarshire in respect to cottages, it is, no doubt, exceedingly desirable that better habitations should be provided for farm labourers in many parts of the country; but I hope that this is a matter in which landlords have not been, and will not be, altogether neglectful. It is certainly much more considered now than in times past; and if the principle of classification which we have proposed is adopted, it would fall under the first, and not under the second or third heads. Of course, the landlord would get a charge on his estate, if he thought necessary. The next point that my hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire dealt with was that part of the Bill which proposes to make the Act compulsory, and he welcomed that, in so far as it went; but he seemed to have some misgivings as to whether difficulties might not arise in defining what were fair and reasonable agreements. Now, no doubt, it is a thing that will require care and skill in working out; but, at the same time, it is not a problem that is insoluble, and we should hope that no very serious difficulty will be experienced in solving it. It would be a simple matter for inquiry whether the arrangement made at the commencement of a lease was then a fair arrangement. If it appeared to be fair, it would be allowed to stand; if it was not fair, it would be disregarded. We are not unfamiliar, in law, with examples of contracts being sustained only if they were fair and reasonable. We know that, in railway law, agreements do not stand between Railway Companies which are supposed to have a monopoly and the trader, if they are not fair and reasonable; and the Courts have no difficulty in determining what is a reasonable agreement and what is not. Cases have arisen in which a Railway Company has said in a contract of carriage—"We shall not be responsible for the thefts of our servants." But the Law Courts hold that such a stipulation is neither just nor reasonable, and therefore they do not allow it to prevail. I do not apprehend that there would be any greater difficulty—probably there would be less difficulty—in dealing with the question of what is fair and reasonable, as a matter of agricultural arrangement, at the commencement of a lease than is already experienced in other matters. My hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire said that he preferred the mode of settlement provided by the Act of 1875. I am not quite sure whether he was entirely correct in supposing that there was such a difference, especially in regard to the third class of improvements as stated in the Schedule of this Bill, between its provisions and those of the Act of 1875 as he seems to imagine. If he refers to that Act, I think he will see that there is a variation in the principle adopted with regard to manures as compared with that applied to drainage and certain other improvements, such as buildings. Each is determined very much in the same manner as that which we now propose. My hon. Friend complained that there was no power conferred by this Bill to assign leases. I know that is a point as to which a good deal of difference of opinion has been entertained; but our system has been tried, and, on the whole, I do not think we have found that our Scottish leases have worked badly. They are generally for a period of 19 years. By them, generally, assignees and sub-tenants were excluded; and my hon. Friend can hardly expect that where a lessee has agreed that assignees shall be excluded—where the landlord has, in effect, said to the tenant—"I will deal with you; but I shall not deal with anyone who may become your assignee or sub-tenant"—it would be right to interfere with that stipulation, for which a consideration may have been given, possibly in a lower rent, or otherwise, when the lease was entered into. It is by no means uncommon that when a landlord comes to let his farm, he says—"If I get a good tenant, I will take a less rent." But if he has let his farm for less, because the tenant is a good tenant, the tenant has got the consideration in his lower rent, for agreeing that his lease should not be assignable. There was one point in regard to which I felt very much to sympathize with my hon. Friend, and that was in regard to the hardships that often result from the death of a tenant. There is no doubt that hardship is sometimes experienced where nobody but the heir-at-law can take up the lease, and where, perhaps, the widow and family have to be turned out. In the proposal to allow a bequest of leases, I apprehend my hon. Friend was coming nearer to sound principle than he was in dealing with assignation, and to some of the other points he mentioned. In this connection I desire to say a word in regard to the appropriateness of the provisions of this Bill to the system of lease-holding in Scotland. I know that some people think it is not so appropriate to Scotland, where we have long leases—19 years usually—as to England. I venture to say that the idea is not well founded. I can hardly conceive any case to which the provisions of the Bill are more appropriate than to that of a 19 years' lease. One of the commonest experiences at the commencement of a 19 years' lease has been—but I hope it will not be so in future—that the condition of the farm had been let down, simply because the tenant would get no compensation for his improvements. The consequence of that was that the incoming tenant was occupied during five or six years in getting the farm up to its proper standard. Then, perhaps, he would keep the farm for six, or eight, or 10 years in high condition; and then, for the remainder of the lease, he, like his predecessor, having no security for his improvements, would begin to take what he could out of the farm, so that the result was that the farm was only in its highest and best condition of cultivation during about half the duration of the lease. We believe that, by providing for compensation as we have done by this Bill, we shall insure that the normal standard shall be uniformly maintained throughout. The incoming tenant will find the farm in high condition, and the outgoing tenant will leave it in the like condition. Therefore, I venture to say that the Bill is, if possible, more appropriate to our system, where, undoubtedly, the durability of tenure for 19 years did conduce to a high standard in the middle of the lease, although it allowed a somewhat low standard in the beginning and end of a lease. We believe that we shall henceforth see a high standard maintained throughout. There were various other points as to which I should have desired to speak; but I have already occupied too much of the time of the House, and we are very hopeful, as there appears to be a general consensus of opinion in favour of the principles of the Bill, that we may obtain the second reading at this Sitting. There are, of course, other matters which we shall be glad to consider and to discuss in Committee; but I submit that there has been a clear case made out for reading the Bill a second time now, and for the House accepting the main principles upon which the Bill has been based.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, that no hon. Member who had addressed the House had described, in terms sufficiently strong, the great disappointment felt by the tenant farmers of Scotland on the appearance of the Bill, and especially on one part which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Linlithgow (Mr. M'Lagan), and to which he (Sir Alexander Gordon) was sorry the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate had not referred—the absence of any provision for giving the tenant farmer the result of his good cultivation. The whole Bill was devoted to compensation for particular outlays; but there was one class of improvement which was as beneficial as any other, and that was a continued course of cultivation. That ought to be provided for. The Bill as drawn was, in fact, simply a premium upon slovenly cultivation, rather than a measure in the interests of good cultivation. He would explain what he meant. Take the case of two farms of the same size and condition in every respect, with a lease for 19 years, at the rent, say, of £300 a-year. The man who cultivated his farm with care and attention was placed at a disadvantage in comparison with the man who treated his holding with proportionate neglect, inasmuch as the rent of the former would be raised, whilst that of the latter would remain as it was. The good tenant might then be removed to make room for the man who was willing to pay the increased rent. Any Act which introduced such a practice could not be drawn upon sound principles; and he believed that that was one reason why the farmers were so greatly disappointed with the Bill. He was very much struck with the reference of the hon. Member for Linlithgow to questions of drainage and building being referred to arbitration. He (Sir Alexander Gordon) believed that such a system would hold out many inducements for carrying out improvements, and that it would give great satisfaction to the tenants. He should, therefore, like to see the system carried out farther than was now proposed. It was already the constant practice in Scotland for disputes between landlord and tenant to be settled by an arbitrator appointed by the Sheriff of the county. That was actually the law of the land now in England and Scotland, disputes being settled in the County Courts in England and the Sheriff Courts in Scotland; while applications were made in England under the Agricultural Holdings Act, and in Scotland by the custom of the country. As to compensation, he thought the test of value to the incoming tenant was not one that ought to be adhered to. It ought to be the value of the holding as it really existed. The incoming tenant might have in view objects different from those of the outgoing tenant; the latter might have erected buildings unsuitable to the objects of the other; and every improvement ought to be considered in its relation to the original purposes of the holding. He thought also the erection of the buildings should include cottages for farm labourers employed on the holdings. There was no allusion to them in the Bill, and he thought that was a very great omission. He was sorry the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate did not intimate that he would be ready to consider an Amendment of that nature.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. B. BALFOUR) was understood to say that he would consider any Amendment in that direction.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he had not heard that part of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's speech; but he was sure many Amendments would be moved in the interests of tenant farmers and labourers in order to make it more acceptable than the present.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* 11th June.

BALLOT ACT CONTINUANCE AND AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Sir Charles Dilke, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 5.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, in rising to oppose the Motion, said, it was hardly consistent to go on with a Bill as to which the promise had been definitely and repeatedly given that it should be only taken at an hour admitting of substantive debate. No doubt, there was a kind of religious compact between the Government and their supporters that this Continuance Bill should be passed; and with regard to the Act itself, he (Mr. Beresford Hope) would confess that it was somewhat sweetened by the abolition of the hustings. Still, his objection to the ballot in itself was unmitigated; and he would not submit to the tyranny which strove to press this thing upon the House as an immemorial inheritance for some ten years. At least, the matter now stood in the advantageous position of not being a Party question. In 1874 it gave an impulsive and casual majority to the Tories, and in 1880 to the Liberals; so that in this connection the pot could not call the kettle black on either side. He was free, as a question of simple fact, to proclaim from the house-tops that the ballot had proved itself to be a delusion and a failure. Lord Palmerston used to be laughed at for opposing it with the assertion that it was un-English; but the wisdom of that suggestion could be tested by examining the legislative condition of so-called free countries elsewhere, where a legislative system existed which was founded on the ballot. In justification of his estimate of the ballot, he would quote the authority of Mr. Justice Manisty against its general tendency. That eminent Judge, at the trial of the Oxford Election Petition, declared that a careful consideration of the evidence which had been adduced led him to the conclusion that, whilst the Ballot Act had, to a great extent, done away with what might be called the simple evil of undue influence, it had created a compound evil of a worse kind; for while, under the old system of open voting, a man who had been bribed could scarcely avoid voting according to his promise, now there were many cases of persons who promised to vote for a candidate, who, in the end, broke their promise. Were they sinners at Oxford above all the boroughs of England? If such things could take place at Oxford under the influence of the Home Secretary, what must happen in boroughs that returned Conservative Members? If the Government really did believe in their own Bill, let them give the House a night to discuss it, so that the subject might be thoroughly thrashed out, and, if possible, made to disprove the criticisms of the Election Judges. In his opinion, the Corrupt Practices Bill ought first to become the law of the land, so that the electors might really know their duty, and then the Ballot Act might take its place as an appendix to it. He was always very loth to take advantage of the Forms of the House for the purpose of preventing legislation being proceeded with; but he could not help, in this instance, appealing to the right hon. Baronet the President of the Local Government Board to postpone the measure, and give a Morning Sitting for its discussion. The Bill was anomalous, if it dealt with two distinct things—namely, the hours of polling and the form of voting. Those two things had no natural connection with each other.

It being ten minutes before Seven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *this day.*

WAYS AND MEANS.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (NO. 3) BILL.

Resolution [June 4] *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir ARTHUR OTWAY, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. COURTNEY.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) [PAYMENT OF COSTS AND EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the Expenses of the Director of Public Prosecutions, including the remuneration of his representative, and of the costs of prosecution on indictment, in like manner as the costs of the prosecution for felony in Ireland, and for crimes in Scotland are paid; and the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, in the first instance, of any costs (not being costs of prosecution or indictment) payable by a county or borough, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for the better prevention of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections (Queen's *Recommendation* signified), *To-morrow.*

It being five minutes to Seven of the clock, the House suspended its Sitting.

The House resumed its Sitting at Nine of the clock.

STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. RANKIN, who had the following Notice upon the Paper:—

> "That, having in view the great and constant increase in the population of this Country, and the consequent difficulty experienced by the working classes in finding sufficient employment, this House is of opinion that a judicious system of State-aided emigration to our own Colonies is both just and politic,"

rose to speak to the Motion, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at five minutes after Nine o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 6th June, 1883.

MINUTES.] — New Writs Issued — *For* Leicester County (Northern Division), *v.* Major-General Edwyn Sherard Burnaby, deceased; *for* Derby Borough, *v.* Michael Thomas Bass, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Considered as amended*—Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (No. 3) *.

Second Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (Limerick Waterworks) * [197].

Considered as amended—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) * [158].

Considered [*not amended*]—Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (Extension of Time) * [181].

Third Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) * [172], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

WINDSOR, ASCOT, AND ALDERSHOT RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Order made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Viscount FOLKESTONE said, he very much regretted being obliged to bring again under the notice of the House this somewhat unsavoury subject; but he was compelled to do so on this occasion, on account of what had happened in the House at the time of Private Business yesterday. He had then moved, as the House would remember, to postpone the consideration of the Bill until Thursday, when he proposed to oppose two other Private Bills, for the same reason as that which induced him to oppose the present one. He was then defeated on a division, and he was now compelled to seem to be separately opposing this Bill, and this Bill alone. He could assure the House, and those interested in the Bill, that his enmity and opposition were not directed against this Bill alone; but that the action he was now taking in the matter was due to what appeared to him to be a question of principle. The reason why he opposed this Bill, and other Bills now down for the consideration of the House, was that there should be no future precedents permitted to be established by the House for altering the classification of the different articles carried by Railway Companies, or for increasing the rates, unless the House should have some specific ground assigned to it for such an alteration and increase, and unless the matter had been brought directly under the notice of the House. Unless that course were taken, he objected to anything done in a Private Bill being used as a precedent for future legislation. The House would be aware that until this year, when a new Standing Order was passed on this subject, at the instance of his right hon. Friend the Member for North Hampshire (Mr. Sclater-Booth), it was impossible for Committees to take any cognizance of rates by the alteration of the classification of articles, unless a Notice of opposition had been distinctly given to the Committee by a Petition being presented on the subject. But now, according to the new Standing Order, it was obligatory on the Committee to take cognizance of such an alteration of classification, and also of any increase proposed in the Rating Clauses. It appeared that this action was necessitated on account of several Bills having been passed last year, with an alteration of classification and of rates, without this having been brought to the notice of the Committees sitting on such Bills, or brought to the notice of the House. The new Standing Order required that the Board of Trade should make a Report to the Committee in regard to the rates and tolls proposed to be charged by any new Railway. He had in his hand a copy of the Report of the Board of Trade, not specially on the Bill they were now considering, but on another Bill. He presumed, however, that the Report of the Board of Trade on one of these Bills was almost, if not quite, identical with their Reports upon the others. In the Report which the Board of Trade had sent out, he found, in Section 3 of that Report, this passage—"A table of some of the rates authorized is appended to this Report;" and then the Report referred to some 35 Railways in an Appendix which had been permitted to obtain differential rates, and an alteration of the classification of guano and artificial manures, as compared with dung and compost, and other manures in times past. He found that no Railway obtained this different classification earlier than the year 1857; and the Report of the Board of Trade stated that other instances were to be found in Acts passed in 1862, 1865, and 1866, but more frequently in those of later years, and more notably in 1882. From the year 1857 down to the year 1882, inclusive, he found there had been 2,600 Railway Bills which had received the Royal Assent, and yet the Board of Trade only mentioned 35 which had made special charges for guano and artificial manures. Now, it appeared to him that if only 35 Railways had obtained this difference of classification since the year 1857, it was hardly an average precedent to fall back upon, because certainly 35 out of the 2,600 Railway Bills which had received the Royal Assent since 1857 was a very small percentage indeed. Further, in the Report of the Board of Trade, he found—

> "That of the Railway Acts of former years, when guano and artificial manures were less important than they have since become, no distinction was made between artificial manures and ordinary manures, and both were placed in the lowest class at about 1*d.* per ton per mile. In subsequent years it had been the practice to grant more favourable terms."

That fact he had already alluded to in showing the small average number of Railways which had got these more favourable terms. Then the Report of the Board of Trade went on to say—

> "Most, if not all, of the larger Companies appeared to have made special charges for guano and artificial manures, as for manufactured articles."

It appeared to him, therefore, that if most of the Railway Companies had done this, they had done it in contravention of the clauses of their own Acts. The Board of Trade attached to their Report another Appendix, in which they gave a detail of the tolls, maximum rates, and charges authorized in some of the principal Railway Bills; and they instanced six Bills—first, the Caledonian, in which there was a differential rate, although he saw that the original Act classed dung, compost, and all kinds of manures, and artificial manures, in one category; but the Company were permitted, by a later Act, to charge a higher rate for guano and artificial manures when sent only as samples. The six Acts mentioned by the Board of Trade were those of the Caledonian, with a differential rate; the Great Northern, which had the same rate for all manures —namely, 1½*d.*; the Lancashire and Yorkshire, which had also the same rate for all manures, and a rate rather less than 1½*d.*; the Midland, with the same rate; and the Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Act, passed in 1880, which was one of those Bills which managed to get a different classification without the matter being brought to the notice of the House. An hon. Friend told him yesterday that he was a very large consumer of artificial manures, and he obtained those manures from Liverpool. He used them upon a farm in the neighbourhood of Ely, in the county of Cambridge. They were brought to him over two railway systems from Liverpool, and the annual charge at which they were delivered to him at his farm for railway carriage was about a halfpenny per ton per mile. The hon. Gentleman to whom he referred also told him that he used a great quantity of stable manure, which was brought down to Ely from London; and the rate charged by the Great Eastern Railway Company for that stable manure averaged somewhat less than a farthing per ton per mile. Nevertheless, the Bill they were now discussing authorized a charge for artificial manures of 2½*d.* per ton, and a maximum charge for stable manures, dung, compost, and common manures, of 1½*d.* per ton per mile. He had no hostility to this Railway, or to any of the other Railways affected by the same question, in any shape or form whatever. His hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Sir Gabriel Goldney) spoke to him yesterday, and criticized, in no unmeasured terms, the action he was taking in regard to this Bill. He could quite understand his hon. Friend being indignant with him for taking this action if he were actuated by hostility towards the Bill; but, as he had said before, his action was not on account of hostility to this Bill, or to any other Bill, but he merely wanted to prevent a precedent being established in future for charging differential rates, or higher rates, for these manures than the majority of Railway Companies had been permitted to charge in times past. However, he should not take any notice of the expressions used by his hon. Friend. He should not send him a cartel, nor bring what his hon. Friend had said to him before the House as a matter of Privilege; but what he maintained was that, unless sufficient cause were shown, Railway Companies should not generally be allowed to alter the classification of goods, or to raise their rates. If sufficient cause were shown to a Committee that it was necessary for a Railway Company, in the conduct of their business, to do so, then the Committee before whom such Railway Companies appeared should report the reasons why they had come to the conclusion that such an alteration of classification, and such a raising of rates, ought to be allowed, and the House should be informed of those reasons, so that the alteration should not be made in Railway Bills, and passed by the House without notice, with the possibility of it being used as a precedent for the action of Committees in future. It appeared to him that if precedents were allowed to accumulate in this way for altering the classification and raising the rates, it would be impossible, and, indeed, unfair, on the part of the House, to prevent the great Railway Companies, and, indeed, all other Railway Companies, who were satisfied, and had been obliged to be satisfied, with the original charge authorized in former years, coming to the House and obtaining its sanction to an increase of rates. Whenever they came to the House of Commons for further powers to increase their rates and alter their classification, he did not see on what principle of justice, if this Bill were allowed to pass with the full cognizance of the House, they would be able to deny the same claim in other instances. He had only one other point in regard to this matter. It had been said that this was a manufacturer's question. Now, he could not see how it was a manufacturer's question at all. It was purely and entirely an agricultural question. If the Railway Companies were allowed to charge these rates, did the House suppose that the manufacturers would charge 1*d.* less to the farmers? It was not a question of lowering the rates, but a question altogether of raising the rates; and, therefore, he said it would be the consignee who would have to pay these extraordinary charges in regard to guanos and artificial manures, and not the consignor. He presumed that it was a general case in respect of these articles that the consignee paid the railway charge for carriage, or, if the consignor paid it originally, he charged it to the consignee when he sent in his bill. Therefore, it was clear that if the rates were raised the amount of the increase would fall upon the agricultural community, who were those who bought the articles in question. He knew that some people said, and said very justly, too, that there should not be the same charge made for artificial manures, which required great care in carriage, as was made for dung and compost and common manures, which were chucked into a truck, carried away, and chucked out again, without the necessity for any care being exercised in regard to them. They were told the other day that the Great Northern Railway Company were mulcted in the sum of £10 on account of some damage done to artificial manures or guano in the course of transit. But let the House say there should be a difference between artificial manures and common manures; and let the House decide upon some maximum of rate beyond which Railway Companies should not charge for artificial manures. Let them, also, decide that there should be a maximum rate beyond which the Railway Companies should not charge for the carriage of dung, compost, and common manures. But it appeared to him that if the House was prepared to decide that there should be a difference in classification between artificial manures and common manures, they should also go into the whole question of classification. He believed the question of classification now remained the same as when these Railway Companies first came before Parliament for the powers they now possessed; and it was not at all clear to his own mind that it was not desirable for the Railway Companies to accept the classification made originally, which included artificial manures and common manures in one category, rather than re-open the question of the whole classification of all articles they were now permitted to carry by their Acts of Parliament. Now, one of the Railway Bills to which he took objection had actually placed artificial manures in the same class as sugar. He was informed that sugar was worth £25 a-ton, while artificial manures and guano were worth, at the very utmost, about £6 or £7 a-ton. If it was unfair that the Railway Companies should be obliged to carry artificial manures at the same price as dung, compost, and common manures, being so much more valuable than common manures, surely it was unfair, on the other hand, that any Railway Company should be permitted to class articles, such as artificial manures, worth £7 a-ton, in the same category as sugar, which was worth £25 a-ton. What was sauce for the goose was certainly sauce for the gander. It only remained for him to emphasize what he had said before, that he was not taking this course from any hostile feeling whatever towards those Railways. He had had a conversation, not very long ago, in the Lobby with the manager of one of the largest Railways in England; and the gentleman in question was kind enough to say, after he had explained his action to him, that he considered it was perfectly legitimate. All he wished to do was to stop a precedent being established in future without the fact being brought to the cognizance of the House, in order to prevent the enhancement of rates, or a difference of classification being developed, to any great extent, to the detriment of the agricultural interest. He begged to move the Motion which stood in his name—

"That the Bill be re-committed to the former Committee, and that it be an Instruction to the Committee to reduce the rates proposed by the Bill to be charged for guano and artificial manures."

Mr. SPEAKER: The Instruction of the noble Viscount will be a separate Motion if the House agrees to re-commit the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now considered," in order to add the words "re-committed to the former Committee,"—(*Viscount Folkestone,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "that the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question."

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, the principal objection he had to this Motion, and he thought the objection which the House would have to the Motion also, was this—that, in the event of its being carried, he did not see how it would be possible for any Member of the House, who had a proper respect for his own character, to serve upon a Private Bill Committee. The case was this. It was the case of a very small Railway, the merits of which he would not go into at that moment. It had been opposed on several occasions before by the noble Viscount (Viscount Folkestone), and by one or two other hon. Members acting with him. It was introduced as a local line purely, and really involved no question which ought to have attracted the attention of the House. Nevertheless, there had been a considerable consumption of time in discussing the question of the rates introduced into the Bill. It would, however, be recollected that before the Bill was referred to a Committee for consideration a Resolution was proposed by his right hon. Friend the Member for North Hants (Mr. Sclater-Booth), in the early part of the Session, that the Board of Trade should report on every Railway Bill referred to a Select Committee as to whether it proposed to charge differential rates, and that the Committee should take those Reports into their consideration, and make a special Report to the House upon them. There had been, he thought, according to the list he held in his hand, at least 40 Railway Bills brought into the House containing a similar paragraph to that which was objected to in regard to this Bill; and in regard to most of them there had been a Report from the Chairman of the Committee, that they had considered the Report of the Board of Trade referred to them under the Standing Order, but they saw no necessity for altering the rates contained in the Bill, which were in accordance with those sanctioned by Parliament on other occasions. About a fortnight ago the noble Viscount the Member for North Wilts (Viscount Folkestone) placed a Notice on the Paper almost similar to that which he had just moved, asking the House to re-commit the Bill to the Committee which had already considered it, in order that they might again consider the question of rates and charges, especially in reference to guano and artificial manures. His hon. Friend who sat below him, the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), was the Chairman of the Committee, who presented a Report to the House, only two or three days ago, which he would venture to read to the House. It was made with reference to an Instruction the Committee had received from the House in regard to the present Bill—

> "Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson reported from the Committee on the Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway (re-committed) Bill: That they had made further Amendments thereunto by reducing the rates to be charged for the conveyance of common manure and compost, and all undressed materials for the repair of highways, as well as coke, culm, slack, and clay from twopence halfpenny to one penny halfpenny per ton per mile as the maximum rate, and also by reducing the maximum charge for the carriage of guano and artificial manure from threepence to twopence halfpenny per ton per mile."

That was a Report from a properly constituted Committee. This particular subject had been before the House during a greater part of the Session upon this and other Railway Bills, not only as to this particular charge of a maximum rate, but also in reference to the reconsideration of rates and charges, and the classification of tolls in relation to the Report of the Board of Trade. Well, this Committee had reconsidered the matter, and had presented another Report, in which, as a matter of fact, they had reduced the tolls. Now, was it possible that hon. Members would consent to act upon Private Bill Committees in future, if, after giving patient and careful consideration to questions of this kind, Motions were to be made without the slightest evidence being adduced, but on a mere statement that certain individuals were dissatisfied with the result? Would the House consent to have its time occupied by debates of this sort, and to re-commit a Bill back again to the same Committee, time after time, simply because a few hon. Members chose to say—"We do not like what you have done, and, therefore, you must do something else; and unless you do something else we will press forward these Motions day after day." He thought the House ought to set its face, in a determined manner, against proceedings of this kind, irrespective of the question whether guano and artificial manures ought to be carried for the same price as common dung and ordinary manures. He was speaking there as an independent country gentleman, having no interest in any Railway whatever. All he knew with regard to this line was that it was a local one of about nine miles in length; and the only reason he had for opposing the Motion was because he considered that the proper course for the House to adopt. The noble Viscount had made use of a singular argument. He said that some Railway Company had placed guano and sugar in the same category, whereas sugar was worth £25 a-ton, and guano only worth £7 or £8 a-ton. Therefore, he contended that guano and artificial manures ought to be carried at a cheaper rate; while, at the same time, he was arguing that common dung, which was only worth 2*s.* or 2*s.* 6*d.* a-ton, ought to be put into the same category as guano and artificial manures which were worth £7 a-ton. If the arguments of the noble Viscount were worth anything, the charge for carrying artificial manures ought to be raised in price, and, instead of being 2*d.*, the proper proportion ought to be something like 1*s.* He had no doubt that the Committee to whom the Bill was referred had fully considered all the arguments brought forward. Everyone knew that in the case of a short line the expenses were much greater in proportion than they were to a long line; and it was quite possible to engage a ship and take a freight all the way to Australia almost at ballast rates, because it was wanted to take the vessel there in order to employ it in bringing other articles home. So in the case of the Railway Companies mentioned by the noble Viscount, who carried common manures at a farthing or halfpenny per ton per mile. It might easily be that they did so in order that they should not send trucks back again entirely empty. Now, the true way of getting a particular class of goods carried cheaply was not to ask for a subsidy for one particular interest at the expense of the community, but to give the Railway Company what they could obtain. In that way the question was left to the result of competition in trade, and they introduced a good commercial principle, which really tended to cheapen rates. He had no wish to detain the House longer; but he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House ought to set his face against Motions of this sort. The present case was taken up by the agricultural interest. To-morrow they might have another taken up by the coal interest, then another affecting the iron interest, or the timber interest, or the Manchester interest. It had long been the custom to have matters of this kind properly relegated to Select Committees; and in this particular instance the Bill had been relegated a second time to a Committee, in order that further consideration might be given to it. Unless the old course were continued, they might in future have matters of this sort dealt with purely as class questions, instead of being dealt with on the merits of the case. All these rates proposed to be inserted in the Bill were fair and equal, and not unusual; and if agricultural produce or manures were to be carried at a loss to the Railway Company, those who were interested in other commodities would inevitably suffer. This was a case in which the House, in its wisdom, had remitted the matter again, and had presented the Report which had been laid on the Table and accepted by the House. He thought it would be exceedingly unwise and improper for the House again to perform the operation of saying that, because certain Gentlemen were not satisfied with the result, the Select Committee should go through the same process again.

Mr. HICKS said, it appeared to him that the hon. Baronet who had just sat down had quite overlooked the real issue before the House. It was not a question whether Railway Companies were to carry at a loss or not, or whether favour should be shown to one particular interest or another; but whether the House was, upon a special issue, to alter the whole course of Railway legislation for the last 40 years. It appeared to him that the Committee had no reason to complain if the House sent this Bill back again to them; because they seemed to have overlooked the real point at issue, which was not so much whether the rates were higher or lower, but whether the classification of goods had been altered. From the very earliest times of Railways certain goods had been placed in the lowest class of rates. This classification, as had been pointed out by his noble Friend the Member for North Wilts (Viscount Folkestone), on all the great Railways was the same. For instance, the London and North Western, the Great Northern, the Great Eastern, the London and South Western, and other Railways, although they might differ in some small degree as to the amount of tolls and rates, were almost universal in the classification of goods; and hon. Members who objected to the decision of the Committee were now asking to alter the classification they had fixed, and to alter, not merely the maximum rate charged upon artificial manures, but to alter it in a great many other particulars. He held in his hand the original Act of the London and South Western Railway. That Act was an Act of 4 & 5 *Will.* IV., c. 88, so that it was nearly 50 years old. Now, the present Bill, which professed to be promoted by a private Company, contained clauses empowering them to hand over their Railway to the London and South Western Railway Company.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was satisfied that his hon. Friend would not wish to make an incorrect statement. This line had no connection at all with the London and South Western Railway Company. On the contrary, it had been opposed by the London and South Western Company throughout; and if it was likely to be handed over to anybody it would be the Great Western, and not the London and South Western.

MR. HICKS said, he had not read the Bill carefully; but in Clause 56 he thought some reference was made to some controlling power which was to be exercised by the London and South Western Railway Company. He did not think, however, that that point would have any great effect on the argument he was trying to bring before the House; because he believed that in the Great Western Act would be found identically the same provision which placed in the same category the carriage of coal, culm, charcoal, cinders, building, and pitching, and paving stones, bricks, tiles, slates, clay, sand, dung, compost, all sorts of manures, lime, limestone, and all undressed materials for the repair of roads, the rate being upon all these articles the sum of 2*d.* per ton per mile. The toll, however, had nothing whatever to do with that matter. It was the classification to which he desired to draw the attention of the House. Under the present Bill, not only were all sorts of manures, except common dung, removed from Class I, but building, pitching, and paving stones, bricks, tiles, common slates, and other materials were removed from Class I. to Class II. If this Railway Company were to do that, as had been said by the noble Viscount, then, in common justice and in common sense, all Railways must be allowed to do the same thing. If it were a good and honest and just classification of the raw materials carried through this country, let the old law stand; but, if not, let them have a Select Committee to go into the question thoroughly and report to the House, when, no doubt, the House would pass a new classification, which should be applicable to all these articles. He certainly hoped the House would not, on that occasion—upon a Wednesday's Sitting, with a comparatively small attendance—pass a Bill which deliberately upset all the previous legislation upon these important matters. It had been pointed out that there were only 20 in all, out of very nearly 3,000 Railway Bills, which had been considered thoroughly and deliberately during the last 50 years, in which an alteration of classification had been permitted. He begged to support the Amendment moved by his noble Friend the Member for South Wilts (Viscount Folkestone).

MR. PELL said, he thought the House might be in some difficulty in coming to a decision on the question, especially after what had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Sir Gabriel Goldney). His hon. Friend had said, and said with some truth, that it was hardly prudent to encourage the practice of taking up the time of the House of Commons with Private Bills in the interest of certain large industries, however large they might be. But the industry of agriculture was one which was in a somewhat different position from any other one. It was not concentrated in any way, and it was not represented by any organization before a Committee on Private Bills; and its case was not presented before a Committee, as it would be in the instance of any other industry connected with any large and important town which was likely to be affected. Therefore, he ventured to submit that it was only in the House itself, in a full Assembly, that the agricultural interest could have an opportunity of bringing their grievances forward. Nothing had yet been brought under the notice of the House, although he certainly hoped to hear some statement from the Chairman of the Committee to justify this extraordinary, and he thought he might say this extravagant rate charged for the conveyance of a class of goods which was essential, or considered to be essential, now to the successful carrying on of the operations of husbandry. Therefore, upon that ground alone, if there were no other, he thought those whom his hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Sir Gabriel Goldney) described as one or two Gentlemen acting together were justified in opposing the further progress of the Bill. The one or two Gentlemen who were described as acting together were one or two Gentlemen who spoke on behalf of some score of other Members of the House, and many hundreds of thousands outside the House. It was perfectly obvious that if the principle were adopted of making these differential rates in the Bills of small Railway Companies, the Railway interest, so prominently represented in the House, would not be long before it succeeded in extending the principle, and in getting the higher rates allowed to the larger and more important lines. He, therefore, thought it would be better, even as regarded the consumption of time, that this question should be settled in 1883, rather than left to be brought up in future years. It might be said that this was a small line, and that, after all, so far as the present Bill was concerned, it was not a matter of very much moment. Now, this line was to be worked, he believed, in concert with the Great Western Railway Company. At any rate, he gathered that from the statement of his hon. Friend the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson). It did not, however, matter to his argument what Company would have to work the line. Through rates would have to be established on the small line, and the larger line which worked the traffic, and those through rates must be raised. Agreements would have to be entered into between the large parent line and the one which he might call the small child—namely, the Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot line; and no hon. Member could be so blind as not to see that all these arrangements had been made between the larger Company and the smaller Company before the Bill went upstairs to the Committee, and that the promoters of these high rates upon small lines might be Directors and shareholders of the larger Railway Company. Therefore, it was not right that they should confine the question to a consideration of the interests of the small line, when they knew perfectly well that the proprietors of the larger Railway were interested. Unless some adequate and satisfactory explanation was given by the Chairman of the Committee to justify the establishment of these higher rates and this alteration of classification, he should certainly feel bound to do as much as he was able to arrest the further progress of the Bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he had not hitherto taken any part whatever in the discussion on the merits of this question of the charges for agricultural manure; but he thought it right to do so now, because his Department was specially concerned in the Report which had been presented, in the first place, to the Select Committee to which it was referred. In the discussion which occurred some time ago the fact was mentioned that the Committee might pass rates that were injurious to the agricultural interest, because their attention was not drawn by any responsible body to the fact that certain Bills which had been introduced contained provisions authorizing higher rates and altering the classification of goods; and, under those circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman opposite the Member for North Hants (Mr. Sclater-Booth) proposed a Standing Order, requiring the Board of Trade to present a Report to the Select Committee upon such Bill; but the right hon. Gentleman did not cast upon the Board of Trade the duty of expressing any opinion upon the matter. That was left to the Committee themselves; and in the Reports which the Board of Trade made they had endeavoured strictly to confine themselves to the duty of calling attention to all the essential facts, leaving the Committee themselves to decide on the merits. In the Bill before the House to-day there were two questions raised—first, as to the merits of the particular proposal in the Bill, and whether the classification was fair; and, secondly, a question of general principle and some importance—namely, whether the House was going to undertake the duty of inquiring into the details of Bills which had been relegated to Committees upstairs and carefully considered by them, after hearing evidence that was not in the possession of the House? Further, whether the House, in all these cases, was to undertake to do over again the work prudently remitted to a Committee? It appeared to him that the greatest possible inconvenience would arise from the adoption of any principle such as that; and the strongest case should be shown, and the clearest proof should be given, that the Committee had failed in its duty, before the House undertook to review its decision. Now, what was the case in regard to the present Bill? The proposal of the noble Viscount (Viscount Folkestone) was this—that in the case of artificial manures of considerable value, a rate as low as it was possible to impose should be in all cases imposed. Now, it did appear to him a very strong proposition indeed. No doubt, originally, what Committees on Railway Bills had in view was the ordinary manure, which was supposed to be worth something like 5*s.* a-ton, and which was carried with little difficulty and expense. No possible injury could arise to them from the wet; and they were in a position altogether different from that of artificial manures, which required great care in conducting the transit, and which were of considerable value. It therefore appeared to him that the Railway Companies, *primâ facie*, at all events, were entitled to have a higher sum for carrying them.

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE said, he thought that in what the right hon. Gentleman was pointing out to the House he was labouring under a misapprehension. He (Viscount Folkestone) did not propose that this Railway Company should be obliged to carry artificial manures at a rate which did not pay them. Far from that, what he desired was that the Committee should decide the matter, and inform the House if it was necessary for this Railway to charge a higher rate, so as to prevent a precedent being created in future. If the Committee found, on the evidence brought before them, that the Railway Company could not carry these artificial manures at a profit at the ordinary average rate of 1½*d.* per ton, then by all means let them say so, and inform the House of the fact.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, that, no doubt, the Chairman of the Committee would inform the House of the reason which induced the Committee to come to their decision; but he had no doubt that all these facts were brought under the notice of the Committee, and that they had given their consideration to the question whether this Railway Company should be called upon to carry these artificial manures at the same rate as ordinary manures. The noble Viscount had spoken of the classification which had been adopted, and had pointed out in his statement that manures which were worth more than £5 or £6 a-ton were placed in the same category as sugar, which was worth £25 a-ton. Perhaps he might be allowed to point out that the classes in this Bill dealt with a considerable number of articles, and that they could not multiply indefinitely the number of classes. Therefore, they must include a number of things in the same class. If, according to the contention of the noble Viscount, an article worth £5 a-ton should not be carried at the same rate as an article worth £25 a-ton, or five times as much, how much more unfair would it be that an article worth £5 a-ton should be carried at the same rate as an article worth only 5*s.* a-ton, or 1-20th? The noble Viscount might just as well claim for the farmer and the farm labourer that they should all be carried at half-price. Was the agricultural interest to be favoured, to the injury of every other interest concerned, because it wanted to have lower rates? The only result would be one of two things—either the Railway Companies which adopted the proposal would be obliged to charge higher rates for other articles, and other industries would be mulcted in order to confer a benefit upon the agricultural interest by carrying artificial manures at an unfair advantage, or the Railway would not be made at all. Now, it was said that this line was required for the convenience of the district. It was, to a large extent, an agricultural line. It was in the interest of the farmers and agricultural interests generally that it should be made, and no opposition came from the district to this proposal to charge higher rates for artificial manures. The objection came from persons who were not connected with the district at all, but who were altogether outside it, the immediate interest concerned being quite satisfied. Under all these circumstances, he thought the House, as a general principle, ought not to rashly interfere with the decisions of its Committees upstairs; and, keeping in view the merits of this particular case, he did not think the House would act wisely if they were to send back the Bill to a Committee which had not only once, but twice, already considered it. If the noble Viscount went to a division, he (Mr. Chamberlain) should vote against him.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he could assure the noble Viscount at starting that he was not desirous of entering into any controversy with him that might lead to unpleasant results; but, at the same time, he hoped the House would really weigh very carefully what it was asked to do on this occasion. If Committees on Private Bills were to be conducted at all, then, he said, the House was bound to support those Committees, unless very strong cause was shown that they had neglected their duty. On what was the opposition to the Bill they were asked to consider now based? It was a Bill for a short line of railway, connecting a particular local district with an important main line; it was a Bill promoted by a private Company. The Committee, when it came to the consideration of the Report of the Board of Trade, had, in his opinion, as Chairman of the Committee, two things to consider. One was the question of classification, and the other the question of the rates to be imposed. They went carefully through both of those questions, and heard the evidence laid before them with the greatest attention. It was shown, at all events to their satisfaction, that with regard to the question of classification on a great line of railway, where the work could be done at the terminus by a very different proportion of cost in reference to the carrying results of the line itself, compared with the cost of the same work on smaller and shorter lines, that the smaller line could not possibly carry remuneratively articles at the same rate they could be carried for by a larger line, which had a considerable number of miles on which to recover the amount of earnings. That being the case before them, they came unanimously to the conclusion that on the point of classification, which was one of the points referred to them by the Board of Trade, a difference ought to be allowed on an article which compared in regard to the amount of care in carriage very strongly, as had been shown by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, with other articles with which it was proposed to be classed. It did seem to the Committee that where agricultural manures, which were of a given value and required delicate handling on the journey, and were liable to deterioration by exposure to wet, had to be dealt with, they required more care on the part of the Railway Company than common manures, which might almost be left to take care of themselves. It appeared to the Committee that in such a case they were justified in not classing artificial manures with common manures and ordinary dung, especially when they heard from the Railway Company themselves that they could not carry them at the price remuneratively to themselves. They, therefore, considered that it would be unfair towards the Railway Company to class artificial manures in the lowest class in which common manures and dung were put. That was the reason they arrived at the first Report which they presented to the House. The House, in its wisdom, thought it well to send that Report back to the Committee for further consideration; and although the Committee had gone very carefully into the case on the evidence they had before them on the first occasion, he, as Chairman, and he thought the rest of his Colleagues upon the Committee, felt the Instruction of the House was an Instruction to them to go again over that evidence, and reduce the rates to the lowest possible amount. They went into the question of classification again, and he need not say that the same evidence which justified them in placing the two descriptions of articles in different classes in the first instance weighed strongly with him in their second Report, in which they maintained the classification, but reduced both of the rates. They reduced the rate on common manures to the lowest maximum rate charged by any line, and they reduced the rate on artificial manures to 2½*d.*, making a difference of 1*d.* between common articles carried in ordinary trucks and artificial manures which required care and watching in their transit. The noble Viscount said that it was not right to classify artificial manures with such articles as silk, or sugar, or other more valuable articles. But in the second Report of the Committee they took artificial manures out of that class, and put them into the class next to the lowest class—the class in which pig iron, bar iron, iron castings not manufactured, and other articles of that heavy description were dealt with. They took them out of the class in which sugar, corn, grain, flour, &c. were included, and placed them in a class between those articles and the lowest class, showing, by that very fact, that they had gone carefully into the question of classification as well as into the question of rates. That having been the action of the Committee, and their second Report having been presented after a most careful investigation by the Committee, the House was now asked to send back that Report to the same Committee, with an Instruction to them again to reduce the rates. Now, he ventured to think it would be exceedingly difficult to get Members to give that attention to the Private Bill Business of the House which it undoubtedly deserved and required, if the House was on every occasion, at the instigation of any particular trade or interes—the did not care what it might be—which happened to command a certain amount of influence, or a certain number of votes, in the House to take into its own hands what were properly the duties of a Committee upstairs, and if the House was, on its mere *ipse dixit*, to reverse a decision of a Committee arrived at upon evidence which had been carefully considered. He did not for a moment say that he objected to the Bill being sent back to the Committee in the first instance. They might have made a mistake. It was evident they had not reduced the charges to so low a point as, on further consideration, they thought it possible to reduce them after the decision of the House; but after the second careful consideration given by the Committee to the whole of the case, and feeling that they had done everything they could to meet the views expressed by the House, it would be most unwise to refer the Bill back again a second time. He understood the noble Viscount to say he wished this step to be taken in order not to create a precedent in regard to future legislation for the larger lines of railway. He thought, if the House laid down a rule that their Committees were to go carefully into all these considerations, every Committee would be bound to look into all the details of any question submitted to them; and it must be borne in mind that these differential rates had already been allowed in regard to a number of other lines connected with the larger Railway Companies. Of course, they would hardly ever be able to show the same case which the shorter lines could show to justify them in asking for a higher rate of carriage. The noble Viscount had stated that there were considerably more than 2,000 Railway Bills—he thought the noble Viscount put the figure at 2,600—which had passed the House since 1857, and that it was only of late years that the classification had been altered. But the noble Viscount went back to 1857 when artificial manures were not so much a necessity to the agricultural community as they were at present. The alteration had been made more rapidly within the last few years, especially since 1879; and he did not think it could be found, in any instance since 1879, that the original classification had been formed. But most of the lines to which the alteration applied were short lines; and, no doubt, that fact had pressed upon the Committees in coming to that conclusion. He did not think the question of the number of lines of railway which been sanctioned since 1857, and the small percentage which contained these altered charges, was a matter of much importance. The total number of Railway Acts would be much reduced when they took into consideration the fact that a number of these Bills were merely Bills containing continuing powers, and that they were not for new lines of railway, but for additional powers granted to existing Railway Companies. If that fact were inquired into, he thought the number of 2,600 would be very considerably reduced, and that it would be found that a very much smaller number of new lines had been sanctioned than the number of Railway Acts which had been passed by Parliament. Looking at all the circumstances which surrounded the case, he must say that he thought the wishes of the House had been carried out as carefully as possible, and that it would be a most dangerous precedent to enable any class of individuals in the House, who had an interest in the carriage of particular articles, to compel Select Committees of the House to perpetually undertake the reconsideration of decisions which they had carefully arrived at.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY remarked, that if any justification was necessary—and he admitted that justification was necessary—for the course the opponents of the Bill had pursued, it was to be found in the fact that the Railway Companies were the aggressors in this case. They proposed to change the policy which had hitherto been pursued from the beginning of the history of railways. With a very few exceptions, artificial manures had always been classed along with all other kinds of manures. No doubt, a few exceptions had crept in through inadvertence on the part of the House of Commons; but out of the vast number of Railway Bills which had passed the House from 1857 up to 1869 there were only 17 exceptions. In 1869 artificial manures were used nearly as much as they were now; but Parliament adopted a certain arrangement for their classification, and from 1869 down to

1878 that classification was adhered to. In 1878 a few exceptions were made; and since then, from 1878 down to 1882, there were only 17 exceptions to the general rule. Therefore, in this instance, as far as classification was concerned, the Railway Companies were the aggressors, in endeavouring to introduce a new line of policy. As one who was a Member of the Rates Committee of the House for two years, he was able to say that that Committee had brought before them very great anomalies which existed in the classification of goods; and if it were desirable for the Railway Company to change the classification in this particular instance, then, in the interest of the public, it was desirable that there should be a general re-classification altogether. He objected to the alteration of classification without those interested on the other side of the question being heard before the House. No doubt the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) had the evidence of the Railway Companies; but did the Committee hear any evidence whatever on behalf of farmers, or those interested on the other side of the question? This whole subject was fought out by the traders and agricultural interest before a Committee of the House of Lords, in the case of the Great North of Scotland Railway Bill, at very great expense to the traders a year or two ago, and the House of Lords refused to adopt the proposal of the Railway Company on that occasion to put artificial manures in a separate classification. The question for the House to determine was, whether this proposal, which was altogether an exception, should now be adopted, and that without the whole question of classification being discussed, and those interested on the other side heard before a Committee of the House. In regard to the rates, they had heard a great deal about the difference between various kinds of manures, and the propriety of their being charged different rates. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had told the House accurately enough that a great variety of articles were entered under one classification, although they were of different value. The fact was that common sorts of manures were charged almost invariably below the maximum which the Railway Company could charge, because they knew very well that they would not get them to carry at all if they charged a higher rate; and the practice was to charge for common manures very considerably under the maximum; and, on the other hand, to charge for artificial manures the full maximum rate, so that a fair equality was established. Thirty-six Railway Bills had been introduced into the House this Session. In 18 of these Bills the promoters were satisfied with the old classification; and in the other 18 the promoters wished for a new classification in respect of artificial manures. Now, there was nothing special in those Bills to justify any departure from the ordinary rule of Parliament; and it seemed to him that the change depended very much more upon the Parliamentary Agent who prepared the Bill in fixing the classification than on the necessities of the case. Three or four of these Railway Companies had deferred to the opinion of the House, as expressed in previous divisions, and had gone back to the old classification; but two or three were endeavouring to establish this new policy of making a different classification. There was a great deal to be said in reference to what the right hon. Gentleman had stated as to short lines being unable to carry at the same rate as long lines; but provision was made for that in the present Bill by giving a higher maximum rate for common manures. If reference were made to the Report of the Board of Trade, it would be found that it had hitherto been the practice to make no distinction. The Board of Trade said—

> "In the Railway Acts of former years, when guano and artificial manures were less important than they have since become, no distinction was made between those manures and ordinary manures, and both were placed in the lowest class of about 1*d*. per ton per mile. In subsequent years it has been the practice to grant more favourable terms."

In the present Bill it was proposed, in consequence of the shortness of the railway, to increase the rate for common manures by 50 per cent; and that was certainly a very large increase in respect of the shortness of the line. He was entirely at a loss to understand on what evidence the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade could say that the old rates were not remunerative; because the managers of every Railway Company examined before the Rates Committee told the Committee most distinctly that they did not know the cost to the Railway Company of the carriage of any kind of goods. That statement was repeated over and over again; and if that were so—and certainly it was upon the evidence before the Railway Rates Committee—he did not see how it was possible for the President of the Board of Trade to come to the conclusion that any particular rate was remunerative or unremunerative. He asserted most distinctly that they had it on evidence, in the statements of the Railway Companies themselves, given by their own managers, that they did not know what the cost of performing any particular service was. He did not desire, and would certainly strongly deprecate, the idea of all special rates being brought under the consideration of the House in passing Private Bills; but he contended that this was a question of policy—namely, whether, at the request of two or three Railway Companies, the House would deviate from the course it had adopted from the very commencement of railway legislation, without hearing the evidence of both parties interested in the question?

MR. R. H. PAGET said, he thought that the supporters of the Motion must show a very strong case to justify an application of this nature, and to convince the House of the desirability of referring back a Private Bill for a second time to a Select Committee which had had charge of it. He felt very strongly the inconvenience which would arise if that course were to be adopted with anything like frequency. At the same time, he thought the House was indebted to the noble Viscount the Member for North Wilts (Viscount Folkestone) for introducing this matter to their notice, and for having raised a debate upon it. It must be remembered that the first reference back to the Committee had already been justified, because the Committee, on reconsideration, had materially reduced the rates. The question now before the House was, whether there was sufficient reason to justify them in referring the matter back again? They had had the opportunity of hearing the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), who acted as Chairman of the Committee; and, therefore, the House was now, for the first time, put in possession of the reasons which had induced the Committee to arrive at their decision. He thought it was valuable that they had that fact on record in the debates of the House.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he wished to justify himself in the matter. When he brought up the Report it was moved that it be read by the Clerk at the Table; and after that had been done he made a speech to the House, stating many of the facts which formed the prominent reasons why the Committee had been induced to alter their original decision. Many of those facts he had only repeated to the House in the course of the debate that day.

MR. R. H. PAGET remarked, that it was now before the House that the reason which had induced the Committee to act as they had done was that they were dealing, not with a large and important railway, but with a small line promoted under special circumstances, which, in their mind, fully justified the exceptional rates they had introduced into the Bill. There was only one remark that he would venture to make upon that point, and it was this—that the whole of the case of those who opposed these Bills could be placed in a nutshell. The interest they were endeavouring to protect had no *locus standi* to appear before a Railway Committee, and that was the sole point. If the interests of the agriculturists were attacked in regard to the carriage of manures, they had no *locus standi* to appear before the Committee and be heard. The Railway Rates Committee, which sat for upwards of two years, recommended that such a *locus standi* should be given, and that the farmers interested in these points should be entitled to appear before the Committee, and have their case heard by calling witnesses, who might be examined and cross-examined. If that were done, no doubt the House would hesitate to re-open a question when a Bill came down to them. The sole thing that could be urged on behalf of those who opposed the present Bill was this—that they had no opportunity of opposing the proposals contained in the Bill in the place where they ought to have been heard—namely, the Select Committee itself. The fear which the noble Viscount the Member for South Wilts (Viscount Folkestone) had was that, if these alterations in classification were permitted to take place in these Bills, they would be immediately extended to all the great lines of railway. He thought that fear might now be said to be without foundation; because the House was now in possession of the reasons which had alone induced the Committee to consent to this change of classification being introduced. Under these circumstances, he would put it to the noble Viscount whether he thought it would be wise to trouble the House with a division upon the matter? They had had a full discussion, and the noble Viscount had had an opportunity of stating his case completely; and he thought that everyone who had heard the noble Viscount would feel satisfied that he acted, not from any private feeling of opposition to the Bill, or to this Railway Company, but that he had taken the case up solely upon grounds of public interest, which, in his opinion, required that the question should be brought before the House. After the House had had an opportunity of hearing all that had been said, he trusted the noble Viscount would be satisfied with the good work he had done, and would not put hon. Members to the necessity of dividing.

Viscount FOLKESTONE said, that after the appeal of his hon. Friend above the Gangway (Mr. R. H. Paget), he should like, with the permission of the House, to be allowed to withdraw his Amendment. ["No!"] He had no wish to go to a division; but, at the same time, he could not regret having brought the matter before the House. He thought they had had a most admirable discussion; but he could not insist upon asking the House to recommit the Bill again to the Committee to which it had already been committed before. Indeed, that was not his object in having brought on the discussion.

Mr. CARBUTT confessed that he was unable to see why the noble Viscount should propose a Motion of this kind if he did not intend to go on with it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he thought the noble Viscount was well advised in deferring to the general wish of the House, and in yielding to the request made to him by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. R. H. Paget). He (Mr. Chamberlain) would make a further appeal to him. For some reason or other, he found that the noble Viscount had on the Notice Paper for to-morrow a Motion in regard to two other Bills in the same terms as that which he had introduced that day. It was undesirable that the matter should be continually raised, seeing that it was precisely the same question; and he thought the House ought to understand, if the Motion were now withdrawn by leave of the House, that the whole matter was finally settled as far as the noble Viscount was concerned, and that his objection to the other Bills would not be pressed.

Viscount FOLKESTONE said, that, in answer to the right hon. Gentleman, he would give the matter his fullest consideration; and, no doubt, before the end of the Sitting it would be in his power to state what action he intended to take. He must have a short time for considering what that action ought to be.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he wished to make an appeal to the House and to his noble Friend (Viscount Folkestone). He thought the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had placed the matter very fairly before the House. He felt certain that the House did not wish to force the noble Viscount to go to a division. He imagined the House would be generous enough to allow the noble Viscount to withdraw his Motion; and when he had considered the question fairly, he trusted the noble Viscount would intimate that it was not his intention to proceed with his opposition to the other Bills.

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR said, he was particularly interested in the Bill coming on to-morrow, having been Chairman of the Committee to which it was referred. He therefore wished to have an assurance from the noble Viscount that he did not intend to raise all this discussion over again, having taken the opinion of the House that day upon a question which was precisely similar.

Viscount FOLKESTONE remarked, that he would make this suggestion to his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) and the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade—that he should consult with them privately on the matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he wished to point out to the noble Viscount that no object could be gained by a further discussion. The House, therefore, ought to know at once whether it was the intention of the noble Viscount to re-open the matter again to-morrow, or upon any other day, the matter itself having already been decided by the discussion which had taken place, and the points being exactly the same.

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE remarked, that if it were the same point he would not proceed with his opposition to the other Bills; but it might turn out that the point was not the same.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, there was one other matter which it was important to consider. Hon. Members who had been present during the debate that day, and had heard the whole of the discussion, and who might wish to take part in a decision upon it, might not be present to-morrow.

Question, "That the words 'now considered' stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered;* to be read the third time.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS.

RESOLUTION.

Standing Order 167 read.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY), in rising to move an addition to the Standing Order, said, he would state, as briefly as was consistent with the importance of the question, the reasons which induced him to make this proposal to the House. It would be well to consider for a moment what the history of this Standing Order was. Before the passing of the Companies' Clauses Act, 1845, Companies were regulated by a provision contained in special Acts; and those special Acts, from time to time, authorized the payment of interest out of capital. The first was carried in 1837. Only three Acts, however, were passed in that Session. In 1844 there were seven Acts passed; in 1845, 26; and in 1846, 92. The Standing Order was made in 1847. It was considered then that the number of Railway Acts which had been passed exceeded the disposable capital power of the country; and it was notorious that considerable distress was occasioned to many persons who had invested their savings in Railway speculations by reason of capital being called up too fast. It was in order to put a check upon the railway mania that it was considered that payment of interest during the construction of the railway should be stopped. Speculation, as everyone knew, was very high at that time, and it was thought necessary to put a stop to it. Hence the Standing Order of 1847, which prevented the payment of interest out of capital, was passed, and it had regulated the proceedings of Railway Companies in that respect ever since. It was with that Standing Order that he had to deal; and it behoved the House to consider whether railway enterprize was now such as to require the prohibition enforced by that Order, or whether, on the other hand, it did not act prejudicially in checking the development of legitimate railway enterprize, and whether the circumstances were not such now as required to be dealt with by further legislation. When he acceded to the Office which he now held, he found that his Predecessor, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's (Sir Lyon Playfair), had been in correspondence with the Board of Trade upon the subject, in consequence of several Bills having been before the House which proposed to set aside the Standing Order relating to the payment of interest. He found in that correspondence a letter from his right hon. Friend, in which he asked if it was a wise and sound policy to preserve unchanged a Standing Order which appeared to be systematically violated in practice? The President of the Board of Trade, in reply to that letter, stated that the Board were disposed to think that some alteration of the Order was desirable; and soon after that correspondence a Committee was appointed by the House to consider and report whether the Standing Order No. 169, prohibiting the payment of interest or dividend out of capital during the construction of a railway, should be retained or modified. That Committee was composed of a number of hon. Members of considerable experience and authority in the House, and his right hon. Friend the Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter) was a Member of it. He regretted exceedingly that his right hon. Friend was unable to be present that day, and he regretted it even more on account of the cause; but the House would be satisfied that an inquiry conducted under the auspices of his right hon. Friend was a full and searching one. As regarded the matter, that Committee said—

> "Your Committee consider that the prohibition of the payment of interest out of capital which is contained in Standing Order 167, in the Companies' Act, 1862, and in other statutes affecting public Companies, is in accordance with sound financial principles, and acts as a protection to the public. In special cases, however, your Committee recommend that it may be permitted to pay interest upon capital during the construction of railways or tramways, subject to the following conditions."

And then they defined the conditions under which they considered, in special cases, payment of interest out of capital might be allowed. Thus, they said that his Predecessor, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's (Sir Lyon Playfair), recommended the amendment of the Standing Order, and that the Committee appointed to consider the subject recommended that, under certain circumstances, the payment of interest out of capital should be allowed—that that proposed change should be carried into effect. The then Chairman of Ways and Means, and the Committee, all recommended that this question should be dealt with. He observed that his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) had given Notice of an Amendment to his Amendment of the Standing Order. His hon. Friend proposed to follow the course recommended by the Committee; and he (Sir Arthur Otway) would frankly tell his hon. Friend that he should have been disposed also to adopt that course, were it not for a reason which he would state to his hon. Friend, which seemed to him (Sir Arthur Otway) to be conclusive. He found it would be impossible to effect this change by a Bill. He would ask any hon. Gentleman who had paid attention to the state of Business in that House whether there was the slightest chance of any Member introducing a Bill in that House, and getting it passed during the present Session? He was confirmed in that opinion by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, with whom he had communicated on the subject. What was the answer he found in the letter to his Predecessor, dated the 26th of February this year? The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "As regards the amendment of Standing Order 167, which forbids the payment of interest out of capital during the construction of works, there would be so much difficulty in carrying a Bill in consequence of the strong opposition, such a measure would meet with, that I cannot entertain the question of introducing it."

If the change was to be effected at all, it was impossible to effect it in any other way than by the method he (Sir Arthur Otway) proposed—namely, by adding to Standing Order 167 the words of which he had given Notice. Now, there could be no doubt that when Standing Order 167 was proposed, it was essential, for the purpose of putting an end to the unhealthy state of things which existed in consequence of the wild speculations which existed. Speaking generally, he did not question the soundness of the principle contained in the Standing Order. While saying this, however, he must remark that in all foreign countries, so far as he knew, without exception, the payment of interest out of capital was allowed. Her Majesty's Government had sanctioned it in our Indian Possessions, and it had also been allowed in the case of certain Railways in England. Therefore, it was not to be supposed that this proceeding was altogether novel, or that it infringed a principle considered infallible. As he had said, this prohibition had been relaxed in several instances even in England. The Great Northern, one of the most important Railways in the Kingdom, was allowed seven years for its construction, and, by special Act, the Directors were authorized to pay interest out of capital at the rate of 5 per cent per annum; and he felt sure if the Great Northern had not obtained authority of that nature, that important line, in all probability, would not have been constructed. The most serious objection, to his mind, of this payment of interest out of capital arose from the encouragement it might sometimes afford to what were termed bogus Companies. He had no sympathy whatever with those Companies. He admitted there were instances where they had not only done great damage to existing interests, but where they had caused a great amount of distress; but he had endeavoured to meet the objection of those bogus Companies by the provisions which he had put in his Notice; and he thought the House, if it consented to his Motion, need be under no apprehension that henceforth encouragement will be given by it to Companies of this description, because, by the arrangements he proposed, it would be necessary to establish the *bona fides* of a Company. The Motion said—

> (3.) "That payment of interest be not allowed to begin until the Railway Company have obtained a certificate of the Board of Trade to the effect that two-thirds, at least, of the share capital authorized by the Bill, in respect whereof interest may be paid, have been actually issued and accepted, and are held by shareholders, who, or whose executors, administrators, successors, or assigns, are legally liable for the same."

He hoped that requirement, strictly carried out, would answer the purpose they had in view; and he thought the House need be under no apprehension on that score. He had heard the hon. Baronet the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) say that in dealing with this subject they must bear in mind the many clergymen, widows, orphans, and others, who, from time to time, had been deluded into putting their scanty savings into unsound undertakings—into these bogus Companies. Well, there had been a great deal of exaggeration about that; and he did not know that the House would feel specially inclined to go out of its way to take under its care those who were rash enough to go into those ventures. He felt sure the House would rest fully contented with the provisions he had inserted there. There was another thing to which he would call serious attention, as he thought it very materially affected the question. Notwithstanding the existence of the Standing Order 167, it was notorious that means were found to pay interest out of capital—that the law was evaded. Since he had concerned himself in this matter, he had had much communication, both in and out of that House with gentlemen of the railway world, concerning this Standing Order; and one of them said to him the other day—"I can evade, I have evaded, and I will evade your Standing Order whenever it is my wish to do so." He (Sir Arthur Otway) said, was it right that such a state of things should exist? Was it consistent with the dignity of Parliament that anyone should be able to address language of that kind to a person holding the Office of Chairman of Committees? If there were no other reason than that the Standing Order of Parliament was constantly evaded, that should establish a necessity for dealing with the matter. He had endeavoured to deal with this point in a manner which he thought would be efficient for attaining security in this matter. He would impose—if the House should consent to his proposal for the amendment of the Standing Order—in the rule allowing, under certain conditions, payment of interest out of capital penalties, summarily recoverable, upon all those who might hereafter set aside or evade the Standing Order. That, he trusted, if adopted, would be found an effectual means of stopping the evasions which, he thought, had brought great discredit on the Standing Orders of the House. He proposed also to make illegal and void any contract entered into by any Company, or by any Director of any Company, under which payment of interest on dividend prohibited by the Standing Order should be, directly or indirectly, provided for. Now, he admitted that this question was one of considerable difficulty, and one on which opinions were much divided; but he thought the House would agree with him, after what he had said, that it should now be dealt with. It was not fair that the large interests involved in these matters should be hampered or harassed by uncertainty as to the action of Parliament in this matter. He had no sympathy with those Gentlemen who, as it seemed to him, took a pleasure in opposing Railway Companies—who seemed to look on Railway Directors almost as if they were malefactors. There was no question in which railway interests were concerned on which those Gentlemen did not immediately collect together as an opposing force to the railway interest. With feelings of that kind he had no sympathy. He looked with the greatest respect on the railway interest. Take, for instance, the London and North-Western Railway Company. It possessed a revenue greater than that of some European Monarchies, and conferred advantages and gave employment to thousands and thousands of persons in the country. He must say that his sympathies were far from being opposed to such a Company; on the contrary, he should consider the duty of Parliament even to do all it properly could to promote and assist and aid Companies who were conferring upon the community the benefits such as those great Railway Companies were conferring. Therefore, it must not be supposed that he had any feelings of a hostile character towards the Railway Companies in making this Motion. He believed the proposal he had to make would be found, in the main, far from prejudicial to the Companies. He felt it his duty to make this proposition, finding the question in a most unsatisfactory condition on taking the Office he now held. His Predecessor had had on the Paper for some time a Notice dealing with the matter; and, as he had said, a Committee had reported in favour of dealing with the subject—although they recommended a different mode of procedure to that which he now proposed. He could not hope that his proposition would be accepted by all; but he had brought it forward because he considered it his duty to do so, and he thought he had done it in a fair and equitable spirit. It was in that spirit that he commended it to the attention and approval of the House; and he trusted that if the House should think fit to sanction the Amendment he proposed they would find in it a final settlement of this question.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

To add, at the end of the said Standing Order, the words—" And except such interest (if any) as the Committee on the Bill may, according to the circumstances of the case, think fit to allow, subject always to the following conditions:—

(1.) That the rate of interest allowed by the Committee do not in any case exceed four per centum per annum;

(2.) That interest be allowed to be paid in respect only of the time allowed by the Bill for the completion of the Railway, or such less time as the Committee think fit;

(3.) That payment of interest be not allowed to begin until the Railway Company have obtained a certificate of the Board of Trade to the effect that two-thirds at least of the share capital authorised by the Bill, in respect whereof interest may be paid, have been actually issued and accepted, and are held by shareholders, who, or whose executors, administrators, successors, or assigns, are legally liable for the same;

(4.) That interest do not accrue in favour of any shareholder for any time during which any call on any of his shares is in arrear;

(5.) That the aggregate amount to be so paid for interest be estimated and stated in the Bill, and be not deemed capital within Standing Order 153;

(6.) That notice of the Company having power so to pay interest be given in every prospectus, advertisement, or other document of the Company inviting subscriptions for shares, and in every certificate of shares; and

(7.) That the half-yearly accounts of the Company do show the amount on which, and the rate at which, interest has been paid;—

and the Company shall be authorized by the Bill to pay interest accordingly, but not further or otherwise.

"If in any case the Committee on the Bill do not think fit to allow any such interest, then there shall be inserted in the Bill provisions making liable to penalties, recoverable summarily, any director or officer of the Company who shall, directly or indirectly, pay or procure to be paid any interest or dividend prohibited as aforesaid, and making illegal and void any contract entered into by the Company, or the directors thereof, or any of them, under which payment of any interest or dividend prohibited as aforesaid shall be, directly or indirectly, provided for.

"The Bill shall not be reported by the Committee until there has been laid before them a Report from the Board of Trade respecting any proposed payment of interest; and the Committee shall report specially to the House in what manner they have dealt with the recommendations or observations in the Report of the Board of Trade."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir JOSEPH PEASE, in rising to move, as an Amendment to the Motion of the Chairman of Ways and Means—

"That it is not desirable to alter the effect of Standing Order 167 until a Bill has been passed to amend 'The Companies Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845,' and 'The Companies Clauses Consolidation (Scotland) Act, 1845,' so far as these Acts relate to the payment of interest out of capital by Railway or other Companies,"

said, the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means had stated, very accurately, that he (Sir Joseph Pease) had for some time taken a strong view in opposition to that which the hon. Baronet had enunciated. He felt that any alteration of this Standing Order would be attended with general detriment not only to the railway interest, but to the larger interest of the community in general. He had to thank the hon. Gentlemen the present and the late Chairman of Ways and Means for the opportunities they had from time to time afforded him of expressing his views on this subject. He would find no fault with the manner in which his hon. Friend (Sir Arthur Otway) had introduced this very important question to the House, although he must demur a little to some of his inferences and some of his historical facts. The hon. Baronet told them that this Standing Order was passed in order to put a stop to Railway speculations of an undue and unwholesome character; but he (Sir Joseph Pease) thought he could prove that it was passed at a time when speculation had not reached that culminating point which, in 1847, produced so much disaster in the country. The hon. Baronet had put the issues fairly before them. One of his points was whether Standing Order 167 put a stop to enterprize—whether it did not require to be dealt with; and then he had put before them what he (Sir Joseph Pease) had always considered an extraordinary argument—namely, that because the Standing Order was infringed it required to be altered. As to Indian Railways, the parallel the hon. Baronet had drawn was hardly a sound one. The State guaranteed interest in the case of those undertakings, which he believed to be a right thing to do. This guarantee was given in order to induce capitalists to invest, and the State shared with the shareholders any profit there might be above a certain amount of interest. Then, again, in the case of Indian Railways, the State had power to buy them, which was not the case with English Railways, until 10 per cent had been paid. Standing Order 167 followed a Law of Parliament made in 1845—the Companies Clauses Consolidation Act, 8 & 9 *Vict.*, c. 16. By Section 65 it was provided that—

> "All monies raised by the Company, whether by subscription of the shareholders, or by loan or otherwise, shall be applied—firstly, to paying costs and expenses incurred in obtaining the Act, and all expenses incident thereto; secondly, in carrying out the purposes of the Act"—

that was, that the purposes indicated were the only ones to which money might be applied, not to re-funding shareholders' money already paid by them. Section 121 said—

> "That the Companies shall not make any dividend whereby their capital stock will be in any way reduced;"

and another section—24—authorized payment of interest on monies paid in advance of calls until the time of actual payment. These were the laws which, for long years, had regulated this question in the Railway world, independently of any Standing Orders. They were embodied in almost all Companies Acts from that time to this, with very little exception. The Great Northern Act, it was true, was an exception. In that case power was given to pay interest out of capital; but there was no Standing Order of the character of Standing Order 167 in force when that Act was passed. About £1,000,000 was paid, he believed; therefore, the Great Northern shareholders had been mulcted from that time to this of the interest on that sum. They had received their own money back again in reduction of the amount which was paid to the Company. The declarations of Parliament on this subject were, as he thought, consistent with sound financial legislation. In 1862 they had an Act which authorized the construction of Limited Liability Companies. In 1864 there was another Act which dealt with the same subject. The Limited Liability Companies were prevented from paying interest out of capital during the construction of new works; and if the House was now prepared to alter the law, it would be doing that which would result in endless confusion and great commercial difficulty in this country, for they would have to authorize the Limited Liability Companies also to pay interest out of capital during the construction of works. In 1864 there was an Act passed for facilitating the construction of Railways, which gave the Board of Trade very considerable powers. That Act embodied the Act of 1845. Therefore, whatever Acts of Parliament had been passed, without exception, since that day, it was no longer a question of the Act of 1845, but the Act of 1862; and the two Acts of 1864 both reiterated the then feeling of Parliament, and their judgment 20 years afterwards, that the principle laid down in 1845 was correct and beneficial, and ought still to operate. Standing Order 167 was passed not at the end of the Autumn Session of 1847, but in the spring, before the great Railway financial crises came about. He had looked up the debate which had taken place on the Standing Order, and he found that there had been no feeling of panic to urge Parliament on in passing it. The debate had been a very instructive one, because it showed what the view was then of what he might call very high financial authorities—men who would be looked up to in all ages as the great financiers — he might almost say the fathers of finance in this country. Even Mr. Beckett Denison, a man whom many of them recollected as a man of great intellect and strong views, whilst he was Chairman of the Great Northern Railway, taking part in the debate, only said—

> "A number of deeds had been signed by parties a year or two years ago, in which it was stipulated that interest should be paid from time to time upon calls, as they were paid up; it was now proposed to compel Directors to break faith with such subscribers, and thus enable these latter to refuse to proceed. The practice complained of had been allowed and encouraged by Parliament in Bills it had heretofore passed. He would move, as an Amendment, to strike out the words 'in the present and every,' and insert 'introduced for the first time in any.'"—(3 *Hansard*, [93] 296.)

Mr. Denison admitted in that speech that the principle laid down in the Standing Order was right, and said, in effect—"Do not let us interfere with what Parliament has already done; but let us take care that the Bills which Parliament may pass shall contain no such provisions now." Mr. Ricardo said he—

> "Considered the insertion of a clause allowing interest to be paid upon calls out of capital to be 'a delusion and a snare.' It only led people to believe that they were investing their money instead of speculating. He had always in Committee on any Bill struck out that clause. If it was left in a Bill, the effect only was that when Directors wanted to call for £2 10*s.* they called for £2 15*s.*, and the shareholder paid so much more in order to receive part of it back again."—(*Ibid.*)

Mr. Hume

> "thought the principle of paying interest on the capital of railways before profits could accrue was a fraud on the Legislature, and a bait held out to ignorant persons for the purpose of inducing them to engage in speculations which they would otherwise avoid."—(*Ibid.* 297.)

Sir Charles Wood, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had certainly a high character as a financier, said—

> "It was only within the last two or three years, since the construction of railways had become of a much more gambling or speculative character than before, that it had been found necessary for Railway Directors to obtain the power given by such a clause. In all other undertakings, whether in mining, agriculture, manufactures, shipping, or whatever their nature, parties received no interest on their investments till profits were realized; and there appeared to be no reason why an exception should be made in favour of railways."—(*Ibid.*)

He might quote several other Gentlemen, whose names were familiar to them as matters of history, who took part in this debate; but he would not trouble the House. Finally, the Standing Order was carried, in a small House, by 70 Ayes to 27 Noes, or by a majority of 43. Sir Robert Peel, perhaps one of the most able financiers of modern times, voted in favour of the Standing Order, as also did Sir James Graham. The Standing Order was intended to guard, not so much against legitimate enterprize—for that was able to take care of itself—but against rash speculations, financial irregularities, and bubble Companies, into which those persons described as parsons, widows, and people who are led away by prospectuses, were led away to invest their savings in railways to their own detriment, as he thought he could show, and also to the great detriment of the State. His experience of railways was pretty considerable, having began when he was comparatively young. The railway with which he was most connected was made on what he believed to be the most wholesome of all principles—it was made mainly by the men who desired to use it, and a large proportion were on the Board of Management. The railway turned out to be one that paid very well to the shareholders. This was owing to the fact that—as ought to be the case with all railways—the traffic senders were thoroughly well represented on the Board, and had some control over the management. There was another class of railway—and it was a considerable one—namely, Companies which had been honestly set up by Companies who had appointed their own Boards of Directors, who had spent the money in accordance with the wishes of the shareholders. Then they must confess there had been a third class of railways, which, he thought, had done a great deal of damage to the commercial interests of the country—namely, those got up by contractors and speculators, which had come to nothing, or had come to grief, or had been absorbed by older Companies, to the great detriment of the traffic senders on those older railways, as well as to their shareholders. The traffic senders had to submit to increased dues in order to pay interest on the increased capital. The House was told that because some speculators had broken through their rules the Standing Orders of the House must be revised. He had tried to find out to what extent this had been done; but these things having occurred in the past, it was difficult to find the figures. The President of the Board of Trade would hardly be able to find the statistics; but he believed that the amount of money expended on these rash undertakings had not been more than £8,000,000 or £9,000,000. That was a comparatively small sum of money, looking at the amount which had been invested in railway enterprizes in the country. But it was a most extraordinary doctrine to lay down that because the Standing Orders of the House had been infringed, therefore they ought to modify them. They might just as well say that because there were a great many pickpockets who were not caught and put into Newgate, therefore they ought to give up their laws and let out those pickpockets who were in Newgate. The question was this—was the law right? If it was, let them uphold it. They had better uphold it than repeal it. He begged to remind the House that the process sought to be introduced by the amendment of the Standing Order was not paying interest, but handing an investor back part of his capital. The system was very delusive to those who did not understand financial matters, as it led them to believe that they were going to get a substantial percentage on their money from the very first; but, in the long run, they found out their mistake. A payment of £1,000 in equal payments over five years would be reduced, at 4 per cent, to £913; therefore, if an investor had put £913 into the railway, and £87 into the Post Office, or any other savings' bank, he would be in the same position as though he had handed the £913 over to a Railway Company. It was in order to enable this transaction to be accomplished that the Standing Order was to be changed; and that proposition, he thought, should not be approved of on principle. The hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means, who had preceded him, had asked—"Does this Standing Order stop enterprize?" He (Sir Joseph Pease) would reply, undoubtedly, it did not stop legitimate enterprize, and that he could prove from a few figures which he would quote. In 1847 the railway mileage was 5,640; in 1882, it was 18,180; whilst, in 1847, the capital was £196,000,000; in 1882, it was £750,000,000, showing an average of £15,000,000 a - year. The amount expended in the United Kingdom during the past 10 years had been £200,000,000, and that in spite of the Standing Order. These facts spoke for themselves, and showed that the Standing Order did not stop legitimate enterprize. Would this bring back that reckless speculation which his hon. Friend had so much deprecated, and which he felt also every man in the House would as much deprecate? Three years ago people had began again to talk about proceeding upon the fallacy of paying interest out of principal; and in the Session of 1881 there were schemes which involved £4,000,000 of money brought before the House, and if any of them were passed it was in accordance with the Standing Order. In 1882, 10 schemes were brought forward, embracing a capital of £29,000,000; and in 1883—when the right hon. Gentleman near him had taken up the question, and it was understood that the Board of Trade was favourable to it—there were 46 schemes, the amount of capital being £78,000,000. It seemed to him, therefore, that there was great danger of bringing back that reckless speculation which his right hon. Friend would have been the very first to deprecate, and which he considered the House would be very wrong to encourage. Now, he had traced this thing back, he thought, to head-quarters—and he wished to speak on this matter with the greatest possible delicacy, as he had to refer to a railway to which, as sitting on another Railway Board, he was opposed—namely, the Hull and Barnsley Railway. This Company issued a prospectus, in which they promised 5 per cent interest during the construction of the works. Mr. Forbes, and others connected with the railway, had stated, when they went as a deputation to the President of the Board of Trade, that without that rate of interest they would not have been able to procure capital; but that, as it was, capital came in easily—every penny they wanted was subscribed during a few hours on the strength of that prospectus.

Colonel GERARD SMITH said, he did not know that it was ever stated that without that prospectus they would not have been able to get the money subscribed.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE said, he had the evidence taken before the Committee and the statement made to the President of the Board of Trade with him, and could, if necessary, furnish the hon. and gallant Member with quotations bearing on this point. It was not, however, essential for his purpose. He believed that the representations which had been made by the promoters of the Bill had been owing to an entire want of knowledge of the law. He could hardly understand his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Smith) and those who had acted with him, going into the scheme with their eyes open, knowing that the Standing Order and the law were both opposed to them. It was a great mistake. But what he wished to refer to was the deputation which waited on the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade the other day. Amongst the Members of that deputation were his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Smith), Chairman of the Hull and Barnsley Railway, Messrs. Lucas and Aird, the contractors, Mr. Robert Baxter, solicitor to the Mersey Tunnel—which had a Bill before Parliament with this clause in it—and Mr. Cope, solicitor to Messrs. Lucas and Aird. Mr. Burchell, Parliamentary Agent to the District Railway Company, was also there; and last, but not least, was Mr. Forbes, who was so well known in the railway world for his great ability and his position as Chairman of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway—a railway which, unfortunately, had never paid a dividend—and of the Metropolitan District Railway—which declared a dividend of $\frac{5}{8}$ in 1882. If the Hull and Barnsley Company had made a mistake, he, for one, should not for a moment object to their coming in a white sheet with a candle in their hands asking to be put right, after due inquiry, with their shareholders. He would not oppose them if they did that—he should pass no opinion on the Hull and Barnsley scheme as a railway enterprize; but he said this—if they had made a mistake by all means let them acknowledge it; and if the House would grant them what they wanted under the circumstances in which the prospectus was issued, he, for one, should offer no opposition. He said this, because, if the mistake had been made, he did not wish the Company to come here and agitate and beg the President of the Board of Trade and the late and the present Chairmen of Ways and Means to use their influence to alter an Order that ought still to be retained. Had this been a Free Trade policy—had his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means repealed the Order and said—"Raise your money on whatever terms you can—*Caveat Emptor*—whether at 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 per cent," he could have understood it. It might then have been said that the shareholders would take care of themselves; but as that had not been done, Parliament must take care of the public. They did not in that House allow people to take care of themselves; but by a great many Acts they protected them in their trade and investments. His hon. Friend, and the great advocates of this change in the law, said—"Let us do it under safeguards." Everyone who had heard the right hon. Gentleman's statement that day would admit that he had taken great pains with his safeguards. But he (Sir Joseph Pease) would like the House to hear what they who had advocated the change had said about it. Mr. Rees, a Parliamentary Agent, was asked by the Committee on Standing Order 167—

> "Are you in favour of a repeal, or of an alteration in the present Standing Order?"

And his reply was—

> "On the balance, I should say I should certainly not repeal it—I should amend it. In all cases where the interest of the public, as in the case of rates and tolls, and so forth, depends upon the way in which capital is dealt with, and promoters have to come to Parliament to obtain powers to levy those rates, I think it reasonable that Parliament should see, in the interest of the public, that there should be some control exercised over the issue and application of capital."

Then Mr. Farrar was asked—

> "Are you in favour of the total repeal of this Standing Order?"

And his reply was—

> "That is a difficult question, because it is so much entwined with the whole practice of Parliament, and with the Companies' Clauses Act, as well as with the practice of Parliament. The Companies' Clauses Act, which

> was passed in 1845, I think obviously contemplates that dividends shall not be paid out of capital. It has a clause which practically authorizes interest to be paid on capital which is not called; and, therefore, impliedly prevents its being paid on capital which is called; and I think it would be a question, if you had no Standing Order of this kind, and did not alter the Companies' Act, whether the Courts of Law would not, upon the Companies Act as it stands, and the ordinary law, prevent the payment of interest out of capital; at any rate, unless specially sanctioned by the special Act."

This gentleman was of the opinion that there should not be a total repeal, but that there should be an amendment of the present Standing Order. What were the conditions under which a Railway Company was to be allowed, during construction, to take 8½ per cent additional capital from its subscribers and pay it to them again? Why, the hon. Baronet's safeguards would make the thing worse for the various Railway Companies than it was at present. He first of all said that 4 per cent was to be paid. Why 4 per cent? A great many of these Companies might never in working pay 4 per cent, yet the shareholders were to have 4 per cent during construction. The railways might not pay 2 per cent. He believed that at this moment there was £37,000,000 of railway capital upon which no percentage at all was being paid, and the average on the rest was very little over 4 per cent; and yet here, when not 1*d.* was being earned, but during the time of construction, 4 per cent was to be paid to the shareholders. But that was to be done during the time of construction of works. He never could see why it could be confined to during the construction of works. If right then, it could not be wrong after the works were completed, because really the principle was the same. Only when the works were completed that there was more chance of a dividend, before the completion there was none; and, therefore, it was only to carry the thing to a *reductio ad absurdum* in paying money out of capital in the shape of interest, and this going forward would bring the whole concern to a standstill. Then the right hon. Gentleman would cast upon the Board of Trade the responsibility of certifying as to the *bona fides* of two-thirds of the shareholders. How was the President of the Board of Trade to know whether the names submitted by a number of clerks were those of *bonâ fide* shareholders or not—how was he to know that the clerks in an attorney's office who signed the contract are *bonâ fide* shareholders, or that they were not acting under the guarantee of someone else?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: He will only see that they are legally liable.

SIR JOSEPH PEASE said, the legal liability of the people put forward might be found to amount to very little, the household effects of each probably amounting to no more than £5 or £6 in value. Then he wished to point out particularly to the House that, by abolishing this Standing Order, they were beginning again that which had failed them in the past—namely, subscription contracts. He was old enough to have seen a great many of these, and they were found to be so utterly delusive as to be no standard of liability before Parliament; and yet, in order that a shareholder might receive his capital back in the shape of interest, the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means proposed that they should go back again to that system. Then a Committee of the House was to be the judge of the future prospects of the line—as to whether 4 per cent was to be paid during construction or not. Surely the Committees of the House had enough on their shoulders without being asked to say what dividend Railway Companies could pay, and what might be the character of their competition with neighbouring or adjoining Companies. If duties of this kind were put on Parliament they would not be discharged. Would they, for the sake of doing so little, put so much on the shoulders of the Board of Trade and the Committees? It was a very grave objection that, by adopting the Motion, they would at once place on the Committees of the House the responsibility of giving a Parliamentary sanction to the payment of this rate of interest—to the payment of a dividend which was no dividend at all, but only a repayment to the shareholder of a part of his money. The debentures of these railways would get into the market, and trustees under wills and settlements would be constantly pressed to invest their trust money in these schemes sanctioned by Parliament—in these speculative Companies—for they would be nothing better than speculative Companies. The Committee reported—

"Considering, however, the bearing of these proposed changes upon the existing law, and the desirability of obtaining uniformity in legislation, your Committee are of opinion that it would be better to proceed by a general public Bill, instead of a mere modification of Standing Order, No. 167."

Sir Francis Reilly was of opinion that if this Standing Order was altered, to give it effect it would be necessary that the Act of 1845 should be repealed by special provision in every Act of Parliament containing a clause allowing interest to be paid out of capital, or the Act would have to be altered. The hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Brand), amongst others, was strongly of opinion that it would be inconsistent with sound policy to put clauses in Acts of Parliament only to be repealed afterwards by their Committees in detail. With regard to what he would call the philanthropic argument, many investors would take advantage of a Railway Company offering interest from the commencement of the undertaking, in order that they might be saved the trouble of putting the amount on which they desired to live during the construction of works into savings banks. In this way the offer of interest during the construction of works deceived the poorest class of investors—Clergymen, Independent, Baptist, Methodist, and the poorer class of shopkeepers—who knew nothing of the real merits of the undertaking they went into. He did not wish to refer specially to the Hull and Barnsley shareholders; but it was fair to point out that the average amount subscribed by individual shareholders to that undertaking was only £250; whereas the average amount invested in the railways of the United Kingdom was between £1,500 and £1,700. This showed that the terms offered by the prospectus drew into it a large number of shareholders. The Hull Savings Bank, in its Report last year, deplored the falling-off of deposits, attributing it to the fact that many of the depositors had transferred their savings to the Hull and Barnsley Railway, the amount withdrawn for that purpose being estimated at £20,000 in one year. He mentioned this to show that in altering the Standing Order as proposed they would be drawing in that class of investors who ought to be protected—if our laws were to be protection at all—as they were the least able to take care of themselves. The general position of railways in the country was hardly understood by those who would alter the Standing Order. In 1881 there was £276,000,000 of ordinary Railway Stock, of which £36,500,000 paid no dividend at all; £6,250,000 paid 1 per cent or less, and £15,250,000 paid 2 per cent or less—that was to say, £58,000,000 paid under 2 per cent. His hon. Friend asked that the Committee of the House of Commons should decide whether these people should have 4 per cent at the time that their money was going into the hands of the Railway Company. Herapath stated that in 1881 £95,500,000 only earned 2½ per cent or less. Only £1 10*s.* 8½*d.* on an average was paid on £95,000,000. Only £3,250,000 earned more than 8 per cent. In 1870-1 the average dividend paid by the Companies was 4·74 per cent, and in 1880-1 it was 4·29. The arrangement proposed would enable new undertakings to pay 4 per cent before anything was earned; whilst it was shown that the average of established, sound undertakings was only 4·29. The Great Eastern paid £1 12*s.* 6*d.*; the Lancashire and Yorkshire, £5; the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, £2; the Metropolitan, £5; the District, 12*s.* 6*d.*; the North Staffordshire, £2 10*s.*; the Caledonian, £4 2*s.* 6*d.*; the Highland, £4 5*s.*; the North British, £3 2*s.* 6*d.*; giving an average for the English Railways of £4 15*s.*, and for the Scotch, £3 2*s.*; whilst the average for the Irish Railways was £3 3*s.* 6*d.*, or a general total of £4 9*s.* Looking at these figures, looking at the amount of money invested in railways and the small return, and considering the small amounts which would probably be earned by future railways, he would ask, had the time come when the House could, with anything like propriety, repeal a law which for so long had been in operation, not only without detriment to railway enterprize, but to the advantage of the country and the protection of the weak class of investors? One word more about the cost of railways—and he had gone into this matter rather carefully, and the facts he had ascertained were worthy of the attention of the House. The lowest cost of an agricultural line was £15,000 per mile; and this, to satisfy the requirements of the Board of Trade and the requirements of the public, and to pay 5 per cent, must earn £15,000 per mile per annum. The York and Doncaster, which was an example of this kind of line, earned, locally, £400 per mile per annum, which, instead of being able to pay 5 per cent, was not worth 1¼ per cent; and so it would be for the lines that were to be made under this Standing Order. They were either to compete with existing lines, or, if agricultural lines, they had to be on practically these terms. If they considered the matter from the traffic senders' point of view, they would bear in mind that every unnecessary line added to the charges on his goods. These new small railways were thorns in the sides of the larger Companies, and they bought them up, and the dividend of those larger Companies were maintained, there being no reduction on the charges, which otherwise there would be, to the traffic senders in the district. Therefore, from the traffic senders' point of view, the construction of these lines, stimulated and fostered as they would be by the proposed change in the Standing Order, would be in the highest degree detrimental to the commercial interests of the country. Was there any difficulty whatever in raising money for railway purposes when those purposes were perfectly wholesome and legitimate? None whatever, in the present state of the railway market; £200,000,000 raised for railways during the past 10 years answered that question, which capital, with the exception of a very small amount, had been subscribed in accordance with the present Standing Order of the House. Would the proposed alteration stop fraud? Certainly not, for if it had been resorted to in the past, it would still easily get round the Standing Order. He considered that 4 per cent would not, probably, answer a good many of the speculators; and if fraud had been adopted in order to get around the Standing Order, what was the difficulty still of allowing, as in a certain case before the Master of the Rolls, something more to the contractor per yard, in order that the 4 per cent might be made 5 or 6 or 7 per cent? A man who went round the Standing Order now for the purpose of raising his money because he could not raise it in the open market on the *bonâ fide* character of his undertaking, would still go behind it. He felt very strongly that the proposal would do more harm than good. Those who had gone before them had been well aware of what they were doing, and what they had done, he thought, had been for the commercial health of the country. He would only say this, in conclusion—that he believed there would be some difficulty in moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice; therefore, he would confine himself to the more simple plan of merely giving a negative to the alteration proposed by the hon. Baronet.

MR. GREGORY said, that perhaps he might be allowed to congratulate the hon. Member for Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) on the very able and forcible speech he had made on this occasion. At the same time, however, it did seem that an answer might be given to his arguments on several of the points he had raised, and that there were considerations connected with this question which the hon. Baronet did not altogether touch upon, or did not altogether dispose of. The main objection to the proposed moderation of the Standing Order was that it would lead to the getting up of bogus Companies, which would be prejudicial to the public interest to a certain extent, and still more prejudicial to the interests of the Railway Companies. He (Mr. Gregory) doubted very much, however, whether the operation of the Standing Order, as modified, would affect speculation in railways to any appreciable extent. No doubt, the intention of the Act of 1845 was to diminish speculation; but he did not think it had had that effect, as a great deal of speculation had taken place in the years 1847 and 1848, and, indeed, the figures which the hon. Member himself had given as to the extension of railways within the last 20 years was almost an answer in that respect. What, in his (Mr. Gregory's) opinion, was likely to check speculation, and had already tended to check it, was the better understandings which were being arrived at between the great Railway Companies themselves, and the engagements which they were entering into that they would not promote lines merely for the purpose of speculation, or with the sole object of attacking each others' interests. This, in his opinion, was a greater check to speculation than anything they could do by Standing Orders. He could not help thinking that the proposal of the Chairman of Committees would have a good effect in checking "Contractors' lines." A contractor took up the greater part of the shares in a line, being allowed to charge his own prices in the contract which he entered into with the Railway Company, and getting such prices in the form of shares. It appeared to him that it was much better to get the capital from the shareholders in a legitimate way than to have a line made in such a manner as this. Under the Standing Order, as it was proposed to be amended, the shareholders would receive a moderate rate of interest for any money which might be found by them in anticipation of calls; and, this being so, Railway Companies, in a great many instances, would be enabled to obtain *bonâ fide* capital for the construction of their works instead of having to rely upon the contractors. It might be said, "It is quite true that the contractor does not receive interest;" but he received a very large premium, so that really the operation of the Standing Order in the case of contractors' lines came to nothing at all. Just let them see what was proposed by the Standing Order. What was contemplated was that shareholders should receive moderate interest on the money they advanced on calls. Let them first see what that amounted to. The shareholder was liable for the full amount of the capital he subscribed; any person who took a share became liable for the full amount of the calls upon such share. Therefore, all that he did by making this advance was to pay a liability which would fall due at a certain time. The payment of the 4 per cent interest was nothing more than an allowance, at a moderate rate of discount, for the payment of future liability. It was an every-day mercantile transaction. No man would pay a debt which was not secured unless he had some allowance for doing so. That was just the position in which a shareholder was placed by the Standing Order which was now proposed. He was certainly liable for the full amount, and by paying his calls he paid off so much of his liability. Was he not entitled, under such circumstances, to a moderate consideration for anticipating his liability? That was really all that was asked and contemplated, and, as he had just said, it appeared to him to be purely and simply a mercantile transaction. Remember, that the interest to be given was a very moderate one. It was confined to 4 per cent, and various conditions were imposed for the protection of the Company and shareholders. A certain amount of capital must have been actually issued, and must have been taken out; and, after all, it was provided that it should be in the discretion of the Committee to say whether they would or would not allow any interest whatever to be given, and, therefore, any party which applied for such a power would have to make out a substantial case for what they asked. Under those circumstances, it appeared to him that this was a very fair and moderate proposal. He could not think that it would materially affect the interests of the great Railway Companies, nor did he think they ought to stand in the way of the proposal, if in itself it was a fair and legitimate one. He did not think the Standing Order, in its present form, or the Act of 1845, had had the effect of checking speculation. Speculation would go on in spite of all safeguards, if the occasion arose for it; and if there was a great plethora of money, or if there was great commercial prosperity, speculation would break out in one form or another. Speculation of late years had been somewhat checked by the bad seasons which they had had to encounter; but six or seven years ago it was in full life. It took the shape of investments in railways, and investments in Joint Stock Companies of various kinds; and, whatever they did, they did not check it. When the winding up of all those Companies took place, they saw what had been going on. It was then, however, too late to apply a remedy, and there was nothing the Legislature could have done which would have had any good effect. In conclusion, he had only to say that, considering that this allowance of a small discount upon the payment of a debt, which matured in the future, was purely a commercial transaction, and was one which was carried on every day, and having regard to the very little effect of the Standing Order which was already existing, or the Act of 1845, he could not help thinking that the proposed alteration was one which ought to receive the sanction of the House.

Mr. CARBUTT said, he was not a Railway Director; but he wished to make a few observations in the interest of the Standing Order as at present framed. In his opinion, it would be most disastrous not only to Railway Companies, but to the public at large, if the Standing Order were altered in the way proposed by the Chairman of Committees. The hon. Baronet (Sir Arthur Otway) had said it was not likely that Parliament would be so rash as to take under its protection widows and orphans. He (Mr. Carbutt) did not ask Parliament to take under its protection widows and orphans; but he asked them not to offer them a system whereby they might find in three or four years that a good portion of their investment was gone. Parliament did protect the interests of minors; and, although he did not ask it, he did not see why they should not protect widows and orphans. They heard a great deal about encouraging natural thrift, and they were told the people of this country did not save money like the French. The French had invested their money in land, and our people ought to be encouraged to invest their money so as to have a chance of getting some proper return. He believed the proposition of the Chairman of Committees was wrong, because it would enable people to be paid interest on money during the construction of a line which, when worked, might not pay 1*d.* of interest. At the end of a few years the poorer class of investors would have no more money to go on with; they would find their shares at a great discount, falling into the hands of the capitalist. The proposed Standing Order would be of great advantage to the large capitalists, but of no advantage whatever to the small capitalists. Small men would be persuaded to go in the undertaking by the presence of the larger capitalists; they would get their interest for the first four years; they would spend it, and at the end of that time they would have to sell their shares. His own impression was, that if railways were required at the present time the right thing was for the capitalist to make them. At the present moment there was invested in the railways of the country something like £752,000,000. That represented an investment of £21 per head of the population, and the opinion formed by railway men and others conversant with the subject was that they could only earn £1 per head per traveller. Generally speaking, a new line received its traffic by taking it from old lines, and it might be years before it could earn 1*d.* of dividend. It was not for the Legislature to encourage small investors to go into speculation, speculation which ought to be carried out by large capitalists, who could afford to wait for some return for their money. If it was desired to encourage railways—and he had no doubt this proposition was made with that view—the best thing to do was to decrease the duty on the passenger traffic, and thus allow Railway Companies to earn dividends which would enable them to reduce fares. What did they find in the case of the larger lines—those lines which were earning fair dividends? They were always attempting to reduce their fares; and he found it stated by Mr. Moon, Chairman of the London and North-Western Railway Company, that at the present time the earnings of that Company were something like 1*s.* 2*d.* per train per mile less than in 1867. There was thus a reduction of 25 per cent of earnings, and all that reduction had gone into the pockets of the passengers. It was clear that the only way to encourage railways was to give them every facility for earning money, and not to allow them to pay dividends which they had not earned. Upon examination hon. Members would fined that the railways of England cost in construction something like £40,000 per mile, but that, on the average, the railways all over the world only cost £18,000 to construct. If they were to pay dividends during construction the capital account would be very materially increased—if they were to add the sum of money expended upstairs in obtaining Parliamentary sanction, which in the case of many of the small lines amounted to 16 and 17 per cent of the capital, and if they added the 20 per cent to be paid during construction, financial matters would be rendered serious in the extreme. The Prime Minister was doing all in his power to reduce the National Debt; but he was doing it at the expense of the taxpayers. If they allowed this 20 per cent to be paid during construction the capital account of the railways would increase at an enormous rate; and when, in future years, it might be necessary to say that the Railway Companies should not pay more than a certain percentage, all this extra capital would have to earn dividend before they could come to any arrangement of the kind. In this case it would be absurd to abrogate the law because it was evaded. The Chairman of Committees had said the law was evaded every day. Were they going to do away with the Law of Murder because murders were not always detected? He hoped the House would hesitate before they agreed to the proposition of the hon. Baronet. In the interest of the working classes he opposed the Motion. He asked the House not to persuade the working classes to invest their money in undertakings in which, for the first few years, they would obtain certain interest, but in which ultimately they would lose their money.

Mr. SALT said, he very much regretted that his right hon. Friend the Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter), who was Chairman of the Committee upon which he (Mr. Salt) had the honour to sit last year, was not at present in the House, so that he might have had the advantage of conferring with the right hon. Gentleman as to the course that he would wish to be taken on this occasion. The hon. Baronet the Chairman of Committees, who had moved the Resolutions before the House, had said that the Chairman of the Committee was in favour of the proposal. It would have been an advantage to other hon. Members of the Committee if they had had the opportunity of conferring personally with their Chairman as to the reasons which had brought him to that conclusion. Failing the advantage of a conference with their Chairman, he felt that he was bound in loyalty to the Committee to maintain, so far as his voice could, the lines that were taken by the Committee. He was bound to say that the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means had most loyally adopted in his Resolutions the recommendations that were made by the Committee to which he referred. With nearly all that fell from the hon. Baronet he agreed; but he doubted whether he could go the whole way with him. The difficulty was one which was very peculiar. It was a matter on which it appeared to him the arguments on one side and the other were so evenly balanced—there was so much to be said on both sides—that no one ought to complain that anyone else took a view contrary to his own. Now, the difficulty, as had been explained, had arisen from rather a peculiar circumstance. The broad principle upon which the House might be invited to act might be invoked with equal propriety and equal strength either for or against these Resolutions. It might be said, with perfect truth, that capital ought to be left, as far as possible, to take care of itself. That was a broad principle upon which all men would agree, and many would say that any interference, under any circumstance whatever, with the ordinary course of capital by any legislative power would not only be foolish, but mischievious. But then, on the other hand, he might allude to another principle which was equally true, and which he thought would be equally acceptable, and it was this—that interest, by its very nature, was something that was to be earned by capital; that it was almost a confusion of terms to say—"You authorized the payment of interest on capital, when that capital was not in a position to earn any interest at all." So that if they proceeded on broad and general principles, he thought he had quoted two instances which illustrated what he ventured to say just now—namely, that this question was a question of great difficulty, and that its merits on one side or the other were most evenly balanced. Let them go one step further, and he would mention a fact which he thought would apply to almost all commercial and monetary Statutes, and it was this—that money was like water; enterprize founded upon money was like flowing water. If they tried to dam it up in one direction it would find an outlet in some other direction. They could not dam it up altogether—it must flow, it must go on, it must in some way or other find a legitimate outlet for the occupation which belonged to it under particular circumstances; and that was exactly what had happened, and that was exactly what had led to the difficulty which they were discussing to-day. Many years ago—in the year 1847—Standing Order No. 167, with which they were now well acquainted, was passed, and the effect of that Standing Order was to prohibit the payment of interest upon capital before the interest was earned. Now, the result of that had been that side by side with the Standing Order had grown up a system—sometimes winked at, but unauthorized in the mind of Parliament—of paying interest by means of dealing with the contractors of railways, and that was well known to hon. Members, and was well illustrated by the evidence given before the Committee last year. That had been carried on to the extent of many millions of money during the last 30 or 40 years. But, suddenly, that was checked; it was checked in the year 1881 by a decision in the Courts of Law, making it difficult and risky, if not impossible, to carry on that operation further; and after that decision was given certain Companies took what was a most proper course—they came to Parliament, stated their case, and applied to Parliament for power to override the Standing Order No. 167. And the question now arose, how was Parliament to deal with the matter? Were they to cause that outlet, that unauthorized outlet, for the employment of money which had been going on for many years, and which had been partially acknowledged and winked at, to be stopped up; were they, when difficulties arose, to alter at once, even to a moderate extent, a Standing Order on which the transactions of railways had been based for many years past? That was a question which it was rather difficult to answer. When considering the position of railways they must look upon railways not in the same light as they did in the year 1845, or 1846, or 1847, when this particular Standing Order was passed. At that time a great speculation was going on, which was creating a system of railways that had not at that time been developed. There was now a largely-developed system of railway communication supplying, and well supplying, every important town in the country; and the question was, how far it was fair to Railway Companies to alter, without due consideration, the Standing Order upon which all their transactions had been based? Railway Companies had, for the last 35 years, been acting upon that Standing Order for what it was worth. He said advisedly for what it was worth; because the Standing Order might not have been worth very much. No matter, however, what its worth was, the railway system of the country developed in a most remarkable degree; developed to the great advantage of the country at large. The expressed opinion of Parliament had declared in favour of this Standing Order, and it was a very serious thing that an attempt should be made to alter it without very strong reasons; and he was inclined to think that with regard to any enterprizes of the nature he had just been mentioning, and which had been well illustrated by what had been said in the House, and what had been stated before the Committee, if the Standing Order was not altered some means would be found for carrying out those enterprizes, he hoped for the advantage of the country. This matter was not one of small importance; and, moreover, it was a matter that ought to be dealt with without any great delay, because the decision of the House was a decision for which a very large number of the promoters of enterprizes were waiting, and upon which the expenditure of millions of money depended. In a Return which reached him that morning, he found it stated that in 1880 there was one Company representing £3,000,000 of capital, and with large borrowing powers, which applied for leave to pay interest upon its capital during the construction of the works; that in 1881 there were 10 Companies, the share capital of which was £22,610,000, and the borrowing capital £6,810,000; and that in 1882 no less than 46 Companies, with share capital of £60,492,000, and with borrowing powers of £18,670,000, asking for power to pay interest during the construction of their lines. That showed that the question was not a very small one, and, moreover, that it was a question which required early and clear decision. These sums of money, even in this country, were very large sums to be strung up in a state of uncertainty pending the decision of Parliament. As he had said just now, his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means fairly and frankly adopted the views which were suggested by the Committee upon which he (Mr. Salt) had had the honour of serving. Those views were shortly these. That, under the circumstances, some check was desirable; that it would be well if, as a general principle, the rules laid down by the Standing Order 167 could be adopted, and better still if they could be adhered to; and that probably they would be more strictly and generally adhered to if some regulation could be made so that, under peculiar circumstances, a concession could be granted with regard to the payment of interest. That, briefly, was the opinion of the Committee, and he took it to be the opinion of his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means. But the question arose, how was this to be carried out? He (Mr. Salt) was bound to say that he had some doubts whether the Resolutions of his hon. Friend could always be carried out, and whether they could rely upon every Committee before whom any Railway Bill came for discussion adopting the clear and definite and consistent views embodied in these Resolutions; it was very uncertain whether the House could fairly expect the decision of one Committee to be quite consistent with the decision of another Committee in a matter of that kind. He believed that, if carried out, not only would these Resolutions, in practice, be beneficial as meeting the necessities of the moment, but he believed that they would prove a far greater check upon speculative enterprizes than the Standing Order 167 had ever proved to be. He would remind the House that the Committee of last year recommended that the alterations of the Standing Order should be made, not by a new Standing Order, but by a Bill. By that recommendation he thought it was loyal and right to stand. He might say that this recommendation was founded upon very high opinion indeed; it was founded upon the opinion of none other than Sir Francis Reilly, contained in a Memorandum put before the Committee. There was another reason why he was inclined to think that the House should proceed by way of a Bill, instead of by mere Resolutions, and he was sorry to say it was the very argument which the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means used in favour of proceeding by Resolutions. It seemed to him that the argument which the hon. Baronet used for proceeding by way of Resolutions in this matter was the very strongest argument that could be possibly advanced for proceeding by way of a Bill. The hon. Baronet had said, very truly, that it was difficult to pass Bills at the present time; but there was now a very powerful Government in Office, and a very able Minister at the head of the Board of Trade, so that he (Mr. Salt) did not make much of the difficulty. The hon. Baronet went on to say that if the proposals were put forward in a Bill, that Bill would meet with the very strongest opposition. It seemed to him (Mr. Salt) that the fact that there would be very strong opposition to these Resolutions, if in the form of a Bill, was the very greatest argument that could possibly be adduced in favour of proceeding by Bill. It must be remembered that the Standing Order had existed now for 35 years, and that its efficacy had come into question, not by any fault of its own, but because certain commercial transactions entirely outside the scope and intention of it had failed, and had been decided against by a Court of Justice. Therefore, they ought to consider very carefully, they ought to give every Member in the House, and every interest in the House, the very greatest and the very amplest opportunity for discussing and challenging and amending any change that was to be proposed in a system which had lasted so long. He would advance another argument in favour of proceeding by way of Bill. Because these Resolutions were proposed by the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means, whose opinion and experience was so valuable in any matter of this kind, he (Mr. Salt) was inclined to receive them with favour; but he could not agree that it was prudent and wise to effect such a change as was proposed by a series of Resolutions upon which only one Motion could be made. Such a difficult problem as that could only be settled by repeated discussion, by repeated inquiry, and by giving the opportunity of considering time after time, either in the House or in the country, in detail as well as in principle, the proposals that were to be put before the House. That could only be done by the machinery which the custom of the House afforded with regard to a Bill. If his hon. Friend persisted with these Resolutions, he (Mr. Salt) could only hope that they would effect their purpose. If the hon. Baronet did not now proceed, and it was found desirable that some Member of the Government should introduce a Bill on the subject, he (Mr. Salt) would be disposed to support the Bill, if reasonably and fairly drawn, as he had no doubt whatever it would be. Failing that, he owed some loyalty to the Committee upon which he served; and in pursuance of the reasons he had stated in favour of dealing with a matter of this importance by way of a Bill, he could not vote for these Resolutions in their present form, though possibly he should not feel an inclination to vote against them. He trusted that the hon. Baronet would be brought to the conclusion that, in this matter, procedure by way of Bill would be preferable.

COLONEL GERARD SMITH said, it now became his duty to make a few observations to the House in reference to the proposed alteration of the Standing Order 167; because he could not conceal from himself the fact that the proposed alteration owed its inception to matters in which he was personally, and the Company over which he so unworthily presided, were concerned. The object of the Standing Order had been clearly explained by the Chairman of Ways and Means. It appeared that in 1837—which was the year in which railways were introduced into this country—there was one Act passed which granted the power to pay interest during construction. In 1839 there were nine Acts passed containing similar powers; in 1842, three; in 1843, two; and in 1844, seven. And then commenced a period which had been alluded to by various hon. Gentlemen, when a considerable increase took place of enterprize in railway matters, and in the year 1845 26 Acts passed containing the power in question, and in 1846 there were 92 such Acts passed. In all, 300 Acts were passed in which there was a clause granting the power to pay interest during construction. In 1847 the Standing Order was passed, but four or five Companies received power to pay interest during construction before this Standing Order was made, and in every Bill which had come before Parliament since the passing of the Standing Order such power had been disallowed. He did not quarrel at all with the statement which had been made as to the object and origin of the passing of the Standing Order. He thought it was exceedingly probable that it arose out of the railway mania of that day, and out of a necessity which seemed to exist in the mind of the House, that as undue speculation was on the increase it was the duty of Parliament in some measure to check it. Personally, he considered that on account of the provisions contained in the Act of 1845 the passing of this Standing Order was entirely unnecessary. He thought it would be seen that the Companies' Clauses Act of 1845 contained provisions that were amply sufficient for the purposes of checking unwise speculation, which Parliament had in view. The Act of 1845 contained a provision that all monies raised by a Company, whether by subscription or by loan, should be applied to meet the expenses incurred in carrying out the purposes of the Company. And then followed Section 121, which provided that a Company should not pay any dividend whereby their capital was reduced. There were other provisions in the Act which more or less elucidated these two points. For his part, therefore, he could not see that there was any necessity on the part of Parliament — nor was it shown in the debates at the time—why this Standing Order should be made to enforce the carrying out, as it were, of the provisions of an Act already existing, and which could be enforced by proper authority. Notwithstanding the passing of the Act, it must be remembered that in that very year, 1845, no less than 26 Acts were passed which contained permission to pay dividend out of capital, and that in the following year no less than 92 such Acts were passed. The House ought to consider what the effect of the Standing Order had been. It seemed to him that the inevitable result which followed all extreme and stringent regulations had followed in that case—that was to say, that the law breaker had followed the law maker. In order to carry out works which Parliament had sanctioned, provisional Directors, or Directors of Companies, had been obliged to resort to every species of evasion of the law. There was only one other thing they could do, and that was to run the risk of having the provisions of the Act of 1845 and certain penalties enforced against them. Of course, that was a risk they could very largely avoid, and in very many instances it had been avoided by the very simple means of, as it were, drawing the teeth of those who were opposed to them. If an independent Company, or a Company which desired to be independent, wanted to pay interest out of its capital, it had only to sacrifice its independence and say to one of the large Companies—" Will you work us; will you buy us; will you do anything so that you may have some control over us?" It was the easiest thing in the world for a great Company to have its teeth drawn. In this way many new Companies came out. No doubt allusion had been made during the debate to himself personally, and to the Company over which he presided. The Hull and Barnsley was an independent Company. Did any hon. Member suppose for a moment that if they had been willing to sacrifice their independence, if they had been willing to be worked by the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, or the Lancashire and Yorkshire, or any other of the great Companies, an Injunction would have been brought against them before the Master of the Rolls? Nothing of the sort. They would have heard nothing of it. An evasion of the law was practised in their case; but the matter was contested, and contested, as he firmly believed, by those who were interested in preserving the opposition traffic. He asked the House to allow him to mention some of the evasions, and to show how they were carried out. He had in his possession a few prospectuses, which had been issued at various times from 1864 to the present date. Some of them he was sure the House would see related to exceedingly important undertakings. The Metropolitan District Railway, which had proved an unquestionable benefit to the public, paid 6 per cent interest during construction. He ought, perhaps, before giving examples, to say that, practically, there were three ways in which evasion could be carried out. One was a very common one—namely, that a certain amount of Consols were placed in the hands of Trustees for the benefit of the shareholders; and in the prospectus issued it was stated that a certain amount of Consols had been placed in the hands of Lord So-and-so, the weight of the gentleman's name and the position of the Company being, no doubt, guarantees that the Consols had been placed as stated, and that they would be available. But where did the Consols come from except out the capital of the Company? A more barefaced evasion than that could not possibly be imagined. Another form of evasion was a very simple one, and one which, he believed, had not yet been contested. It was possible for a contractor to construct the works of a railway, and to undertake in his contract to hand them over to the Directors of the Company, receiving only in return what was termed the mere actual outlay which he had made. Did any hon. Member suppose that the contractors did not add to the actual outlay the interest on the sums of money expended by them, and which had been advanced by them for the purpose of the construction of the works? There was not the smallest doubt in the world that the contractors would charge interest upon the advances. He (Colonel Smith) submitted, under legal advice, that this was a legal method of evasion. But when practised, he knew full well that the contractor would say —"I will do the work and take shares; you shall pay me in paper the actual outlay *plus* the interest on the advances made." Speaking under correction, he maintained that if this was a legal evasion, still it was an evasion, and an unworthy one, and one which ought not to be allowed, though its perpetration would be continued if the Standing Order was not altered. The Metropolitan, and St. John's Wood, and the East London Railways, paid 5 per cent during construction by means of the terms come to with the contractor. During the construction of the North Wales Railway 6 per cent was invested in Consols; and in the case of the Brighton and Dyke Railway, the first prospectus of which bore the name of his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means, 6 per cent was paid by the contractor during construction. In the case of the Forth Bridge Railway 5 per cent was paid by the contractor, and this was an extraordinary instance. Why was not the legality of the proceeding contested in this case? Because, no doubt, the names of the Chairman of the North British, and of a Director of the North British, and of other influential railway people appeared upon the prospectus of the Forth Bridge Railway. No wonder the legality of the proceeding was not contested by anyone when persons of such weight connived at the evasion, and allowed their names to appear on the prospectus. The Scarborough and Whitby Railway, and the Swindon and Cheltenham Extension, paid interest during construction—the former 5 per cent, and the latter 6 per cent. It had been said by the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt) that since the case of the Hull and Barnsley the practice of evading the law had very largely stopped. That, however, was not the fact. The action against the Hull and Barnsley was brought in the spring of 1881, after the prospectus, offering to pay 5 per cent during construction, was issued. In 1882, however, the Brighton and Dyke Railway paid 6 per cent; and in the same year the Swindon and Cheltenham Extension paid 6 per cent. In both cases this took place after the action had been successfully brought against the Hull and Barnsley. There was now also a Colonial Railway, the Chairman of which was Lord Brabourne, the Deputy Chairman of the South-Eastern Railway, which proposed to pay 6 per cent during construction. The Cleveland Extension Minerals paid in 1882 5 per cent, and the case of the Southport and Cheshire Lines Extension brought the House down to July, 1882. This was a railway of undoubted importance; and in its prospectus the General Managers of the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, and the Midland Railways recommended the people to invest their money in the new undertaking. He found that here again, in 1882, the law was evaded, and interest at the rate of 5 per cent was paid by the contractor. Why, he asked, was no Injunction brought in the case of the Southport and Cheshire Lines Extension? Because the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, and the Midland and the Great Northern Railways had jointly agreed to work the line.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN, rising to Order, said, it must be within the hon. and gallant Gentleman's knowledge, if not he would inform him, that as soon as the attention of the three Companies mentioned was called to the mode in which the Southport and Cheshire were raising their capital, they sent a distinct protest against it.

COLONEL GERARD SMITH said, he was not aware of that fact; he heard it with pleasure. But he was not aware that that protest had had the effect of causing the Southport and Cheshire to alter their tactics; because, up to December, 1882, they continued, and he believed they would continue, to issue prospectuses having in their provisions one or other of the well known modes of evading this Standing Order. He thought he had shown that the Standing Order had been evaded continuously, and that it had been evaded since the Hull and Barnsley case. He was at one with the Chairman of Ways and Means when the hon. Baronet said he was of opinion that Railway Companies would continue to evade the Standing Order; and he asked if this was a position in which Parliament ought to be placed? He thought not. The Committees upstairs sat for days together over the Railway Bills introduced; they took, to his knowledge, the greatest possible pains to inquire into the *bona fides* of the different undertakings; and when the Bills came back from the Committees, they, as a rule, received the sanction of the House, though of late there had been a tendency to interfere with and alter the decisions of Committees upstairs, in the immutability of which the House had been taught to believe. What had been the result of some of the evasions? Let them take the case of the Metropolitan District Railway. He knew of no railway of greater importance to the traffic of London and the suburbs than that. The short history of the District Railway was that, after struggling for many years, it had to issue an enormous amount of 6 per cent debentures which would hang round its neck for ever. The financial difficulty in which the railway found itself was such that it would take many years of struggling to overcome. That was a case in point. The House would consider carefully, he was sure, what was the effect of perpetuating this old system. Its effect was to cripple legitimate enterprize; to drive Companies into the hands of contractors; to increase the cost of the lines, and ultimately to diminish the value of the shares. The hon. Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) knew perfectly well that contractors did not intend to be philanthropists; it would not be right to expect that they should be. They were entitled to receive proper remuneration for their services. He knew little of the undertakings started this year; but one of them he regarded of great importance—namely, that for making a considerable length of railway in Scotland. The Bill brought in to authorize the construction of the line was, he understood, rejected by a Committee of the House. There remained, however, before Parliament, one or two very important schemes involving the raising of many millions of capital. Notably there remained the scheme for the Manchester Ship Canal. Did the House suppose that anyone connected with the construction of that Canal could go into the City—for that was where money was obtained—and raise money for that scheme without paying interest during construction? As one who had had to do with raising money he asserted that not one 6*d.* could be raised except upon the undertaking that interest would be paid during construction. They had to consider many important schemes which had been sanctioned—among them the Regent's Park Railway. The Company had been able to raise a certain amount of their money, and why? Because they were able to offer to the shareholders a net revenue from an already going concern from the Regent's Canal which they had bought; but they had not raised the whole amount for that very important undertaking. Then there was the Inner Circle Completion scheme, and also the Metropolitan Outer Circle; and in reference to those railways, which were specially concerned with London, he would call attention to this. In 1863 a Select Committee of the House of Lords was appointed to consider various schemes for the construction of railways in the Metropolitan district, and in their Report they said it would be desirable that an Outer Circle should be formed in the Metropolitan district, intersecting and communicating with the principal lines of railway North of the Thames. That had been authorized by both Houses of Parliament. It was the same with the Regent's Canal scheme. These were two schemes recommended and authorized by Parliament for which, so far as he knew, the money had not been raised, and which were hanging up in Parliament, although Parliament had said they were to be constructed. He knew that the promoters of those schemes intended to carry them out within the powers Parliament had given them; but was Parliament going to insist on the Canal Company raising the capital by evasion, or that the Metropolitan Outer Circle should be forced into the hands of contractors against the judgment of the Company and the shareholders? He would, upon this question, allude to language used by one, to whose words everybody would listen with respect, the late Master of the Rolls, who, in the course of the application for the Injunction obtained against the Hull and Barnsley Railway, said—

> "I should think this case would lead to some improvement in the wording of this clause"—

alluding to the usual prohibitory clause—and, later on, he said—

> "If a man lays out £1,000 in building a house, at the end of that time he reckons that the house costs him not only the money laid out, but fair interest on the money laid out. Why the same doctrine should not apply to railways I do not understand."

Let it not be supposed that railways, who were so much opposed to the alteration of the Order, were paragons of perfection; or that they did not, in one form or another, do very much the same thing as they complained of in the new undertakings, and which by the retention of this Order they desired to perpetuate. The ways in which Railway Companies got their capital were simply these. Of course, a railway was in a satisfactory position for getting capital, or it was in an unsatisfactory position. In the latter case, the practice was to issue Stock at a discount with deferred payments. He could not see the difference between issuing £100 Stock at £80, or issuing it at par, and paying £5 per cent interest over four years, which would come to the same thing. It seemed to him that that was a power which only applied to existing Companies. In some measure he admitted that if that power could be applied to new undertakings it would be a relief, but only a partial relief; and he did not think it a very desirable plan to follow. As a matter of fact and of law, it was not possible for new undertakings to issue Stock at a discount; there was a distinct prohibition of that process in the Companies' Acts. If a Company was in a satisfactory position, the plan Railway Companies had was to issue Stock at a premium, carrying the premiums to a reserve, and undertaking to pay interest during construction out of such reserve. That was done in the case of the Metropolitan Railway, which got power to carry certain premiums to a reserve, and subsequently got power to pay interest on calls out of this reserve. The Metropolitan Railway Act of 1877 authorized the Company to form a fund, called the Reserve Fund, and to—

> "Carry to such fund all premiums payable in shares and stock which the Company have at their disposal, and the Company may, from

time to time, invest the Reserve Fund and the annual income derived therefrom, and may, from time to time, apply such fund for any purposes connected with their undertaking, except the payment of dividends or interest on stocks and shares."

But in 1880, under the pressure of difficulty consequent upon the necessity of obtaining further capital to complete their undertaking, they obtained in another Act power to—

"Apply these funds to the payment of interest on calls in the capital issued,"

thus completely evading the provisions of Standing Order 167. He was quite aware that there were many possible objections to be urged against altering this Order, though he did not think the effect of the alteration would be to tempt unthinking persons into investments. In regard to the Hull and Barnsley shareholders, the hon. Baronet (Sir Joseph Pease) alleged—he did not know upon what authority—that the average Stock held was £250; and he stated that he had gathered that from a shareholder. He might, perhaps, inform the hon. Baronet that no shareholder had access to the register which showed the amount of shareholders' Stock. He had a right of access to the names and addresses of shareholders, but not to the register. What sources of information the right hon. Baronet had he did not know; but, so far as he was aware, this information could only be obtained from the Company. The hon. Baronet also said that some of these unthinking persons were tempted to invest in the Hull and Barnsley Railway by a promise of so much interest during construction, and that some of them were working men who took their savings from the banks for that purpose; but if the hon. Baronet had only thought for a moment he would have seen that that argument could be turned against himself. Did he suppose that the working men of Hull would have taken their savings from the bank and invested them in the Railway if they had not known that there was good reason for the prosecution of the Railway, and that for years they had been suffering under the monopoly and tyranny of the Railway Company of which the hon. Baronet was a Director? Was not that an absolute proof of the *bona fides* of the undertaking, and a refutation of his argument that unthinking persons were tempted to make unwise investments? Another objection was that this permission would allow railways to be made and interest to be paid by the contractors—or rather, the works to be handed over to contractors and interest to be paid by them—and yet no works would be constructed. He admitted that that was possible at one time; but it was impossible now, because shareholders were possessed of a complete defence against it. In these days shareholders would not go to half-yearly meeting after half-yearly meeting and receive their dividends while they knew that the works were in the hands of the contractors, and yet not a spade had been put in the ground. It had been said that the position of railways was not the same now as it was in 1837, or in 1847. The country was pretty well covered with railways. The Company of which the hon. Baronet was a Director was the owner of something like 1,400 miles, which had been brought together until the system had become a gigantic and, on the whole, an excellent affair. He had heard it said that in Westminster there were engineers and lawyers who would take advantage of this change. He knew, and nobody knew it better than he, that there were engineers and lawyers at Westminster; but there were engineers and engineers, lawyers and lawyers, and he did not think there was any intention on their part to take advantage of this provision, if it was altered, in order to establish a system of bogus Companies. Nobody would deprecate the formation of bogus Companies more than he; and he hoped he should be able to show that the provision proposed would prevent the formation of such bogus Companies. The Amendment proposed by the hon. Baronet was to be withdrawn, he understood.

Sir JOSEPH PEASE said, he merely proposed to negative the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means.

Colonel GERARD SMITH said, what he understood to be proposed was a return to the old system. The Act of 1845 contained full powers to prevent interest being paid. It was thought desirable to supplement that Act by the present Standing Order; but he thought he had shown that that was quite unnecessary, and that it had been, and would be, evaded. That was not a position in which Parliament ought to be placed. What was wanted was an increased mode of carrying trade. The rate of interest was 4 per cent, and he thought that a wise provision. The House must remember that it had placed it in the hands of the Committee to say whether there should be interest, and, if so, what rate of interest, not exceeding 4 per cent. If 6 per cent were paid it would be very wrong. The hon. Baronet said, in the first place, that he did not agree in the view that people must take care of themselves; and then, in the next breath, he said he objected to the fatherly care of the President of the Board of Trade. He thought the hon. Baronet was inconsistent; and he hoped this Motion would be passed, as he firmly believed it would aid in the carrying out of works which had been sanctioned and were awaiting construction, and would give an impetus not to bogus or speculative concerns, but an honest and reasonable impetus to trade in a direction in which it was needed.

Mr. LEWIS wished to say a few words on behalf of the public. Everybody ought to be very much pleased with the fatherly care which the hon. Member for Monmouth (Mr. Carbutt) proposed to throw round the public to prevent them from squandering their money; but he thought the public had a totally different interest, which was that reasonable railway enterprize should not be checked by the influence of two or three large Companies. Nothing, in his judgment, could be more unlikely to carry conviction to people's minds against this Motion than the fact that the statement which had been circulated in opposition to it contained the signatures of three gentlemen whose position was well known. They were gentlemen of high standing in their Profession, and they were the legal representatives of the London and North-Western, the Midland, and the Great Western Railways. They were the only persons who had circulated reasons against this new Standing Order; and if a reason why hon. Members should not attend to the suggestions in the Circular were wanted, it would be that the only persons who appeared in the foreground to carry out this opposition were the representatives of those three great Companies. The public were very much indebted to those Companies for the accommodation they had provided; but, having gone through all the infant troubles connected with Railway Companies—having had the measles, scarlet fever, and, perhaps, cow-pox — they wanted to stifle other railways in their birth. What was the interest of the public in this matter? He thought *caveat emptor* might well be applied to the subscribers in these new undertakings. Railway Companies were not so new to the British public that they needed any great protection on that score. His chief objection to the Order which it was proposed to repeal was that it tended to evasions, as the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Gerard Smith) had shown. Was it necessary for the public good, in relation to the question of railway accommodation extension, to keep this restriction in force any longer? He should have thought that on a subject of this kind the opinion of the Chairman of Ways and Means would have gone very far to carry conviction. In considering the terms of the Standing Order which the hon. Baronet proposed, it seemed to him that many of the difficulties and objections which might be started were obviated by the careful way in which the new provision was proposed to be carried out. He thought the provision erred on the side of restriction rather than of laxity. That, however, was a matter upon which he thought the hon. Baronet who filled so worthily the position of Chairman of Ways and Means was a better judge than he. He only referred to that to show the extremely judicious way in which this arrangement was to be carried out. They had not only to convince a Private Bill Committee that power ought to be given in each particular case, which was a matter of very great importance, but there were limitations as to the payment of interest, and as to when that interest should run, and as to whether interest should begin until the Company had obtained the requisite certificate that a large proportion of the capital had been subscribed. There was also the provision that notice should be given by advertisement stating when the interest was intended to be paid. He thought the Conditions 4 and 7 in this new Standing Order conceded all that was reasonable and necessary; but, however that was, it was hardly necessary to quarrel with an excess of care in drawing these restrictions. If one looked at the objections which were made to this proposal in the document signed by the three solicitors of the great Railway Companies, he would be startled to find that they would take us back to the speculative period of 1846. Many hon. Members could remember the wild character of that speculation, when a newspaper could hardly be taken up which was not covered with railway prospectuses. This existing Order had its origin, no doubt, in that wild and maniacal speculation; but so far from that being an argument in favour of the retention of the Order, it was against the Order, because the circumstances having disappeared the law ought to go with it. He found in this Circular what the real grievance of the great Railway Company was. They saw that independent Companies had now some chance of existing, and that the number of Private Bills proposing to pay the interest for capital was increasing. That meant that railway enterprize was more energetic than it had been, and the public must get some benefit out of that; and, therefore, when it was proposed to assist that enterprize by a relaxation of the rules under which the House had acted in regard to private legislation, these great Railway Companies said they must endeavour to get Parliament to be as staunch and as stiff as ever in reference to the rule against interest being paid out of capital. It was not necessary to go into a dialectic discussion as to what was the meaning of paying interest from capital, and whether it was moral or not was out of the question. It seemed to him to be a trifling sort of infringement of the great principle that you must not pay interest from capital to say that a Railway Company, during construction, should be able to say to their subscribers that they would so arrange that the money should not be absolutely unproductive, and so that there should be no impediment in the way of a *bonâ fide* subscription. Paying interest from capital in that way did not make a subscription less *bonâ fide* than it would be under other circumstances. On the contrary, the most careful and most cautious investors might look upon that as an expedient to which they might well resort without being open to the remark that they were entering into a speculation and deserved to lose their money. It seemed to him that this was an important matter to those who, like himself, were not large holders of Railway Stock. He happened to hold Stock in one of the Companies that had given a guarantee; but that was under peculiar circumstances, and was not within the rule of Parliament. It was very desirable, in his opinion, to allow this liberal extension.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR: The Standing Order 167 was passed under exceptional circumstances and for a specific purpose in 1847. From 1837 to 1845 the railway practice was to allow payment of interest on capital, and in the year 1846 nearly 100 Acts, representing £40,000,000 of capital, were passed with authority to pay interest during construction. What principle is infringed in allowing interest during construction? If the hon. Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) were to spend £50,000 in the construction of iron furnaces, would he not in his books debit the cost of those furnaces not only with the £50,000 actually expended, but also with the interest of the money which he drew from other sources and placed in the furnaces till they became productive? It is just so in a railway, whether the money representing interest comes out of the pocket of the shareholders or out of the banking account of the Directors. The true and actual cost of construction is the capital employed *plus* the interest which remained unearned during the period of construction. If the shareholder prefers that this interest should be paid to him through the Directors, rather than keep an account and add it to his capital account in his own books, that is a mere matter of convenience. Order 167 was passed not on account of any principle involved, but as a means of checking the railway mania of 1846. No doubt it had the desired effect, and largely checked railway speculation. The times have now changed. A network of railways spreads over the whole country, but they are chiefly in the hands of the great Railway Companies. These Companies do not always see it to be to their interests to construct branch lines into the neighbouring localities. These localities, however, do desire railway communication, and are anxious to procure it for themselves. They come to Parliament and get Acts, obtaining the capital by a circumvention of the Standing Order, for the contractor pays the interest on capital while it lies idle. The hon. Member for South Durham tells us that the holdings of Stock on the great railways average £1,700, and that in railways such as the Hull and Barnsley, which was got up by a contravention of Standing Order 167, it was only £250. Is not this a proof that the question at issue is one between the great capitalists and the general public? The general public desire to promote railway enterprize in their own way, and are willing to subscribe money on terms most convenient to themselves. The hon. Member for South Durham is a great railway magnate and capitalist, and scarcely appreciates the interests of small capitalists, who would subscribe their £200 for a railway undertaking, and, under the benevolent purpose of protecting clergymen and widows, would refuse them permission to participate in railway undertakings. I believe that the securities of the new Standing Order will give a far more efficient protection to these classes than the opposition of the hon. Member, for the effect of its refusal will be to throw these clergymen and widows again into the hands of the speculative contractors, as at present, instead of giving them the securities of a *bonâ fide* undertaking. The hon. Member for South Durham tells us there is no call for such a relaxation. He says that for any undertaking that is sound there is capital enough coming forward. But, in his next sentence he himself demolished his own argument, for he said that while in 1881 there was only one scheme for a railway with a capital of £4,000,000, as soon as it became bruited about that it was in correspondence with the Board of Trade as to relaxing the Standing Order in 1882, 10 schemes arose for £29,000,000, and in 1883 there were 46 schemes, with £78,000,000 of capital. Could anything be more conclusive as to the fact that capital has been strangled by this restrictive Order, and that as soon as it is likely to be relaxed new capital is ready to flow into railway enterprizes? I do not think that it is consistent with the dignity of the House to have a Standing Order which is systematically evaded. It is far better so to modify it that fair play may be given to small as well as to large capitalists in the construction of railways. The Chairman of Ways and Means has surrounded his proposal with safeguards, so that only legitimate enterprizes will be encouraged; and with this belief I heartily support the proposed changes in the Standing Order.

Mr. RAIKES said, that with all that the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) had said he entirely concurred, and he thought the House was greatly indebted to the right hon. Gentleman for having come forward to champion the project of which he was the original author. There had been in this debate a tendency to ignore what would be the fate of these unwary investors and small capitalists even if the Standing Order were not altered. Those people had money which they put into some speculation or investment, and at the present time the operation of the Standing Order was to say that "The only investment in which you shall not put your money is a small English railway. You may put it into any foreign undertaking you like, and there are plenty of foreign Governments who will guarantee you interest, not only during construction, but for many years after the line is made." English capitalists who chose to be tempted by those directions were not to be blamed; but there could be no question that an immense amount of English capital, ready to be invested, had been driven from this country to foreign countries. The English Government themselves, in their Indian Possessions, made a practice of guaranteeing interest which he believed was paid during construction; and he, therefore, did not think that that lofty commercial Phariseeism which had been seen during this debate was altogether appropriate on the part of Members who were always ready to support the Government. He could illustrate this by an experience of his own which was rather instructive. He had the honour to be the Chairman of a Railway Company in a foreign country, and also of a small English Company. When the foreign Company invited subscriptions, the invitation being fortified by an Imperial guarantee, they received applications for five or six times the number of shares they had; but when the English Company invited subscriptions, they only got applications for two-thirds of the shares. That, he thought, was a very clear proof of the unfortunate effect of the existing legislation with regard to the employment of British capital in the making of new British railways. He did not wish to blame the great Companies, who, in fact, had all the benefit of the course which they now condemned, for the line they had taken. They had got something which was very like a monopoly in the railways, and it was very natural that they should wish to keep it. But it had been suggested by the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt), and in some degree by another hon. Member, that it would be better that a matter of this kind should be dealt with by a Bill, than by a proposed alteration in the Standing Order. But how were they to get rid of the present Standing Order? They could not technically deal with that by a Bill; and if they passed a Bill, that would seem to be an entirely inappropriate proceeding. If they brought in a Bill, that would still leave the Standing Order on the records, although it might conflict with the Act. Sooner or later they must come to the question of amending or repealing the Standing Order, and the proper way of dealing with the Order was by amendment or repeal. The Act of 1845 was in operation, and it was because that operated only with regard to undertakings which had not a special Parliamentary Charter, that this House had supplemented it by this Standing Order. Each and every railway scheme when legalized became as much the law of the land as the Act of 1845; and, therefore, it seemed to him, if they were to deal with the question at all, they must deal with the Standing Order, and not with the Act. One point had been put with great force by the last speaker, and that was the dictum of the Master of the Rolls. If a man was going to purchase £100 worth of Stock in a railway, from which he knew he could not receive any interest for four years, he paid £120 for his Stock. The proposal of the Chairman of Ways and Means would have exactly the same effect, but in a manner which would probably be more convenient to the parties. The matter had been so completely thrashed out to-day, that he had very little more to add; but he thought he might say that he had it on very good authority—taking the example of one of the largest undertakings ever before Parliament — that by the Manchester Ship Canal Bill the promoters proposed to charge £623,394 for interest at 4 per cent during construction on their capital of £5,633,924; and he believed it was a matter of common notoriety that unless they were able to give effect to that particular clause in the Bill their scheme would have to drop, and that the great attention now being bestowed upon that Bill by a Committee upstairs, and the large attention which it would probably receive in the other House, would probably be all thrown away, if the promoters were barred from an essential and necessary step before they could carry out their scheme. He hoped the House, having regard to the fact that this proposal was that of the Chairman of Ways and Means, who he knew had given special attention to the subject ever since he assumed his Office; that it only carried out the recommendations of an extremely able Committee last year; and that it had been supported by every hon. Member who had spoken except those who represented the great Railway Companies, would pay on this occasion more attention to what had been shown to be the interest of the public, than to any invitation to sacrifice those interests, as they had been sacrificed in the past, to the demands of private Corporations.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: As some allusion has been made during this debate to the communications between myself and the late and the present Chairman of Ways and Means, I should like to add a few remarks. In what I have to say I am expressing not the opinion of the Government as such—for I believe it would be unusual for a Government to take part in any proposal to alter a Standing Order—but I am expressing my own personal opinion, which, I think, is that of my Colleagues, and notably that of the Prime Minister, who is not, I think, an inconsiderable authority on what constitutes safe finance. I think the House will agree that we have to thank the Chairman of Ways and Means for having brought this subject before us. It was a difficulty which had grown very much in the time of his Predecessor; and I think it is only in accordance with his official duties that he has thought it necessary to call attention to the difficulty, and, if possible, get over it. On the merits of the case it appears to me there are two questions to be decided. In the first place, there arises a question as to the feeling of the proprietors of the great existing lines, and the promoters of new lines. The action of the existing lines is, of course, quite intelligible. It is not their interest to promote or increase competition. I cannot help pointing out that in some cases those great lines obtained their capital by the evasion of this very Standing Order upon which they are now desirous of insisting. Having passed over the bridge they are now rather ungraciously trying to break it down, in order to prevent any other person crossing. Their very interest is so very self-evident that it is not necessary to point it out; but, after all, their interest is not the interest of the public. They assert that what they desire is not to discourage enterprize, but to discourage bogus Companies. I should like to know what is bogus enterprize in the matter of a railway undertaking? Is it enterprize which is not likely to be a good undertaking to the shareholders? Then, if that is the definition, the London, Chatham, and Dover, and the Metropolitan District, and even the Great Eastern Railways were bogus undertakings. I take these three Companies, and I do not believe that from their first establishment up to now they have paid more than an average of 1 per cent, if so much. But, although these investments have not been particularly satisfactory to the shareholders, they have been of the greatest advantage to the public; and if we are to protect investors at all I am less inclined to protect those investors whose losses are of the greatest benefit to the general public. You cannot protect the unwary. The widow and the clergyman, who are supposed to be weak-headed, will find some other means of investment if you protect tehm in this particular way—in British mines or foreign Stocks; and in these forms of investment there will be no compensation whatever in any advantage to the general community. Having regard to the impossibility of protecting investors as a whole and in all respects, this is a direction in which you should least of all attempt to protect them. Then you have a Standing Order which is evaded by people whenever they have an interest in evading it. Believing the moderate proposals of my right hon. Friend are likely to be beneficial, and seeing that they have the support of three successive Chairmen of Ways and Means, and that they carry out the recommendatios of the Select Committee, I hope the House will see its way to adopting them.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD said, he should occupy the attention of the House but a very short time. A great deal had already been said on that side of the House, and on the other side also, against the proposed alteration of the Standing Order, and he should confine his remarks to a document which had been published presumably by the supporters of the proposal, and which appeared to contain a concentration of the arguments on which they relied. He found it stated in this document that one of the reasons why the Standing Order ought to be modified was that it had been in force since 1846. He did not exactly see the force of that argument; nor was he disposed to admit the accuracy of another of the arguments used—namely, that unless the proposal of the Chairman of Ways and Means were agreed to it would be impossible to raise the capital required for the construction of railways throughout the country. He believed that, considering the large amount of capital in this country on which very low interest was being paid, there was no speculation which could be proposed that would not be well supported. They had been treated to a very remarkable dictum by the supporters of the proposal—namely, that the question could be solved in a moment, because the Resolution was in accordance with common sense. His common sense taught him that it involved a false principle to spend by anticipation what was expected to be derived from the usufruct of property. Whether it was an orchard that was planted and the trees of which were not yet grown, or a railway which was yet to be constructed, it was dangerous and speculative, until some fruits were seen or some earnings were made, to anticipate, and spend by anticipation, what profits were expected to be obtained. His right hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) had entirely lost sight of the great distinction which existed between the present case and that which he had referred to. His right hon. Friend had compared the railways which would come under the operation of this Standing Order with the great railway in the Brazils, in reference to which an enormous amount of capital had been raised, because the interest was guaranteed by the Brazilian Government. But this guarantee by the Government made all the difference. Such a guarantee transformed the speculation into an investment, and the investor became the creditor, not merely of a Railway Company, but of a powerful Empire. It made all the difference whether they regarded the matter in the light of an investment or as an adventure, and whether the people who advanced their money were to be considered as partners or speculators. He most submissively asked his right hon. Friend the Member for Cambridge University to believe that, without being at all interested in any Railway Company, one might not unreasonably take exception to what he (Mr. Hubbard) regarded as the exceedingly dangerous financial policy which the right hon. Gentleman had enunciated. Nothing ought to be relied upon as the fruit of expenditure until it had been actually obtained; and, whether the Resolution were carried or not, he thought his hon. Friend the Member for South Durham (Sir Joseph Pease) had done good service in bringing before the House a question of great importance. Although the House might not be able to prevent evasion of the Rule which it had laid down, it was most important that it should not give its sanction to a false principle; and he entirely agreed with the views which had been expressed by the hon. Member for South Durham.

Mr. MUNTZ said, he had heard many strange propositions brought forward in that House; but the strangest that had ever come under his notice was that which had been propounded that day—namely, that because a Rule or a law had been evaded it ought to be modified or got rid of altogether. The Standing Order of the year 1847—he believed it was No. 167—was, he believed, speaking from memory, made because as many as 92 Bills had been introduced which provided for the payment of interest during the time of the construction of the line to which they related. The simple question now before the House was this—Was the House prepared to sanction the payment of interest out of capital? For his own part, he could say, in reply to the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis), that he held no shares and had no interest whatever in any Railway Company. Speaking, then, as an independent man and as an independent Member, he could never sanction the payment of interest out of capital. All the bogus Companies that came before the public were got up on this principle; and, although they might not be there to protect the widow, or the spinster, or the married woman, especially after the new Married Women's Property Act had become law, he certainly thought they ought not to encourage speculations of the kind which he knew would arise if this proposed modification of the Standing Order were agreed to. What, at that moment, was the value of 4 per cent, taking any debenture or any Preference Stock in any respectable Railway Company? It would be found that 4 per cent stood at 108, 109, or 110; and yet it was proposed to offer, through the Railway Companies, that which the public would understand to be a perpetual 4 per cent. What would those unenlightened country people who had been referred to know about the matter? ["Oh, oh!"] An hon. Gentleman said "Oh!" He would ask that hon. Member to consider for a moment what would be the result if this proposal were agreed to. Many of the bogus Companies guaranteed a certain percentage. A woman, or some inexperienced person, looking at the announcement of one of those Companies, would say—"This is guaranteed. It is perfectly safe, and I shall get my 4 per cent; whereas, if I were to go into the market and buy *bonâ fide* Preference Stocks, I could not get them under 108, 109, or 110." Under such circumstances, he did not think the House would be doing its duty if it sanctioned this payment of 4 per cent. A Committee had inquired into the subject, and that Committee had presented a Report to the House. Why should they not accept the Report of that Committee? Why did not the Chairman of Ways and Means, and the other Gentlemen who were acting with him, accept that Report? He considered that the proposal before the House was one which was quite unprecedented, and which ought never to have been made.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he thought the discussion had been of a somewhat instructive character. An hon. Member, and the Railway Company with which he was connected, appeared to have got into some little mess with regard to a Railway Bill of theirs; and they, the House of Commons, had been asked to discuss that question through the long hours of that Sitting to the exclusion of an Irish measure of the greatest importance, which had been put down for today after several days' discussion in that House. The Government were well aware of this, and had, in fact, been asked not to bring forward to-day this question of a private railway adventure. They had, however, placed it upon the Paper, knowing that it would lead to a long discussion; and they had gone through the form of putting down also an important Irish measure, for the discussion of which exactly 20 minutes now remained. This was treatment the Irish Members could not for a moment put up with. They had called their Colleagues over from Ireland, and some of them had come to London at considerable inconvenience, to discuss this important Irish Bill, which had been before the House now for seven years; and yet the whole of the Sitting had been given up, not to the discussion of that Bill, but to a matter which was certainly of no very pressing nature. An hon. Gentleman — he did not know whether he should call him hon. or right hon., but he had spoken from the Treasury Bench — [*Cries of* "Question!"] He was explaining why he proposed to move the Adjournment of the Debate. In his opinion, it was monstrous that the House of Commons, the Legislature of the country, should be called on to waste its time upon such a discussion as had taken place to-day—a discussion raised, not in the public interest, but simply and solely for private interests. If the debate had been allowed to close within any reasonable time, so that the Irish Members could have brought in their Bill, he should not have objected, but the whole of the Sitting had been taken up; and, as a protest against this misuse of the time of the House of Commons, he begged to move the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Molloy.*)

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, he could not but express his acknowledgments to his hon. Friend (Mr. Molloy) for the very timely protest he had made. When they considered the position of the hon. Baronet the Chairman of Ways and Means, and his recognized connection with the Government, they could not acquit the Government of the responsibility of having deliberately chosen this day for the discussion of the matter which had occupied their attention for so many hours. It was all the more necessary that they should mark their sense of the action of the Chairman of Ways and Means in this matter; because future Wednesdays, which should be devoted to Public Business, might be appropriated for the discussion of Private Bills, in the same manner as to-day had been. He saw that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary was in his place, and they might regard him as the Leader of the House in the absence of the Prime Minister. He wished to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether it was the intention of the Government, through their Chairman of Ways and Means, to appropriate every Wednesday when an Irish Bill stood as first Order of the Day? If that was their intention, they ought to announce it at the earliest possible moment, so as to give the Irish Members an opportunity of making such arrangements as would save many of their Colleagues the trouble of undertaking a useless mission to that House from their homes and businesses in Ireland. It was perfectly well known that many hon. Gentlemen, who would not otherwise have been present in the House, had come from remote parts of the Kingdom to be in their places during the discussion of the Irish Bill which stood as first Order of the Day. But it was not merely those interested in this Irish Bill who had cause to complain. He noticed that the second Order of the Day was a Bill in the hands of his hon. Friend the Member for Scarborough (Mr. Caine), who was anxious to make the extraordinary proposition that actions for breach of promise of marriage should be abolished. He (Mr. O'Connor Power) regretted that, owing to the action of the Chairman of Ways and Means, he would not have the opportunity of voting against that proposition. He begged to ask the Government for an explanation of the course they had adopted; and he was glad that his hon. Friend (Mr. Molloy), by the Motion he had moved, had afforded them an opportunity of giving such an explanation.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would at once respond to the appeal which had been made by the hon. Member who had just sat down. All he could say was that he had asked the Chairman of Ways and Means, and some of his Colleagues, whether the Government had had anything to do with the bringing forward of the question which had occupied the attention of the House during the greater part of the Sitting, and he found they were not responsible for it. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power) had spoken of the Chairman of Ways and Means as if he were an official of the Government. But, as had been explained over and over again, that was not the case. He was the Chairman of the House. He (Sir William Harcourt) could assure the hon. Member for Mayo, in perfect good faith, that the Government had nothing whatever to do with what had taken place; but he would point out that the only result of carrying the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate would be that another Wednesday would be occupied with the discussion which had been already carried on at such great length. The hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) had spoken of the Government having fixed the first Order of the Day. Everybody knew that the Government had nothing to do with the fixing of the Orders of the Day on Wednesday, and that they had really no hand in the arrangement of Business on that day. Under these circumstances, he hoped the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Molloy) would withdraw the Motion for Adjournment, and allow the House to come to a division on a matter which he would not say had been discussed at too great length, but which, at all events, had been fully and fairly discussed.

COLONEL MAKINS said, he should certainly support the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate, and for two reasons. The first was that he might enter a protest against dealing with a subject of such great importance by means of a simple Resolution of the House in the form of a Standing Order. The question was one upon which men of authority and experience in that House were evidently so much divided that it ought to be dealt with, if at all, by legislation. His other reason for supporting the Motion for Adjournment was to protest against what he might almost call the barefaced argument which had been made use of by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain), who said that the Standing Order should be done away with, because it had hitherto prevented inexperienced people from falling into the hands of adventurers, and that he was perfectly content that the widow and the orphan should sacrifice their investments if only the public benefited by their so doing. That certainly was not a proposition which should have been brought forward in support of the modification of a Standing Order.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY) said, he wished merely to confirm what had fallen from his right hon. and learned Friend the Home Secretary. No communication whatever had passed between any Member of the Government and himself on the subject. He regretted extremely that the discussion had led to the postponement of other Business, and more especially to that of the Bill which was in charge of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. O'Connor Power). But what was his position? The question with which his Resolution dealt was one which it was absolutely necessary to settle. He had already put the Motion down on four or five different days; but on each occasion he had been appealed to to withdraw it. The Session had, in the meantime, progressed so far that, considering that it was necessary to discuss it properly, he had considered it advisable to bring it on to-day. He must point out that, if the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Molloy) thought fit to persevere in his Motion for Adjournment, the only result would be that he should be obliged to occupy another Wednesday. He (the Chairman of Ways and Means) could not allow the question to remain in the position in which it now was; and, in all probability, unless a division were taken to-day he should select next Wednesday for the resumption of the discussion. Therefore, he earnestly hoped the hon. Member would withdraw his Motion, and allow them to proceed to a division.

Mr. W. SHAW said, he rose merely for the purpose of making an appeal to his hon. Friend the Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) to withdraw his Motion. He had not intervened in the discussion, because he had not wished to talk against the Bill which stood first on the Orders. He was quite sure the Chairman of Ways and Means (Sir Arthur Otway) had no notion that the discussion upon his Resolution would occupy the whole day when he put it upon the Paper. At the same time, no change in the Standing Orders of the House would be more useful in Ireland han that which was embodied in the Resolution; and he appealed to his hon. Friend to withdraw his Motion, and allow the House to proceed to a division.

Mr. SEXTON: I would ask my hon. Friend to withdraw his Motion.

Mr. MOLLOY asked leave to withdraw the Motion for Adjournment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 131; Noes 123: Majority 8.—(Div. List, No. 117.)

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 7th June, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 2) * (80); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 3) * (81).

Second Reading—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders * (64); Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) (75).

Report—Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) * (31).

Third Reading—Poor Law Conferences * (65), and *passed.*

CONSTABULARY AND POLICE (IRELAND) (PAY AND PENSIONS) BILL.

(*The Earl of Kimberley.*)

(No. 75.) second reading.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was the result of an examination into the pay and pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Police by two Commissions which had gone over to Ireland and inquired into the subject, its object being to improve the pay and pensions of both these Forces. He was certain the admirable services of the Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Police were so well known to all their Lordships that it was quite unnecessary he should say anything to commend the Bill to the House. No body of men could be more deserving of being treated justly and liberally by Parliament; and he believed the improved conditions as to pay and pensions contained in the Bill would prove satisfactory to the Force. He would conclude by moving the record reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Kimberley.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

MALTA—REFUGEES FROM EGYPT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Earl DE LA WARR, in rising to move for—

> "Papers from the Government of Malta to the Colonial Secretary in connexion with residence and cost of maintenance in Malta of refugees from Egypt during the autumn of last year, and for all correspondence up to the present date,"

said, he did not suppose that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Derby) would have any objection to laying the Papers upon the Table of the House. They referred to a matter of considerable interest to the Maltese people. It would be recollected by their Lordships that during the recent naval and military operations in Egypt, last summer, a large number of persons from that country were sent to Malta, in consequence of the serious events which were taking place, endangering life and causing the destruction of property. The number of refugees, he understood, amounted to between 17,000 and 18,000. By the liberal response to the appeal of the Lord Mayor, a sum of about £6,500 was sent to Malta from this country in aid of these distressed people; but a large sum was further needed to supply the pressing wants of those whom the consequences of war had rendered destitute; and, to meet these cases of urgent necessity, the local Government advanced £11,000, or thereabouts, out of the local Revenues, with the expectation that it would be repaid by the Imperial Government. It should be remembered that these persons, being British subjects, were sent from Alexandria to Malta—that was to say, they did not go there of their own free will or choice, but were compelled to leave Egypt by the authorities. They might have been sent elsewhere, say to Cyprus, or any other place more convenient; but they were sent to Malta, because, perhaps, many of them were Maltese. He wished to call the attention of the Government to these facts; and to ask them whether it would not be a great hardship upon the Maltese Government and people—an injustice as it seemed to him—to call upon them to pay for the consequences of a war which was entirely an Imperial question, and for which the Imperial Government was solely responsible? He begged to move for the Correspondence in the terms of his Notice on the Paper.

Moved for—

"Papers from the Government of Malta to the Colonial Secretary in connexion with residence and cost of maintenance in Malta of refugees from Egypt during the autumn of last year, and for all correspondence up to the present date."—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, I have not the least objection to the production of copies or extracts from the Correspondence in question; indeed, I quite agree with the noble Earl opposite (Earl De La Warr) that, if we are to discuss these matters satisfactorily, we should do so more conveniently when we are in possession of the information moved for. But the fact is, the whole question really lies in the narrowest possible compass; and I do not know that the Papers will materially affect the view your Lordships will probably take of it. The facts are simply these. When the Egyptian disturbances began in June of last year, a very large number of British subjects—nearly the whole of them being natives of Malta, or connected by family or other ties with the Island—left Egypt, in consequence of the impossibility of their getting adequate protection in Alexandria. They were sent to Malta, and there the great majority of them were maintained out of public money, partly supplied by private charity, and partly at the expense of the State. My noble Friend said some 17,000 or 18,000 persons were so sent; but those are higher figures than I have heard mentioned by anyone else. A statement which I hold in my hand gives the number of refugees who had arrived by the beginning of July at something like 8,000, and the greater part of them must have arrived by that time. Some of these persons appear to have had independent means, or to have been supported by their friends, because only 6,600 odd received relief. Of these, 5,893, or nearly nine-tenths of the whole number, were Maltese, and only 460 who were British subjects, were other than Maltese. The importance of this point will presently be seen by your Lordships. The total expenditure connected with the removal and relief of these refugees was, in round numbers, £33,000. Of that sum, £15,000 was for transport, and it was entirely paid by the Imperial Government. The sum expended on relief was £18,000; and that was provided from various sources. There was a public subscription in London for the relief of these persons, which produced some £6,400, and there was a grant of £6,000 from the Imperial Treasury, and it is intended to leave about £5,700 as a charge upon the local Exchequer. The Vote has been before the Council; but the Council has not met, and the Vote has not yet been taken. My noble Friend objects to any part of the expenditure being thrown upon the local resources of the Island. To that my answer is three-fold. In the first place, out of the total expenditure of £33,000, we do not call upon Malta to pay more than about one-fifth or one-sixth; secondly, nearly all the refugees were connected with the Island. I quite agree that if they had had no connection with Malta, and had simply been taken there because it was the nearest place of safety, there would be no ground for charging the funds of the Island. But as that is not the case, and as nearly all are really Maltese, there is no injustice in calling upon the Island to contribute to the expenses incurred. In the third place, undoubtedly the finances of the Island and the industrial classes there gained very much from the large expenditure of English money caused by the war. It is said that the refugees did not leave Egypt voluntarily, but were removed by order of the Government; but that is not quite accurate. It may be true as regards some of the refugees, no doubt; but the reason why they were removed was not to serve any purpose of Imperial policy, but because they could not, as I said, be protected adequately where they were at Alexandria. My noble Friend said some of these persons were not connected with Malta, and should not have been sent there; but my answer is that the great majority of them would have very good ground of complaint if they had been taken anywhere else. As I have said, these are the facts of the case. There will be no objection to give the Papers asked for; but the Motion should be amended, as it may be necessary to look through the Papers, and to select those which shall be laid on the Table of the House, omitting only those which concern private individuals, and are of no public interest.

Earl DE LA WARR said, that instead of 17,000 or 18,000 as he had said, he should have given the number of Egyptian refugees as 7,000 or 8,000.

The Earl of CARNARVON asked whether the Government of the Island had a surplus last year?

The Earl of DERBY, in reply, said, he could not remember, and he was not Secretary of State for the Colonies at the time referred to.

Motion *amended*, and *agreed to*.

Address for—

"Copies or extracts of Papers from the Government of Malta to the Colonial Secretary in connexion with residence and cost of maintenance in Malta of refugees from Egypt during the autumn of last year, and of correspondence up to the present date."—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 7th June, 1883.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee—Postponed Resolution* [May 31] *considered.*

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Considered as amended*—Oxford, Aylesbury, and Metropolitan Junction Railway *.

Withdrawn—Totnes, Paignton, and Torquay Direct Railway *.

Public Bills—*Resolution in Committee*—Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) [Payment of Costs and Expenses] *.

Ordered—First Reading—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (Cambridge, &c.) * [216]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) (Aston, &c.) * [217]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) (Halsall Heath, &c.) * [218]; Railway Passenger Duty, &c. * [219].

Second Reading—Consolidated Fund (No. 3) *.

Committee—Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) [7] [*First Night*]—R.P.

Considered as amended—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) * [143].

Third Reading—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 2) * [158]; Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (Extension of Time) * [181], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—LAW AND JUSTICE—ALLEGED SEVERITY OF SENTENCE.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is true, as reported in the "Times of India" of May 11th, that Mr. Justice Kernan, of the Madras High Court, lately sentenced two men to penal servitude for life, the one for stealing "a quantity of brinjals and two bundles of plantains valued at two rupees," the other for stealing a cloth valued at sixteen rupees. (It is stated that on the following morning the Judge "commuted the sentence on the first prisoner to six years' rigorous imprisonment in consideration of his advanced age);" and, if he will inquire whether the Madras Government has given its sanction to these sentences?

Mr. J. K. CROSS: Sir, I have seen the report in *The Times of India* referred to. It relates to two separate cases, the details of which appeared in other Indian papers, and are as follows:—The old man, whose sentence was reduced to six years, had been convicted four times previously. The Judge thought the case one for transportation—not for imprisonment; and, not having power to pass sentence of transportation for anything less than life, he sentenced him for life, saying, at the same time, that he would recommend Government to reduce the period, The other prisoner, who was convicted, not of stealing a gold laced cloth, but of receiving it knowing it to have been stolen, had also previously been convicted four times. On the last occasion, in 1878, the Judge, in passing sentence of five years' imprisonment, which only expired last February, warned him that if again convicted he would be transported for life. There is no reason why special inquiry should be made into these cases.

EGYPT (MILITARY EXPEDITION)—SUPPLY OF FLOUR FOR THE TROOPS.

DR. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the unsound flour received in Egypt for the use of our troops, and the statement respecting it submitted to Lord Morley's Commission by the Assistant Director of Supplies and Transport, Whether the samples were prior to its purchase submitted to and approved by the Director of Supplies and Transport, and the Commissary General at head quarters, or any official trained as a commissariat officer; and, if so, whom; who is responsible for mode of shipment, which is alleged to have contributed to its unsoundness; and, who on behalf of the Government examined the flour in detail before shipment, and took the usual steps to see that sample and bulk supplies agreed?

MR. BRAND: Sir, it being necessary to send flour from this country to meet the requirements of the troops on first landing in Egypt, and until local supplies suited to the climate could be obtained, the class of flour to be sent was determined on the advice of Messrs. Bovill and Co., the War Office brokers. They considered that of the stocks then available in London for immediate shipment, American, which had been successfully used in Natal and in the West Indies, was best calculated to meet climate and service requirements with a minimum of risk. The opinion of these gentlemen, who are specialists of the highest standing, was considered conclusive, and their selection was approved by the Director of Supplies on the samples they submitted to him. Commissary General Morris, who had been appointed senior Commissariat officer of the Expeditionary Force, and who had been brought to the War Office from Ireland to advise generally on supply questions connected with the force, was temporarily absent from London when the flour was selected. The Director of Supplies is responsible for sending stores alongside the ship. The stowage on board is done under the professional supervision of the Admiralty. In reply to the hon. Member's concluding inquiry, I have to say that the Government brokers thoroughly tested the bulk supplies, and furnished certificates from the Dock Company, as to the condition in which the bags were shipped. This is the custom of the London trade. It affords sufficient protection for the vast transactions of the mercantile public; and it would have been very unwise for the War Department to set up temporarily a different system for its comparatively restricted transactions.

DR. CAMERON: Was the Director of Supplies consulted before the American flour was decided upon?

MR. BRAND: I have said that he is responsible. He was unwell at the time the arrangement was made; but his duties were most efficiently carried out by the Assistant Director of Supplies.

SIR HENRY TYLER: I should like to know if any steps have been taken to recover compensation for the bad quality of the flour?

MR. BRAND: No further steps have been taken. As I stated in reply to my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow, the War Office brokers—specialists of the highest standing—were consulted and their advice acted upon.

SIR HENRY TYLER: Have no steps been taken with a view to punishment?

DISPENSARY HOUSES (IRELAND) ACT, 1879—SEC. 8—PALLASKENRY DISPENSARY.

MR. SYNAN asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, against the frequent protests of the Board of Guardians of the Rathkeale Union, the Board of Public Works (Ireland) effected an insurance on the Pallaskenry dispensary buildings, in said union, at double the rate usual in said union, and put the guardians to great delay and inconvenience in reducing said rate to the usual rate; whether the said Board of Works carried out the negotiation for said insurance so loosely that the entire amount of the insurance is placed on the most insignificant part of the buildings, and whether they will take steps to remedy that defect; whether the loan by the Board of Works is secured by a mortgage on the rates of the union, and not on said buildings; and, whether they were justified in interfering with the right and discretion of the Board of Guardians to effect the insurance in the manner they considered most economical and best for the union?

Mr. COURTNEY: Sir, the facts, as furnished to me, differ materially from those given in the Question. The insurance in this case was effected by the Board of Works under the 8th section of the Dispensary Houses Act of 1879. The insuring Company tried to get a double rate; but the Board stopped this as soon as they were able. The policy covers all the buildings erected under the loan. The loan is primarily charged upon the buildings.

Mr. SYNAN asked whether a separate value was put on these buildings for the purposes of the insurance?

Mr. COURTNEY: Unquestionably not. The whole building was insured together.

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—AFFAIRS OF ASHANTEE.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the further Report promised by Sir Samuel Rowe upon the state of affairs in Ashantee has been received; and, whether Papers upon this subject will soon be presented to the House?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: Sir, the further despatch from Sir Samuel Rowe, to which I referred in my Answer the other day, has arrived; but it does not contain so full a report as was expected, because Sir Samuel Rowe, as he informs us, has sent Captain Barrow and Inspector Kirby to Coomassie to inquire on the spot into the state of things. However, Papers up to the latest date connected with this question will be at once laid on the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA (THE TRANSVAAL)—THE LOAN.

Mr. GORST asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any part of the amount (£100,000) which the Transvaal Government engaged to pay to Her Majesty's Government within the financial year 1882-3, and which was reduced by consent to £50,000, has yet been paid?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: The answer to this Question, Sir, would be, No; but I may add that, as it would be convenient that the House should be accurately informed of what has passed and happened in connection with this Transvaal Debt, all the recent Correspondence relating to it shall now be laid on the Table as a separate Paper.

Mr. GORST: Will the hon. Member say whether Her Majesty's Government have any expectation that this sum will be shortly or ever paid?

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY: According to the information received by the Government, there is at present no money with which to defray the liability.

MAINTENANCE OF MAIN ROADS (SOUTH WALES).

Mr. H. ALLEN asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the Grant in Aid of Main Roads in South Wales this year will be on the same basis as last year, viz. to the extent of half the average expense, since 1870, in excess of income derived from tolls?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, Sir.

THE CASTLE, DUBLIN—ST. PATRICK'S HALL.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Board of Works in Ireland have drawn the attention of the Treasury to the very dilapidated condition of St. Patrick's Hall, Dublin Castle, and have sent in an estimate for the general repairs; if so, why that estimate has not been submitted to the House of Commons; if he is aware that, on account of the dilapidated and ruinous condition of the walls of St. Patrick's Hall, the Knights of St. Patrick created since 1868 have been prevented from having their banners and shields hung up according to ancient custom, although they have been charged and have paid very heavy fees for that purpose; and, if he will submit an estimate for the necessary repairs during the course of the Session?

Mr. COURTNEY: I understand, Sir, that St. Patrick's Hall is much in want of painting and gilding; but it is not dilapidated, still less ruinous. The

Board of Works reported in the autumn that it could be painted and gilded at a cost of £400; but, looking to the heavy charges on the Vote for Irish public buildings this year, the Treasury decided to postpone this work until more urgent claims have been met. Provision was made for repairing the walls so as to allow of the insignia of Knights being hung; but, in order not to disturb the walls twice, they will not be hung up until the other work is taken in hand.

COMMISSIONERS OF WOODS AND FORESTS—THE NEW FOREST.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the Right honourable Member for North Hants, as official Verderer, Whether it is the case that a serious encroachment is being made by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests on the rights of the Commoners of the New Forest in respect of the pasturage; and, whether he can state the nature of the encroachment, and what steps the Court of Verderers have taken to guard the interests of the Commoners?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH: Sir, a Memorial has been addressed to the Verderers of the New Forest by certain Commoners, complaining of damage which is being caused to the pasture by the operations of a person who has been licensed by the Commissioners of Woods to dig for and carry away loam. A summons has been issued against the licencee; and the questions involved, which are undoubtedly of importance, have been the subject of correspondence between the Commissioners and the Verderers, so that my hon. Friend may feel assured that they are receiving careful attention.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—ELECTION OF GUARDIANS, CLIFDEN UNION.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to the circumstances of the election of Poor Law Guardian for the electoral district of Bunawen, in the Clifden Union, in which the candidates were Joseph M'Culla and Valentine Kelly; if he is aware that Joseph M'Culla claims to have a majority of votes; and, in spite of his demand for a scrutiny, Mr. Blake, his opponent, was allowed to take his seat without any such scrutiny taking place; and, if, under the circumstances, the Local Government Board will direct the scrutiny asked for to take place?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, Mr. Kelly, not Mr. Blake, was returned as elected by a majority of one vote, and was entitled to take his seat as a Guardian. Mr. M'Culla, the defeated candidate, asked for a scrutiny of the votes; but his demand was based merely upon a general statement of his belief that he ought to have had a majority of votes. The Local Government Board could not take any action on a vague statement of this kind, but informed Mr. M'Culla that if he would furnish them with a list of any votes which he thought were improperly recorded, and the grounds of his opinion, they would cause inquiries to be made. I see no reason to interfere with this decision.

NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. W. H. SMITH asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he will lay upon the Table a list of the Prisons within the limits of the Mediterranean, North American, Pacific, China, East Indian, Australian, and Cape and West Coast of Africa Stations, in which it is proposed to carry out sentences of imprisonment which may be inflicted by court martial, under the provisions of the Naval Discipline Bill, before that Bill is read a second time?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Sir, I do not think there will be any objection to giving a return of the Consular Prisons within the limits of the several Naval Stations, and I will communicate with the Foreign Office on the subject. I would, however, point out to the right hon. Gentleman that it is only intended, under the Naval Discipline Acts Amendment Bill, to take power to confine Naval prisoners in such gaols, and that that power will only be used in the case of gaols reported to be fit for the purpose.

CAPTAIN PRICE asked the hon. Gentleman to lay upon the Table a Return showing the number of cases of corporal punishment since 1870, the number of cases of punishment for striking superior officers, and the number of cases of theft?

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I should be glad if the hon. and gallant Gentleman would supply me with particulars of what he wishes.

ARMY—TROOPS IN INDIA (NUMBERS).

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he can inform the House how many thousand men the European Army in India is below its fixed establishment?

MR. J. K. CROSS: Sir, this information was given by Lord Morley on Monday last in the House of Lords. The deficiency in Cavalry and Infantry is 4,971. There is an excess of 34 in Artillery.

ARMY—PARADING OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SOLDIERS FOR DIVINE SERVICE ON HOLY DAYS.

COLONEL COLTHURST asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether there would be any objection to parading Roman Catholic soldiers for service on holy days in the same way that they are paraded on Sundays: provided always, that arrangements can be made upon such days for not interfering with the ordinary routine of the service?

MR. MACARTNEY asked whether there would be any objection to parading Irish Protestant soldiers on July 12, August 12, November 5, and December 18?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: Sir, I think that my reply to the hon. and gallant Member for Cork County will satisfactorily answer the Question of the hon. Gentleman opposite. It is the custom of the Service to give Roman Catholic soldiers every facility for attending Divine Service on holy days, when military duty is not interfered with thereby. Instructions were sent to all General Officers in April, 1881, to this effect. No further orders on the subject are considered necessary.

PEACE PRESERVATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1881—EXTRA POLICE AT KILMALLOCK.

MR. O'SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why it is that extra Police are still retained in Kilmallock district at the expense of the ratepayers, notwithstanding the fact that no serious crime or outrage has been committed in that district for the past two years?

MR. TREVELYAN: Sir, I have already, in reply to former Questions, explained the circumstances under which these extra police are required at Kilmallock; and I regret to say that they do not appear to have undergone in the interval any change which would justify the withdrawal of the police. A respectable man living three miles from Kilmallock is kept in constant danger of his life. He is mercilessly "Boycotted" for claiming the protection of the Government from illegal orders passed against him by the Kilmallock Land League. The "Boycotting" was instituted, and is in great part kept up, by people of Kilmallock. This persecution and personal danger continue to this day; and so long as this is the case the police cannot be removed.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: Is not this case in a different barony altogether? It is not in the Kilmallock Barony.

MR. TREVELYAN: The proceedings, which took the form of a mock judicial proceeding, were proceedings taken by the Kilmallock Land League itself.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: Is not that two years since? Has any action of the kind taken place during the last six months?

MR. TREVELYAN: The "Boycotting" is still kept up, I am sorry to say.

SPAIN—EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CUBAN REFUGEES FROM GIBRALTAR —COLONEL MACEO.

MR. O'KELLY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Colonel Maceo is now treated with the consideration due to his rank, or whether it is true that he is kept under lock and key during the twenty-four hours of the day; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to make any further representations to the Spanish Government with a view to securing the absolute liberation of Colonel Maceo?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Sir, Her Majesty's Government have quite recently received renewed assurances, in reply to inquiries on their part, that Colonel Maceo is treated as a prisoner of war of superior military rank. Papers will be laid on the Table.

EGYPT (RE-ORGANIZATION) — IRRIGATION WORKS.

MR. CARBUTT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What steps, if any, have been taken to re-organize the engineer service of the irrigation works in Egypt, and if in any appointments that may be made, the claims of civil engineers will be duly considered?

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: Colonel C. Scott-Moncrieff has been appointed Inspector General of Irrigation, and the applications for appointments under that officer have, when received by the Secretary of State, been forwarded to the Egyptian Government; but that Government does not appear to contemplate making any further appointments at present. The most competent persons, whether military or civil, will be appointed. There is no reason to believe that there is any intention of not duly considering the claims of civil engineers.

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES ACT, 1883—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in reference to the Orders in Council of 20th April, Whether Chief Constables are bound to recognize certificates granted in one district for keeping explosives for private use, when the holders of the certificates may use the explosives in districts different from those in which they obtained the certificates of fitness to keep explosives?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Yes, Sir; I understand that these certificates will be personal to the holders of them, and will be available in different districts.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS—LEGISLATION.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Public Works Loan Bill this year, and when he expects to do so; and, whether he will inform the House, either by means of a Return or otherwise, what has been the course of the advances and repayments to the Public Works Loan Fund in the last financial year; and how far it is probable that the excess of repayments over advances, to which he referred in his Budget speech, will go?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. CHILDERS): Sir, in reply to my right hon. Friend, I have to say it is my intention to introduce shortly a Public Works Loan Bill. I cannot name the day for its introduction at this moment. In reply to the second Question, I have to say that the advances out of the Exchequer for Public Works during the last financial year amounted to £630,567, and the repayments were £1,291,186. I presume that the passage in my Financial Statement to which my right hon. Friend refers is that in which I said that the balances being £1,000,000 more than at the same time in the previous year, I proposed to pay off £1,000,000 of the Indian Loan of £2,000,000. The Exchequer balance on the 31st of March, 1882, was £5,977,000, and on the 31st of March, 1883, £6,973,000, showing an increase as near as possible of £1,000,000. I propose to devote this £1,000,000, which had already accrued on the 31st of March, to paying off half the debt due on the Indian Loan; and I ask for the necessary powers in the National Debt Bill now before the House. I cannot at this moment form an approximate estimate of the excess of repayments over advances during the present financial year.

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART — SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM—THE ART GALLERY.

MR. DILLWYN asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education, Whether purchases of pictures for the South Kensington Museum have been recently made; and, if so, whether it is intended to establish at that institution a second national collection of pictures, in addition to that of the National Gallery; and, if such be the case, by whose recommendation, and on whose judgment, the purchases of pictures for South Kensington have been made?

MR. MUNDELLA: Sir, purchases of water-colour drawings and pictures are made for South Kensington, in accordance with a practice of many years' standing. It originated in 1857, when, by a Minute of the Board of Trade, approved by the Treasury, the Sheepshanks collection was accepted, "in order to found a Gallery of British Art in connection with the Schools of Art under this Board." The subject is fully treated in the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on the South Kensington Museum in 1860. If my hon. Friend will refer to the Civil Service Estimates, he will find a sum has appeared in the Votes for this purpose under a separate heading for many years past. The drawings and pictures are selected with special reference to the completion of the historical collection of British water-colour artists, and for use as examples for students in the Art Training Schools, and for circulation among the Schools of Art in the country. The purchases have been made on the recommendation of the Director for Art—at one time Mr. Redgrave—then Mr. Poynter—now Mr. Armstrong. The collection of British water-colour drawings at South Kensington is the most complete and interesting historical collection in existence. The National Gallery does not purchase water-colour drawings; and my hon. Friend will see that there can be no rivalry between the National Gallery and South Kensington, when I say that the whole of the purchases last year did not exceed £400.

FRANCE AND CHINA—RUMOUR OF IMPENDING HOSTILITIES.

Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any information confirming the telegrams in Tuesday's "Standard," which state that a war between France and China is imminent? The hon. Member wished to ask in addition a Question of which he had not given Notice, Whether the Under Secretary could inform the House what Power was referred to by the French Foreign Secretary in the late debate in the French Assembly, when he stated that a Great Power was now egging on China to resist the demands of France?

Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I prefer, Sir, to confine my Answer to the Question on the Paper. Her Majesty's Government have received no information confirmatory of the telegraphic announcements referred to in the hon. Member's Question.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—DETACHED DISTRICTS.

Mr. HASTINGS asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether his attention has been called to the inconvenience and difficulty frequently experienced in the administration of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts by the existence of detached and semi-detached parts of counties; and, whether he will introduce a Bill to give to Quarter Sessions the same power of transferring to neighbouring local authorities their jurisdiction under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts, as they now possess of transferring the Police administration under the Police Acts?

Mr. DODSON, in reply, said, that he was aware of the inconveniences arising in the administration of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts. The difficulty referred to in the Question could be met, to a great extent, by arrangements between the local authorities. That being so, the evil appeared hardly sufficiently pressing to necessitate the introduction of a Bill for the particular purpose stated, especially as it would involve questions of rating which would give rise to difficulty. The matter, however, would receive attention.

PARLIAMENT—THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—VENTILATION OF THE COMMITTEE ROOMS.

Mr. VIVIAN asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether he will cause an investigation to be made into the ventilation of the Committee Rooms, with the object of securing a proper supply of fresh air without the draughts which are now necessitated by the opening of the windows? The hon. Member stated that since giving Notice of his Question he had found that the inconvenience was of a far graver character than he thought. A witness who recently gave evidence before a Committee was taken ill in the Committee Room, and expired shortly afterwards.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said, that he believed the Question referred to the ordinary, not the Grand Committee Rooms. It did occasionally happen, when there was great public interest in any inquiry, that the Committee Room was inconveniently crowded, and complaints were made as to the ventilation. It was only in these exceptional cases that he had heard complaints. The whole subject of the ventilation of Committee Rooms was considered by a Committee some two or three years ago, and every improvement which could be suggested was effected. He was not aware that anything further could be done now.

Mr. J. R. YORKE thought the right hon. Gentleman did not realize the gravity of the matter. He wished the right hon. Gentleman would favour with his presence some morning the Room in which the Committee on the Manchester Ship Canal Bill were sitting. That Committee had been at work *de die in diem* since May, and was likely to sit into July. It was very crowded, and if the Chief Commissioner would attend there for a short time some morning he would have some faint idea of the sufferings of those who were forced to attend, day after day, under the influence of the genial climate with which they were favoured in this part of the country.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that he was informed that the Room in question had been inconveniently crowded, and he was also informed that no remedy was possible when that was the case.

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE IRISH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. GRAY asked the Postmaster General, Whether he is aware that the litigation between the city of Dublin and the London and North Western Railway Company, by which the latter were prohibited from charging excessive rates for passengers by the mail route, was based on the existing contract, which expires on the 1st of October next; whether he is aware that the maximum rates the Railway Company is authorised to charge by Act of Parliament are practically prohibitive, and are largely in excess of those actually charged, and therefore that this general provision gives no protection to the public; whether he is aware that the passenger rates charged by the London and North Western Railway Company on their Irish Mail Service are in excess of those charged by the Scotch Limited Mail of the same Company, and the rates charged by other Companies for even faster services; whether, under these circumstances, the Government will in the new contract provide for reasonable Railway passenger fares by the Irish Mail Service, not exceeding the mileage rate by the Scotch Limited Mail; and, in the event of the contract for the sea service being obtained by the City of Dublin Company, that they will provide that the fares between Holyhead and Dublin by the mail service shall not exceed the rates charged by the North Western Company's boats in the rival service viâ Northwall; also, whether the terms of the tender for the conveyance of the mails between Holyhead and Kingstown empowers the Government to give the contract for the conveyance of the mails temporarily to the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, and the permanent contract to the London and North Western Railway Company, whose contract would commence at the termination of the temporary contract one or two years hence; and, if so, whether he will kindly quote that portion of the tender which provides for two contracts for the sea service with two different contractors?

Mr. FAWCETT: Sir, in reply to the hon. Member, I may state that the litigation between the Dublin Steam Packet Company and the London and North-Western Railway Company was based on the existing contract. The maximum rates which the Railway Company is authorized to charge are, no doubt, considerably in excess of those actually charged. I have ascertained that the fares charged to first and second class passengers by the mail train to Holyhead exceed by about one farthing a mile those charged by the London and North-Western Railway by the mail trains to Edinburgh and Glasgow; but the fares charged to Holyhead are less per mile than those charged by the London and South-Western Railway Company and the Great Western Company for somewhat faster trains to Exeter. I stated on Tuesday last that care would be taken, as far as possible, to secure the interests of passengers under the new contract; and a letter has accordingly been written to the London and North-Western Railway Company stating that, to whomever the sea service may be given, it would be a condition of any new contract with the Railway Company that passengers should be carried by the mail trains, that through booking arrangements should be made, and that some security should be given that the public would not be prevented from availing themselves of the mail trains in consequence of unduly high fares. The terms of the tenders which have been advertised for the conveyance of the mails between Holyhead and Kingstown provide only for a permanent service by one contractor. But as the possibility is contemplated that the City of Dublin Company, and others tendering for the service, may be able at the end of one or two years to provide better boats than those now in use, it has been deemed advisable to make arrangements, as far as possible, to provide for the service until the improved boats can be ready.

Mr. GRAY: I apologize for having to ask another Question of the right hon. Gentleman. Could he kindly state in what portion of the tender it is set forth that it is in the contemplation of the Department to enter into two separate contracts with two separate parties? There is, undoubtedly, a provision that a temporary service of an inferior kind, or not of the superior character contemplated, might be permitted for a certain period; but that the parties who were to obtain the permanent contract——

Mr. FAWCETT, interposing, said: I think the hon. Member, on looking at the advertisement, will see that the case is very clearly stated. The case that was anticipated was this—Suppose the Dublin Company said—"At the end of two years we shall be in a position to supply more commodious and faster boats than we now have; but, of course, that will take time." The hon. Member will see that the tenders are so framed as to give the Department an opportunity of entering into a temporary arrangement with the Dublin Company or any other Company, not for an inferior service, but for a temporary service, until the new boats, by whomsoever they are supplied, should be ready.

Mr. GRAY: Do I understand, from the right hon. Gentleman's Answer, that the temporary service is not to be inferior to the present service?

Mr. FAWCETT: I should not like to give any pledge upon that point. That is a question which will have to be carefully considered. If, for instance, we could secure permanently a very much better service by having a somewhat inferior service for a very short period, it might be a question whether that should not be put up with; but I think it would be better not to say any more on that point.

Mr. GIBSON: The point on which there is a great fear in Ireland, and which has been put by the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), is this—Is it contemplated that the short temporary contract for one or two years will enable the Post Office authorities to accept the use of the present boats of the London and North-Western Company?

Mr. FAWCETT: I do not think it is at all likely.

Mr. GIBSON: But is it possible?

Mr. FAWCETT: Well, it would be possible; but I do not think it would be at all likely. I have been anxious, as far as possible, that this question should be considered in wide aspects; and our only object is to secure the best passenger service for the public, and the best mail service for the Post Office. It was desirable to contemplate the possibility that there would be other competition besides that of the North-Western and the Dublin Companies. Of course, I am not in a position to state what other parties will tender; but before the advertisement appeared I received a letter from a very leading shipowner in Liverpool, asking me to give time, so that some other persons besides the Dublin and the London and North-Western Companies should have an opportunity of tendering, and that was one reason why the last day for receiving tenders had been postponed.

Mr. MACARTNEY: May I ask, if the London and North-Western Company sent in a tender offering to supply superior boats two years hence, would the Government accept for the intervening period the boats they now run to the North Wall?

Mr. FAWCETT: I think, as this as been publicly advertised and tenders have been invited, not simply from the Dublin Company and the London and North-Western Company, but from the public generally, it would be very unfair to the parties who wish to tender for me, as it were, to prejudge the case. I think some might be considered to have been taken at a disadvantage.

Mr. GRAY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman—["Oh!"]—this is a matter of very great interest to Ireland—may I ask if the right hon. Gentleman is aware that since the 1st of June last the North-Western Company has adopted practically the system of racing their boats against the present mail boats, and that the Directors of the Steam Packet Company have given orders that their boats should not be so raced? It would be satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman would give an answer that the time of this racing competition shall not be taken by him into consideration in dealing with the relative merits of the two sets of boats, especially as racing in fine weather is no criterion of what the racing would be in winter weather.

MR. FAWCETT: I do not think I can enter into that. The only power Parliament has entrusted to me is that, under the existing contract, I should see that the mails by land and sea were carried within the prescribed time, and that is all I have got to do with it.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to remember that the deputation which waited on the Prime Minister, at which he (Mr. Fawcett) was present, distinctly stated that they had no desire to favour one Company more than another, and said they did not want to have an Irish Company favoured simply because it was an Irish Company?

MR. FAWCETT: What I understand my hon. Friend to say is that the deputation which waited upon the Prime Minister did not wish that an Irish Company should be favoured if the result of that would be to give an inferior service, which I think was an extremely sensible observation.

MR. HEALY: I beg, Sir, to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether any steps will be taken to protect the lives of passengers from boiler explosions occurring through these races? I have known the funnels of the steamers sometimes to be very nearly red-hot.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL—INCORPORATION OF CLAUSES OF THE ACT OF 1875.

MR. NEWZAM NICHOLSON asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, If he will consider the desirability of incorporating those Clauses of "The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875," which it is proposed to retain in the present Agricultural Holdings Bill, with the new Bill, and of reporting the Bill as early as possible with such Clauses incorporated therein?

MR. DODSON: It has, apparently, escaped the observation of the hon. Member that I answered two similar Questions to this on Thursday last. In my reply to the right hon. Baronet the Member for East Gloucestershire (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), I fully explained the position of the Government.

VACCINATION—SYPHILITIC INFECTION.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether one of the Board's officers, in the course of an investigation into the conditions under which syphilis can be transmitted in the act of vaccination, has infected himself with syphilis, and has seriously injured his health; and, whether, if that be true, the conditions under which he succeeded in infecting himself were such as might occur during legitimate operations of vaccination?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, Sir; the facts are substantially as stated in the first part of this Question. The officer to whom my right hon. Friend refers, believing that syphilis, although it had very rarely indeed been communicated in any of the operations of vaccination, nevertheless could, under some circumstances, be so communicated, was desirous of learning the conditions under which such a transmission was possible. His object was to obtain better information than any of the rare and accidental cases hitherto reported could afford respecting the precautions proper to be taken for avoiding even risk of such an occurrence during the practice of vaccination. The investigation required experiments to be made on the human body; and these, though, of course, not acting as an officer of the Board, he proceeded to make on his own person, and at the end of his experiment he did infect himself with syphilis. The case is at present the subject of skilled inquiry, and a complete reply to the second part of the Question cannot be given until it has been reported on. I may say, however, that I believe that the result of transmitting the infection of syphilis was not attained without departure in essential respects from the Board's instructions to public vaccinators, and from the recognized practice of all vaccinators. I cannot conclude without expressing my esteem for this official's self-devotion, and my regret for the personal suffering which he has endured through his honourable sacrifice of himself in the interests of science and humanity.

Mr. HOPWOOD asked whether it had not been long known and admitted by the Medical Profession that syphilis might be communicated by vaccination?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: I said that in rare and accidental circumstances, and under special circumstances, it might.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware of the fact, decided by the highest medical authorities, that it was quite impossible, under all circumstances, to detect the syphilitic taint which might exist in a child from whom the vaccination lymph might have been taken?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: The scientific Report which was being prepared on the present case shows that the circumstances are such as must be brought to the notice of medical practitioners.

PARLIAMENT — MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS—SCOTCH BUSINESS—THE EARL OF ROSEBERY.

Mr. A. ELLIOT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, having regard to his statement in the House of Commons of 24th August 1881, and to the recent resignation of Lord Rosebery, he can now state to the House the nature of the re-arrangements contemplated in the administration of Scotch Business, and when they are likely to be given effect to?

Mr. DALRYMPLE asked, with reference to Lord Rosebery's connection with the management of Scotch affairs, If the arrangement was described at the time as giving additional assistance at the Home Office; and whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman was correctly reported to have stated that the arrangement never was intended to be permanent, and was only intended to propitiate Scotch Members; and whether that statement had anything to do with Lord Rosebery's resignation?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I am very glad indeed to answer the latter Question before that of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire. I intended to ask the House to be allowed to make a personal statement on the subject. Statements have been made and apparently received with credence by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Dalrymple) that something I had said or done had been taken amiss by Lord Rosebery, and had conduced, in some manner, to his resignation. All I have to say on my part—and I am desired to say it also on behalf of Lord Rosebery—is that there is not a word of foundation for it. It is an entirely untrue statement, which has not a colour of foundation of any kind or sort. As to the relations between Lord Rosebery and myself, they have been for many years, and, I am happy to say, are still, those of the closest political friendship and personal affection, which has never been disturbed for a single moment. I do not know for what purpose statements of this character are made. I suppose they are intended to give pain. If so, they have succeeded in their object; but I am happy to have the opportunity of saying that they are entirely without foundation. Lord Rosebery wrote to me this morning—

> "I know what you must be feeling under so undeserved an innuendo; but I am quite as indignant as you are."

I do not think I need say anything more on the personal part of the question. As regards the other matter about which my hon. Friend (Mr. A. Elliot) asks, and to which the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Dalrymple) alludes, what I said the other night I said in, perhaps, too light a manner; but I had hoped that the language I had used would have been understood in the sense in which it was employed. It is perfectly accurate. When Lord Rosebery was good enough to consent to take the Office of Under Secretary of State to the Home Department he took it as a temporary arrangement, and it was so understood by the Government, and so understood by Lord Rosebery and myself, for the purpose of facilitating the conduct of Scotch Business, and it was understood that it was at the desire of a large number of Scotch Members. That arrangement was made in order to meet these views. I explained in the Answer to my hon. Friend the Member for Roxburghshire, to which he refers in this Question, exactly what had passed, and stated that it was in order to give greater assistance in what I may call the lay as distinguished from the professional Business of Scotland. It was never intended that the arrangement, which had obvious inconveniences, should be permanently established, nor was it the desire or the view of Lord Rosebery that it should be so. On the contrary, he always desired that there should be a different and more permanent arrangement with reference to Scotch Business. It was prolonged beyond our expectations, though not beyond my wishes, because I think it was my personal urgency to Lord Rosebery which induced him to continue to perform those functions, which he did with so much ability and advantage to Scotland, longer than was originally intended. Lord Rosebery has always had very much at heart some permanent and regular arrangement with reference to Scotch Business. In that the Government have concurred, and they have already announced that a plan of that kind will be introduced. My hon. Friend has asked me to state the details of that arrangement. Being necessarily considerable, they are being worked out, with the assistance of the Lord Advocate, Lord Rosebery, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I hope we shall have an early opportunity of presenting it to the House. I do not think it would be of any advantage to anticipate the presentation of that scheme as a whole by making any more detailed statement in the meantime.

Mr. A. ELLIOT: I beg to ask to whom the Scottish Members are to look in the meantime, with respect to the conduct of Business described as of a lay character in Scotland?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am afraid they will have to look to the Secretary of State, until we have another and better arrangement.

Afterwards,

Mr. JAMES STEWART asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the statement which appears in the public journals that Lord Rosebery has resigned his appointment at the Home Office is correct; and, whether he will undertake that the Bill which the Government promised to introduce relating to the conduct of Scottish business will be brought in without further delay?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Certainly, Sir; it is part of the engagement into which we have entered, that that Bill should be introduced and placed in the hands of Members at an early period, so that the Members who represent Scotland should have a full opportunity of considering it.

SOUTH AFRICA—PROVISION FOR THE DISPLACED CHIEFS—VOTE IN SUPPLY.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he is now able to state whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose a Vote in Supply for the purpose described in his Notice of Motion, of "making adequate provision for the interests of" any South African Chief "who may have just claims on them?"

Mr. GLADSTONE: In the course of next week I hope to give a reply to this Question, which will likewise embrace the subject of the Transvaal Convention.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can state the intention of the Government, with regard to the Medical Act Amendment Bill, on what day the Government propose to take the Second Reading of that measure, or if he can name any day on which he will be able to state positively when the Second Reading will be taken?

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I will not say anything with regard to this Bill which would lead to the supposition that it would interfere with the progress of the Corrupt Practices Bill or the Tenants' Compensation Bill. But it is a Bill which has been the production of very great labour, and which, I believe, has the very general, and indeed almost universal, assent of the Medical Profession, and which is admitted to embrace provisions of very great importance. Under these circumstances we believe that such a Bill will have a favourable reception from the House. We contemplate passing it this Session, and I shall study to find a means, without disturbing present arrangements, for making progress with the remaining stages of the Bill.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL asked the right hon. Gentleman if he could state positively when the Bill would be taken, and if ample Notice of it would be given?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, that the best way would be for the representatives of the Medical Council to put themselves into communication with his right hon. Friend the Vice President. They would then endeavour to arrange when the Bill should be taken.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—POLICE SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Mr. A. PEEL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Police Superannuation Bill; and, whether he could arrange to place it as the First Order at a Morning Sitting?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON asked the right hon. Gentleman, before he answered the Question, to bear in mind that the Bill affected a large body of public servants throughout the country; that it was opposed in that House; and whether, under the circumstances, the Bill should not be brought on when it could receive full discussion?

Mr. GLADSTONE said, he entirely agreed with what had been stated by the hon. Baronet and suggested by his hon. Friend. He could not name a day for taking the second reading of the Bill at the present moment, but he would endeavour to place it as the first Order at a Morning Sitting.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND) BILL—LEASEHOLDERS IN URBAN DISTRICTS.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government will be prepared in Committee to introduce into the Agricultural Holdings Bill provisions to secure to the leaseholders of houses in urban districts the right, at the expiration of their leases, to claim from the ground landlord compensation for improvements effected in their tenements at their own expense?

Mr. BROADHURST asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, in the event of his not being able to give a favourable reply to the Question of the hon. Gentleman, the Government would endeavour to give him an opportunity for proceeding with his (Mr. Broadhurst's) Bill dealing with these leases, the second reading of which had been put down for Monday next? He believed that his Bill dealt with the subject in a thoroughly effective manner.

Mr. GLADSTONE: My hon. Friend has panegyrized his own Bill, and characterized it as thoroughly effective, and so far as I can understand, although I have not examined it minutely, I believe it fully deserves the description given. I am afraid I cannot make any pledge to sacrifice the time of the Government by considering the Bill at this period of the year. With regard to the Question put by the hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), in general I should answer a Question of this kind in regard to a pending Bill by saying it would be better to wait till we get into Committee on the Bill; but I do not think this will apply to the present Question, because the proposal of the hon. Member is really a proposal not to make amendment in the Bill, but to make a large extension of the scope of the Bill, so as to include another subject altogether. Without disparaging the importance of the subject raised by the Question, and without prejudging its merits, I must say I do not think, under any circumstances, it could be dealt with in a satisfactory manner in conjunction with the Agricultural Holdings Bill. The two subjects turn upon different considerations, if not upon different principles; and I do not think the question of the interest of leaseholders of houses in towns has ever been investigated, and brought into light and matured, in the same manner as the question of agricultural leases.

Sir H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked if the right hon. Gentleman would have any objection to an inquiry, either by a Committee of the House or by Royal Commission, into the present system of ground leases in towns?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I would ask the hon. Member for Portsmouth to be kind enough to put that Question on the Notice Paper.

THE CHANNEL ISLANDS FISHERIES.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS asked the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, Whether he could give the House any further information as to the deputation which waited on him from the Channel Islands with regard to the small islands between Jersey and France, and whether the Government had come to any decision in the matter?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, it was usual in matters where the Privy Council had to give an opinion that the question should be submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown. That course had been adopted in the present case, and he hoped it would be dealt with in a day or two.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Prime Minister the course of Business for to-morrow and next week?

MR. GLADSTONE said, that to-morrow at 2 o'clock they proposed to proceed with Lords Alcester and Wolseley Annuities Bills. As he did not anticipate a wide debate on the subject, he hoped they would be able to proceed with the Committee on the Corrupt Practices Bill afterwards. On Monday the Committee on the Corrupt Practices Bill would be continued.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE asked the President of the Local Government Board whether he could state the day and hour on which the further proceedings on the Ballot Act Continuance Bill would be taken? He was obliged to frame his Question in these terms, as he could not reconcile what took place in the last quarter of an hour on Tuesday's Morning Sitting with the repeated assurances that had been given by the right hon. Gentleman that he would only take the debate at an hour when there could be a substantial debate.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that when the House gave a Morning Sitting to the Government it was in order that it might proceed with Government measures. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman desired to make his speech on the subject a second time. They were anxious to proceed with the measure; but he could not gratify the curiosity of the right hon. Gentleman by stating the exact time when it would come on.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked whether the Committee on the Agricultural Holdings Bill was not to be taken until after the Corrupt Practices Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE said, he should better be able to answer the Question when he had had a little experience of the Corrupt Practices Bill Committee. They desired to take that course which would soonest close the debates on both Bills.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT subsequently inquired whether the Prime Minister would not consent to proceed with the Committee stage of the Agricultural Holdings Bill until it was completed, before taking the Committee stage of the Corrupt Practices Bill? It was highly inconvenient to have the Committees of two Bills proceeding at the same time.

[No answer was given to this Question.]

LAW AND POLICE—"INFERNAL MACHINES."

MR. MACARTNEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention had been directed to an article contained in the "Times" of yesterday and headed "Infernal Machines," extracted from an American newspaper called the "New York World," which gave a long and detailed description of a number of new and highly-destructive infernal machines stated to have been recently turned out in large quantities by a man name Holgate, in Philadelphia, and to have been exported for use in foreign countries; also to a statement made in the "Globe" of yesterday evening to the effect that the American Labour Reform League was about to commence operation immediately, its programme being as follows:—(1), That all accumulators of wealth shall be treated as robbers; (2), to pay no rent is the banner of duty all over the world; (3), all Czars, Queens, Presidents, landlords, railway directors, and bank monopolists are to be taken off by dynamite, dagger, or other means; and, whether Her Majesty's Government would take steps to ascertain through the British Minister at Washington the truth or falsehood of those very serious and threatening announcements?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Sir, I do not think I could, with any advantage, enter into the details of the matter to which the hon. Member has referred. All I can say with reference to menaces of this description is, that Her Majesty's Government are perfectly alive to the necessity of watching and paying attention to such matters.

THE CENSUS RETURNS, 1881—THE CANAL POPULATION.

Mr. SALT asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether, from the Census Returns of 1881, or from any other source, he can state the number of men, women, and children living upon canal boats in the United Kingdom?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: A summary table at page 19 of the Census Report, vol. 2, shows that 8,978 persons —6,225 males and 2,753 females—were enumerated in barges, boats, &c., in harbours, rivers, creeks, and canals in England and Wales at the time of the Census in 1881. That is the only information we have on the subject at present. I fear there exists no machinery by which a Return could be obtained of the number of persons actually living on barges in canals.

PUBLIC HEALTH—NAZARETH HOUSE, HAMMERSMITH—REPORT OF MR. SPEARS.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked the President of the Local Government Board, When Mr. Spears's Report upon an inquiry, concerning Nazareth House, Hammersmith, would be printed; and whether Mr. Spears did not declare in the concluding portion of that Report that the sanitary condition and the management, so far as sanitary affairs were concerned, of the institution were excellent, and that the care habitually bestowed on the children was worthy of special consideration?

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Yes, Sir. I believe those are the concluding words of the Report, which was ordered to be printed some time ago, and I wonder it is not already laid upon the Table of the House. I have no doubt that it will be in a day or two.

EGYPT (MILITARY EXPEDITION)—MILITARY HOSPITALS IN CYPRUS.

Dr. CAMERON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that in the original medical arrangements for the Egyptian campaign the establishment of a base hospital at Cyprus was proposed by the heads of the Army Medical Department, and agreed to by the military authorities; whether the military authorities afterwards decided that Cyprus should not be used for hospital purposes till the month of October; whose duty it was to inform the Director General of the Army Medical Department or principal medical officer in Egypt of this change in the medical arrangements; if he could state the date at which the alteration was decided on; and, the date at which the heads of the Army Medical Department, at home or in Egypt, were informed of it and instructed to make other arrangements for their base hospital?

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER: Sir, the reply to my hon. Friend's first Question is—Yes. In the original arrangements for the campaign it was contemplated to establish a base hospital at Cyprus. In reply to the remaining four of my hon. Friend's Questions, I think I cannot do better than quote the words of the Report of the Committee of Inquiry, which gives the history of the arrangement made at Cyprus, in the shortest compass, and in official form, being already laid upon the Table of the House—

> "At first it was proposed to place this hospital at Troodos on Mount Olympus; but owing to the near approach of the cool season (when the troops would have to come down to the plains), and to the distance by road to Troodos, it was decided not to establish a hospital at that place for the few remaining weeks of the hot season, and a site in the neighbourhood of the camp at Polymedia was chosen instead, which it was intended to make use of at the beginning of October."

The change—namely, from Troodos to Polymedia—was appoved on the 4th of August on the advice of the Chief of the Staff of the Egyptian Expedition, Sir John Adye, with the concurrence of the Director General of the Army Medical Department, Dr. Crawford, and the principal medical officer going out with the Force, Dr. Hanbury, who was in this country at the time. As these officers were parties to the decision taken on the 4th of August, it was not necessary to communicate it formally to them. That is the answer to Questions two, three, and four. With regard to the fifth Question, I have already given the date—namely, August 4, when the head of the Army Medical Department at home, Dr. Crawford, and Dr. Hanbury, the principal medical officer going out with the Expedition, were informed of the change, and when once the Expedition had started, it was for the Commander of the Expedition, in consultation with his Chief of the Staff and principal medical officer, to make any change in the hospital or any other arrangements which had originally been made, if the varying circumstances of the campaign rendered it desirable.

DR. CAMERON said, he did not think his hon. Friend had quite understood the purport of the Question. In the Report of the Inquiry referred to Mr. Lawson asked the principal medical officer of the Army in Egypt whether he was aware that on the 4th August Cyprus had been abandoned as a base hospital, and Dr. Hanbury replied that, on the contrary, he was under the impression when he left London that Cyprus was to be his base. In the next Question he was asked if he had not orders that Cyprus was not to be used or relied on by him until the autumn, and Dr. Hanbury replied that that was the first time he ever heard of it; and further, on the 9th September——

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that he is not entitled to debate the matter, although he may put a Question arising out of the answer which he has received.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: Will the hon. Baronet state to the House, as a positive fact, that Dr. Hanbury had the slightest idea before August 27 that Cyprus would not be used as a base hospital?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: I think I have already stated that the two medical officers were present on the 4th of August, and were informed of the change which was necessitated by the variation of circumstances. The change was made by the General Commanding-in-Chief in consultation with the two medical officers.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: What was the date of that change?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, he must protest against being required to answer questions of detail which would properly be raised when the Vote was taken, and in the course of a full discussion. The whole story was contained in the Report laid upon the Table.

MR. GORST inquired whether a full discussion was necessary before a date could be given?

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF wished to know whether the change was made in consequence of instructions from the Secretary of State or the Commander of the Expedition?

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, he thought that was a Question respecting an official matter which should not be answered in the House; but, at all events, he required Notice of the Question.

PASSENGER AND EMIGRANT SHIPS—ALLEGED STARVATION OF EMIGRANTS.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland the Question which he promised to inquire into the other day—namely, Whether there was any truth in the statement that a number of Irish emigrants at North Adam, in Mass, were in a state of destitution?

MR. TREVELYAN: I am glad, Sir, to be able to give the hon. Member the information he requires. I have here a telegram, dated June 6, 1883, from Consul Henderson, Boston, to Earl Granville, in these terms:—"Overseers of poor North Adams reply no truth in report in *Standard*."

PARLIAMENT—THE HALF-PAST TWELVE O'CLOCK RULE (DROPPED ORDERS).

MR. SPEAKER: With reference to the general desire expressed by the House on Tuesday last in relation to dropped Orders, I have to say that effect may properly be given to that desire by my directing, as a matter of procedure, that a dropped Order, when revived, will be subject to such Amendments as attached to it when dropped; and my direction will be given accordingly, unless it be the wish of the House to give other directions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—:0:—

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) BILL.—[BILL 7.]

(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Solicitor General.*)

COMMITTEE. [FIRST NIGHT.]

Order for Committee read.

MR. BROADHURST, in rising to move—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert a new Clause in the Bill charging the returning officer's expenses at Parliamentary Elections upon the rates in boroughs and counties,"

said, that that very proposal was before the House in the early period of last Session, on the Motion of the late lamented Member for Newcastle (Mr. Ashton Dilke) and, on a division, the Motion was carried by a majority of 2. He had no doubt that but for certain extraneous matter in Mr. Dilke's Resolution it would have been carried by a majority of 20 or 30. It was said that the proposal would be unpopular with the ratepayers. That might be true to some extent; but there were other considerations to be borne in mind than that of popularity. It was the duty of Parliament to do that which was right for the best interests of the nation as a whole. Now, was his proposal just and reasonable? If so, it ought to be adopted. There was no occasion for the ratepayers to be alarmed, as the charge would not exceed, for the year in which the election took place, one farthing, or probably not half a farthing in the pound. That charge, too, would only be incurred every few years, on the recurrence of an Election. It was a common complaint that many men who would make excellent Members of Parliament—he did not refer to working men exclusively or chiefly, but to others of only moderate fortune—could not contest a constituency on account of the expense. His proposal would enable such men to sit in the House. But it was not for that reason alone, or chiefly, that he made his proposal. It would never be possible to strike at the real root of electoral corruption and bribery until they had impressed upon the electors that men seeking their suffrages desired to discharge high and important duties to the country, and not self-advancement or the promotion of their personal interests. In almost every civilized country—in Austria-Hungary, France, Italy, Germany, and Denmark—the expenses of elections were cast either upon the constituency or national funds. He had been assured on good authority, that the effect of his proposal would reduce largely—probably by one-half—the Returning Officers' charges now defrayed by the candidate. Some hon. Members, he understood, were afraid that this proposal, if adopted, would open the door to an influx of candidates to every constituency. But the clause which he would propose would provide that every person becoming a candidate should deposit £100, and should he not poll one-sixth of the number of votes given to the successful candidate, he should forfeit the deposit-money; but that if he should obtain that proportion, the money would be returned to him. This, he thought, would be quite sufficient to prevent mere speculative people—what might be called "carpet-bag" politicians—from invading the various constituencies for the sake of publicity. Moreover, he believed that if these costs were placed upon the ratepayers they would themselves take good care not to have a lot of bogus candidates to unnecessarily increase the charge upon the rates. He was persuaded that by adopting his proposal more would be done to strike at our system of terrible extravagance in election expenses than by any process of penalties and punishments for people who were caught in the commission of illegal practices. He asked the House to agree to this Instruction with the more confidence, because, on former occasions, this proposal had been supported by several Members of Her Majesty's Government. In conclusion, he begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert a new Clause in the Bill charging the returning officer's expenses at Parliamentary Elections upon the rates in boroughs and counties."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

MR. GLADSTONE: I am friendly, Sir, and certainly most of the Members of the Government are friendly, to the principle contained in this Instruction; but I am bound to say that for reasons which I think my hon. Friend will himself appreciate, even if he cannot adopt them, I am unable to support the introduction of such a clause as he proposes in the present Bill. I agree with my hon. Friend in nearly all his arguments, and I make that admission freely, though it may seem to compromise the ground on which I stand in declining to vote for his Motion. I agree with him as to the bearing of this proposal on the admission of men who are not rich into the House, and on the higher ground of principle on which he bases his argument—namely, that to pay the expenses of the Returning Officer is in principle the affair of the local community and not of the individual. With these admissions my hon. Friend will naturally say to me—"Why do you object to introduce the proposal into the present Bill?" We cannot say that it is wholly alien to the purpose of the Corrupt Practices Bill; indeed, it appears to me to be well within the scope of the Bill. True, it is a large extension of the scope of the Bill, and that is shown by the fact that my hon. Friend does not move it as a clause in Committee, but has moved it as an Instruction to the Committee, and I presume he might have moved as an Instruction any proposition of which he was in favour, whether it related to corrupt practices as understood by the Bill or not. As, however, I admit that it is not so far from the purpose of the Bill as to make it appear *per se* improper, and as in truth I have myself on former occasions, when similar Bills were before the House, both spoken and voted in favour of the introduction of a similar proposal, I proceed to explain to my hon. Friend the reasons which lead me on this occasion to take a different course. My first argument against the expediency of agreeing to the hon. Member's proposal is one that certainly is not conclusive against it, although it somewhat detracts from the force of those considerations which the hon. Member has urged in its favour. It is true that by this measure it is intended to lighten to a considerable extent the load which has hitherto been improperly placed upon the shoulders of candidates. The main objection, however, that I have to accepting the hon. Member's proposal at the present time is that, from its nature and history, it is a polemical and controversial one, and that the Government feel that if they had intended to assent to the introduction of this clause into the Bill, they ought to have introduced it into the measure in the first instance. Her Majesty's Government have submitted the Bill to the House as being one not polemical and not controversial, and I rejoice to say that it has been accepted by the other side of the House in a corresponding spirit. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South-West Lancashire (Sir R. Assheton Cross), acting I may say on behalf of the great bulk of his Party, has given a friendly reception to this Bill, and it has made a progress at this moment which it certainly would not have made had it contained this proposal. Had it contained this proposal the Bill would have been a matter of dispute, of contest, at every point in going through the House. My hon. Friend is perfectly in his right in endeavouring to bring the proposal into the Bill; but the Government would not be in their right if they introduced a Bill of this character as one apart from Party contest and the polemics of this House, and subsequently, on the Motion of a private Member, consented to what was not only an alteration of the Bill, but an alteration of a vital character. I think such a course would hardly be consistent with a strict and liberal understanding by the Government of its engagement to the House at large—because the engagement which we contract towards our own Party when we introduce a Bill, which is a matter of contest between Parties, we must recognize as binding on us with regard to the whole House—and especially when, in consequence of that engagement, we have been so fortunate as to be able to make good progress with a measure which in itself as it stands we believe will be a most valuable one, and one which promises to be of great benefit to the community at large, and which is so far divested of Party considerations as to receive the calm and judicial support of all sides. If my hon. Friend had raised this question in a separate Bill, I should have voted with him, as I have voted for the same proposal before; but, although I do not blame him for the proposal he has made, I feel that blame would attach to myself, as a friend of the proposition on its merits, were I to take advantage of the position which we have obtained for the Bill in the House, upon a different supposition, and upon a promise of a different measure, in order to introduce into it a proposal which distinctly alters its character. That I feel is in some degree a matter of faith with the House, and when I look upon it as a matter of policy, I come to the same conclusion. Were we to be parties to the introduction of this proposal, in the first place, we should be liable to some sharp and not unjust reproaches from Gentlemen opposite; but, in the second place, I suspect that we should find that a change of course on our part was not at all favourable to the future progress of the Bill and to its passing through the different stages. We have before us a Bill of great value to the country, and that is admitted on both sides of the House. I believe Gentlemen opposite believe it is of special value to their own Friends. I am weak enough to believe it is of special value to our own Friends. But I do not wish to raise any question of this kind. We nearly all agree that the Bill in its main aim and purport is a valuable measure. Is it not wise, on the whole, to be content with that, and to avail ourselves of the opportunity of getting it through Committee as a measure which is to be argued judicially, and not in a polemical spirit? Is it not well to take that advantage, and rather to trust to other and separate and more legitimate opportunities of proposing the measure contemplated by this Instruction? I do not disparage the arguments of my hon. Friend, and I have no charge to make against him; but, under the circumstances, I must undoubtedly say, on the part of the Government, that we are not able to accede to the passing of this Instruction to the Committee.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that after the line which had been taken in reference to this subject by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, it would be out of place for him to attempt to enter into the merits of this Instruction. The points which were put by the Prime Minister seemed to be unanswerable It would have been regarded as something of the nature of a breach of faith if, after the Bill had been read a second time without this proposal, the Instruction had been accepted by the Government and allowed to be introduced into the Bill. He accepted the speech of the right hon. Gentleman as the conclusion of the Government against the acceptance of the Instruction. On the present occasion the House had nothing to do with any proposal for the introduction of a separate Bill. If such a measure were to be introduced, it would have to stand upon its own merits, and hon. Members would be free to express their opinions upon it, both by speech and vote, as they had done on former occasions.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that whenever a proposal like this had been brought before the House it had been regarded as a political one, and discussed with great interest. In a Parliament in which the present Prime Minister occupied the same position as he did now, a proposal similar to this would have been carried by the House, and would have formed a part of the law of the land, had it not been for the opposition given to it by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary and the Attorney General. If this proposal was not the law of the land at present, the fault was due to the Leaders of the Liberal Party. The language of the Prime Minister to which they had just listened amounted to this —that he was afraid to face the House of Commons with this proposal, although personally in favour of it, because the effect of accepting it would be to delay the Bill for a certain length of time. That was the attitude taken up by the Prime Minister in spite of the incitements of the creatures of the Caucus to heroic resolves and courageous action in the House. It was to be suspected the Prime Minister was a good deal hampered by some of his enthusiastic admirers, who preached at him in this style with a virgin innocence characteristic of Provincial politicians. For himself, he believed the Bill as it stood would be inoperative so far as regarded changing the character of the Representatives of the House in the direction advocated by the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst). Just as in the case of the Legal Profession, an entrance fee of £100 was quite as insuperable an obstacle to many young men as a fee of £1,000 would be, so the Schedule of fees laid down in the Bill would be as effective an obstacle to the entrance of large numbers of men into political life as if the maximum were not £350, but £3,500. So far as that went, therefore, the Bill was a fraud and a pretence. With regard to the example of other countries, he might mention that when Prince Bismarck in fighting the Liberal Party in Prussia over the question of German military re-organization resorted to the expedient of constantly dissolving Parliament in the hope of exhausting the pecuniary resources of his opponents, an hon. Friend told him on the authority of a Prussian Liberal that Prince Bismarck to attain his object need only have dissolved once or twice if election expenses had been on the same vast scale as in England. After one or two elections the constituencies would have fallen into the hands of Conservative Members of larger means as well as more pliant wills. Now, did they not know that with certain exceptions in the case of Ireland the House of Commons was composed almost as much as ever of rich men? [*Cries of* "No, no!"] If the matter were gone into he believed he could show that since the reduction of the franchise fewer poor men had entered the House of Commons than before. The very largeness of the constituencies increased the expenses of the contest, and, therefore, made more narrow the portals of Parliament to men of small means. Some years ago, for example, there was a large number of Liberals in Lambeth who were bitterly dissatisfied with the representation of the borough as it then was; but the effective answer to these discontented ones, was that every vote in Lambeth cost £1. The existing Representatives were the only men who could afford to pay that price for the seats, and so the Liberal Party had to swallow them, whether they liked them or not. If the Government could not carry the Bill with this proposal it would be better to drop it, rather than carry through Parliament an ineffective measure. He therefore begged to say that if the hon. Member for Stoke's adhesion to the Government would not prevent him from going to a division, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) would be very glad to vote for the Motion.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he was very much amused with the speech of the Prime Minister. The right hon. Gentleman said he was very desirous for a substantial reform; but he could not allow improvements to be made in the Bill, because they might not be acceptable to the Tory Party. Now, he never heard of a better course than the one suggested by the right hon. Gentleman for wasting the time of the House. The Prime Minister also said that this Motion should be introduced in the form of a second Bill, so that the Prime Minister's scheme for saving the time of the House would be to introduce two Bills, have fresh divisions on each, send them into Committee at different times, and then he supposed, when they were passed, have a third Bill to consolidate the two. In Ireland they had the experience of two systems. In Parliamentary elections the candidate had to pay the entire expenses of the relieving officer—[*Laughter*]—the Returning Officer—and in Municipal elections the expenses were borne by the ratepayers. In Parliamentary elections, also, the Sub-Sheriff always insisted on getting new ballot-boxes at every election, and the highest prices were charged for rooms, so that the candidate was obliged to pay several times more for these things than the real value supplied. The result was that such elections were a source of considerable emolument to the Sub-Sheriffs, and a means by which men seeking to represent constituences were fleeced in the most unfair manner. Now, he for one had more regard for the quality of legislation than the quantity of it, and he did not see what good there was in returning a Radical Party to power if they were only able to pass such measures as were acceptable to the Tory Party. For himself, he was very much in favour of the proposal of the hon. Member for Stoke. The Bill, if adopted in its present form, would by no means be a perfect one; and he, therefore, appealed to the Government to make it one of real reform by adopting the Motion of the hon. Member for Stoke. With this view he should himself support the Motion.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said, if the Bill was simply a Corrupt Practices Bill—a Bill directed against corrupt expenditure only—the argument of the Prime Minister against adopting the Motion of the hon. Member for Stoke would have been unanswerable. The Bill, however, was intended not only to do away with corrupt expenditure, but to lessen the general expenses connected with elections. That being so, it seemed a most reasonable thing, and quite pertinent to the Bill, to begin with an expense which met the candidate at the very threshold of his candidature. He hoped, therefore, that the hon. Member for Stoke would not withdraw his Motion, which he should support with pleasure.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that one of the objections of the Prime Minister to the Motion was that it would introduce Party considerations into the matter, and lead to Party contests. The right hon. Gentleman should have shown them how or where the Motion would do this, for it appeared to him that the proposal had nothing whatever of a Party character in it, and that it would apply alike to all Parties. The objection that the Motion would lead to prolonged discussion on the whole matter in that House was a very poor one, for it should not be forgotten that many of the best measures that had ever passed the House of Commons had been the subjects of prolonged and even excited discussion. Scarcely any measure of real reform had been granted without a great deal of discussion; and he took the fact that this proposal might lead to debate as a strong proof that there was merit in it. It had been said that Members on both sides of the House were agreed upon this Bill, and that it was very undesirable to interfere with the union that existed. But this union was one of rich men against poor men—a union of rich men to keep out of the House as long as they could other men who were less rich than themselves. He was strongly in favour of the Motion, which he hoped would be adopted.

Mr. LEWIS said, he should have no hesitation in supporting the Motion, as he had done on previous occasions, believing the principle of it to be right and just. In his opinion, there was great analogy between the case of the election of Members of Parliament, and elections under the Municipal Corporations Act. The Mayor of a borough was obliged to find the conveniences and necessities for an election under that Act, because the duty was regarded as a public one, and he had never been able to understand what difference existed in the two cases. The question was not at all one as between rich men and poor men; the essential argument was this—that the officer whose duties were called in question was not an agent of, or employed by, the Parliamentary candidate, but a public officer of the constituency, performing a public duty, the cost of which ought, therefore, to be paid by the public. On that principle, and that principle only, he put the matter, and entirely disregarded any consideration whether the proposal would affect this or that Party. It would be quite another thing if it was proposed to pay anything outside the Returning Officer's expenses; but this was simply an elementary question whether a public officer performing a public duty should be paid by the public for doing it.

Mr. O'BRIEN said, he thought the last speech ought to prove to the Prime Minister that there was no danger of this question being regarded as one of Party. It was the only proposal in connection with the matter that could meet with any acceptance in Ireland, because they were against the application of any part of the Bill, as it stood, to Ireland. The days when a constituency could be bought in Ireland one day to be sold out of it the next were gone, or nearly gone. As far as the people of Ireland were concerned, they had proved their willingness to pay not only the official, but the unofficial expenses of their Representatives, whom they regarded as their servants doing their business.

Mr. HEALY said, it was an extremely interesting spectacle for intelligent people to witness the House of Commons refusing to entertain the proposal of the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst). The Bill before the House was intended to put down bribery. But he would ask, what were the reasons for the growth of bribery? Were they not these? That it had been hitherto a profitable thing to get into Parliament, a profitable thing to invest £2,000 or £3,000 in effecting that object. Why, any person examining that House would find it studded with legislative dummies, whose only title to be there, so far as he could make out, was that they were their fathers' sons, or had a balance at their bankers. They had representatives of the great reigning families in the House, because the great reigning families knew that if the men of the people got in there they would make the laws in a different way, and in a way which the great reigning families would not desire. He regarded the masses of the people of England as simply befooled by the pretence of liberty given of entrance to the House of Commons. Moreover, if the working men of England imagined that they were getting from that House the benefits of the Constitution, they were greatly mistaken. They were bound by invisible bonds, which prevented them from making those changes in the law which they wished to see carried out. The chief reason why the laws were not reformed speedier and better than at present was because the great bulk of the people of

England were shut out from having any voice in the matter. Such a state of affairs could only be removed by a proposal such as that of the hon. Member for Stoke. Of course, the great reigning families and the great banking families desired to continue the present state of things. He had expected that the great Radical Party would be almost irruptive on this question; but what was his astonishment to find the cold chain of silence thrown over them all by the speech of the Prime Minister. It would seem to be that the Prime Minister, intoxicated with the great success with which he had carried the second reading of the Agricultural Holdings Bill—brought in because it was acceptable to the Tory Party—enamoured with that splendid success, could not think of accepting the proposal of the hon. Member for Stoke, because this Bill also was acceptable to the Tory Party. What had become of the combative disposition of the Prime Minister? Had that been the manner of his legislation hitherto, that his proposals were so diluted and watered down in spirit that the test to be applied to them was whether they were acceptable to the Tory Party? He congratulated the Tory Party upon being able to apply this standard to the future intentions of the Prime Minister; and when, in future, the Prime Minister wished to carry all the measures mentioned in the Queen's Speech, he had only to apply to the Leader of the Opposition, and ascertain whether he had any objection to his proposals. So far as Ireland was concerned, this Bill did not ameliorate the position of any candidate. There was no bribery or corruption in Ireland, practically speaking. ["Oh, oh!"] He would prove that, for in the course of the last nine years there were only four Election Petitions in Ireland, and in only one—an Ulster constituency—Dungannon—was it successful; and it was not bribery there, he believed, but they bottled up a candidate—[*Laughter*]—he meant the voters. That being so, why should Irish Members and Irish constituencies be placed under the extraordinary restrictions proposed by the Bill? The Irish people sent their Representatives to that House because they wanted to get changes made in the law, and they sent their Members there as their servants. The Irish Members did not come there to amuse themselves; they did not come there to assist at public dinners, or to attend the Queen's levees and her balls. But they came there to "slog" in the public interests. They came there to work on behalf of the people who sent them; and as for considering whether their proposals and speeches were agreeable to the Prime Minister or his Government, they did not care a single rush, and they believed that it was only by returning a certain class of men who would bring steady pressure to bear on the Government that the English working men would get the reforms they desired, and begin to see the whole character and office of the House. They knew very well that legislation was affected by the character of the House. They might reduce the question to a mathematical calculation, and say that the chances of a certain Bill in a certain direction with a House of Commons of which each Member on an average possessed £1,000 passing would be as 10, while the chance of a similar Bill with a House of Commons possessing each on an average £100 would be as 100. Take, for instance, the Employers' Liability Bill. The employers were in the House, the workmen were outside; and he should like to know how many Representatives the workmen had in the House when that Bill came before the House? It was not to be contended that if they reduced the expenditure they would not bring about a better class of Representatives on the whole. Why had hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway on his side of the House declined to accept a Resolution of that character? Simply because they wished to have their monied influence felt. He was convinced that they would never have thorough-going legislation until the constituencies were bound to pay the expenses of the candidates. The theory to which he had already adverted was that the House of Commons was open to every man. Yes, that was nominally the case, but in reality they found that it was only a certain class of men who were able to get into it. The story was told of a person saying the law was open to everybody. "Yes," said the person addressed, "and so is the London Tavern"—a swell restaurant in its day—meaning "if you are able to pay." In the same way the House of Commons was open to everybody if he was able to pay for it, and the same state of things would continue to exist until the constituents were obliged to pay the expenses of the elections. The idea that Members came there to work in the public interest was an exploded fallacy. There never was a greater mistake. The great majority came there to advance their own personal conveniences and concerns; and hence upon that account, until legislation was carried which would enable the humblest working man to put up against "my Lord Tom Noddy," and fight him upon even terms, the working men and the masses of the people of England would find that Membership of that House was a thing confined to a limited section, and that its legislation would be swayed and conducted by the interests of that limited section, and not by the interests of the people at large.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said, he hoped the Amendment would be pressed to a division, because some Members in the House desired to appear before their constituents in a proper light. He wanted to know whether the great Conservative Party were prepared to stand before the constituencies as being in favour of extravagance, limiting the number of candidates available for seats, and anxious to maintain a barrier against the mass of people being represented by those in whom they had the greatest interest, and with whom they had the closest affinity? This was an opportunity for them to declare themselves upon the matter, because they had no special reasons such as that which seemed to affect the Government so much, for voting against their convictions in order to keep an undertaking with the other side of the House. He hoped there would be found Members on both sides who would not turn back against the opinions which they had expressed, over and over again, in favour of throwing on the constituencies the obligation to provide machinery under which candidates might freely present themselves for seats in Parliament. For his own part, he should have much pleasure in supporting the Motion.

Mr. MAYNE said, that if the Prime Minister had waited until he had seen that almost every Member who had addressed the House spoke in favour of the proposal, it might have affected the right hon. Gentleman's decision. One of the objects of the Bill of the Government was to lessen the expense of elections, and the proposal of the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) went in the same direction. He had had much to do with Municipal and Parliamentary elections in Ireland, and, limited as the Irish Municipal franchise was, he new wards in Dublin in which the constituents were twice as numerous as the constituents in some Irish boroughs; while the expense of the election in the wards did not amount to £1 in every £10 of the expense of Parliamentary elections in the boroughs. The Bill also imposed penalties of a very stringent character upon persons indulging in dishonourable practices at Parliamentary elections. He had been concerned in Parliamentary elections in Ireland where he might almost say he felt disgust at the imposition practised upon candidates by gentlemen in the respectable position of Returning Officers; and if this Bill should become operative, as he hoped it would, probably the only gentleman remaining to be dealt with in the constituency by penal clauses would be those who occupied that responsible position. The proposal of the hon. Gentleman dealt with that person now, and he would cordially support it.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 80; Noes 247: Majority 167.—(Div. List, No. 118.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. LEWIS, in whose name the following Notice appeared upon the Paper, to move:—

> "That this House is of opinion that the course proposed, of limiting the amount of lawful expenditure by candidates for seats in this House, and then restricting, by odious and heavy penalties, the mode of such expenditure in matters not essentially improper, is inexpedient and unjust,"

said, that he did not know that he should have troubled the House with any remarks if it had not been for the observations of the Attorney General on the debate on Monday night, and the imperfect view he had presented to the House of the speech he (Mr. Lewis) had made with respect to the Corrupt Practices Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman had placed him before the public as the representative of electioneering agents, and had distinctly stated that he advocated the cause of bribery. That was certainly very unfair and unjust of the Attorney General, who was as sharp-witted as any Member of the House in apprehending the purport of an opponent's speech. The whole object of his (Mr. Lewis's) speech, on the occasion to which he referred, was to show that the Bill would press hardly upon candidates, and he had not referred to its effect upon electioneering agents. But, because incidentally he stated that if the Bill were to pass into law, candidates would find it necessary to employ more professional assistance than they did at present, the Attorney General thought fit to say he was taking a professional view of the question. In fact, instead of wishing to encourage the practice of resorting to professional assistance, he desired to lessen the number of pitfalls to which a candidate would be exposed by this Bill, and thus to diminish the demand for professional intervention. He appealed to the House as to whether the Attorney General ever attempted in the least to answer the objections he had ventured to urge against his Bill? He contented himself rather with dealing with arguments against the Bill as a whole; but all he condescended to say with reference to the ridiculous anomalies and results following the operation of this Bill was that he would not follow him (Mr. Lewis) through all the details of his speech. The Attorney General had made much of the cheapness of the election proceedings in Hackney; but he would remind the hon. and learned Member that only 64 per cent of that constituency were polled at the election to which he had drawn attention. His (Mr. Lewis's) object on the present occasion was to draw the attention of the House and the country to the specific proposition which he had put upon the Paper, though he did not purpose to ask the House to divide upon it. It affirmed that, inasmuch as the Bill limited the expenses of elections to a very narrow amount, it was most unfair and improper to accompany that provision with others which made particular expenditure penal where no impropriety was actually committed. If a candidate were told that he must not spend more than £350, what was the use of telling him that he must not spend so much in the hiring of messengers and clerks, and in the purchase of ribbon? The very limiting of the amount was sufficient, and it was quite unnecessary to inform him that he must not spend money on one thing or another. The pitfalls in the Bill were of a most serious character; and, as far as the Attorney General was concerned, he did not propose to remove them in any sense of the word, but in a most irregular manner complained that he (Mr. Lewis) had given no definition of the Law of Agency. But whose duty was it to define the law if not that of the Attorney General himself? That law was, however, very strongly bound up in the Motion he had before the House at the present time. The Prime Minister seemed to have derived, from perusing the debate on the second reading of the Bill, the impression that there was no vital difference between the two Front Benches with regard to it. There were vital differences on many questions, such as those raised by the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex (Lord George Hamilton) and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope). Nearly every Member of the House had experience of the manner in which his seat was endangered by the foolish conduct of those whom he had begged not to do certain things. Was there any remedy in the Bill for the Member whose conduct might have been prudent and lawful, but who was unseated for some petty act of folly on the part of his agent? From the commencement to the end there was no reasonable, moderate, or considerate provision to that effect. On the contrary, the supposed offences of a candidate were pursued with unrelenting severity; in fact, the Bill was drawn upon the severest possible lines. His object in making these observations was to draw attention to the extraordinary way in which a supposed offence on the part of a candidate was dealt with. In a borough limited by this Bill to the expense of £400, what could it matter, if the candidate kept his expenses to that amount, whether he had 30 clerks instead of 20, or 20 committee rooms instead of 19, or as many messengers as he could afford; but, according to the Bill, these trifling differences would upset the election. If a candidate was allowed to spend £400, and did not exceed that sum, yet if he had 30 clerks instead of 25, or 20 instead of 19 committee-rooms, his election was upset.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member appeared to be going through the Bill clause by clause. That he was not entitled to do, for that was the function of the Committee.

Mr. LEWIS said, he would submit to the judgment of the Chair, and content himself with the illustrations he had given. He wished, however, to draw attention to this result of the Bill, Even if the very limited expenditure allowed was adhered to in the letter as well as in the spirit, yet should the candidate spend it in a different manner to that provided by the Bill, it involved the loss of his seat. He (Mr. Lewis) was, however, glad to see that already there were many Amendments on the Paper on the first 12 clauses of the Bill, and he believed they would have a lively time of it in Committee. The Attorney General, instead of answering the criticisms on the Bill, had contented himself with eloquent vapouring with respect to purity of election. When the Attorney General described his speech against the second reading as being in favour of bribery, he took a liberty for which there was no justification. He did not think that the hon. and learned Gentleman believed it when he alleged that he was taking the part of a class outside the House on this question. The Attorney General knew that to all these matters he had given close and accurate attention, and he thought, therefore, that it was a subject in which he was entitled to speak without having it thrown in his face that he was the representative of any class or interest. Many observations which had been made were entitled to the most careful consideration; but, instead of answering them, the Attorney General had chosen to cast the slur upon him that he was supporting bribery. That was a great liberty for the Attorney General to take, and the statement was altogether unfounded. As the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) desired an opportunity to bring forward his Motion, he would not detain the House further; but he felt bound to make these few remarks as a protest against the speech of the Attorney General.

Mr. PARNELL said, he was much obliged to the hon. Member for Londonderry for the opportunity he had afforded him of bringing forward the Amendment which stood in his name, the adoption of which by the House would enable Irish Members to withdraw from the discussion of the Bill. The Bill had been introduced for the purpose of meeting a state of affairs existing in some of the constituencies of England which had not existed in Ireland since the passing of the Ballot Act. Before the passing of that Act probably some Irish constituencies were as corrupt as any in this country. But that Act, insuring as it did the secrecy of voting, had protected the voter from intimidation, whether at the hands of his landlord or the clergy. Notwithstanding this, the Irish constituencies were now to be put under this most stringent Act, beset as it was with dangers to candidates, because many English constituencies had proved themselves to be corrupt. There was no more reason to include Ireland in this exceptionally severe Bill, directed against a special evil in England, than there was to place England under the provisions of the Crimes Act of last year, which was alleged to have been passed by Parliament to meet an exceptional state of affairs in Ireland. Since the Ballot Act they had had only four Election Petitions in Ireland, and only in the case of the present hon. Member for Tyrone, who was unseated for Dungarvan, was any of them successful. That was *primâ facie* a very fair claim why the request they made—that the provisions of the Bill should not extend to Ireland—should be granted; and he should be only too glad if the result of the consideration of his Amendment by the House should be that the Irish Members would find themselves in a position to leave English Members to discuss by themselves the provisions of this very complicated Bill. If, however, this Bill was to apply to Ireland, it was absolutely necessary that some safeguards should be inserted in Committee. For his own part, he did not desire to undertake the difficult duty of wading through the Bill in Committee, and of endeavouring to hedge it round with safeguards. The measure had been brought in to meet two evils—first, the increase in corrupt practices on the part of the constituencies and some of their candidates; and, secondly, the alarming and very great height to which election expenses had risen in election contests throughout England. Neither of those two circumstances applied to Ireland.

Corrupt practices did not exist in Irish constituencies. Practically speaking, in any contest for a popular constituency in Ireland the popular candidate could obtain his return for an expenditure very little exceeding, if at all exceeding, the sum charged by the Returning Officer and the hotel expenses of the candidate. He himself was returned for three large constituencies at the last General Election, without any expense whatever except the Sheriff's costs. They had established that principle now throughout Ireland; and everywhere the electors and people were beginning to recognize thoroughly that it was to their interest to prevent the imposition of the excessive charges upon candidates which were so usual in past times, when elections were managed by local magnates and wire-pullers, and that if they expected good service from their Member they must see that he was not unfairly mulcted. These were the lessons that they had endeavoured to inculcate upon the Irish constituencies, and he was glad to say that without any Act of Parliament or repressive legislation they had succeeded so far. It was, then, in the face of the absolute purity of election that prevailed in Ireland that the Government came with this formidable Bill, bristling with spikes and pitfalls of all kinds, against dishonest candidates. The objections of the Irish Members were few but important. In the first place, they said that the Common Law construction of corruption and undue influence was liable to be abused by Irish Judges, and, in the event of such abuse, high penalties would be inflicted without mercy on Irish candidates. He need only refer as instances to the notorious judgments of Justices Keogh and Lawson on the Galway Petition; and it was the fact that Irish Judges in time past had brought to the discharge of their duties in trying Election Petitions a political partizanship which did not appertain to the Judicial character. Candidates should not be submitted to the very great risks which this Bill would undoubtedly entail upon them of being driven from the constituencies which they had been in the habit of representing. Again, this Bill, so far from diminishing election expenses in Ireland, would increase them, for it would be impossible to conduct elections without election agents. In Ireland, they had hitherto dispensed with election agents; but this Bill directed that each candidate should have an election agent. There, at the start, was an expense of £100 upon candidates who from their position were not able to bear any expense which could be avoided. Moreover, there would follow the necessity of employing trained agents in the polling districts, who might be solicitors or other lawyers, to insure that the provisions of the Act were not broken or transgressed. Trying the question by the unanimous wishes of the Irish Members on both sides of the House, and by the almost unanimous expressions of opinion against the Bill, he ventured to assert that there was no occasion for including Ireland in its provisions. It was a measure to meet certain evils that were peculiar to English constituencies alone. Parliament had, therefore, no right to enforce it upon the Irish constituencies, and thus to increase the difficulties of sustaining a popular representation. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, the question of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections in Ireland should be reserved for separate consideration,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.

Mr. GIBSON said, that the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and the Amendment which he moved, were alike remarkable. They had always hitherto had in substance the same electoral arrangements existing in the two countries, the same legal definitions of what were corrupt and illegal practices, and the same results of an infringement of an election law; but now it was proposed to leave Ireland under the old system, and to hand over the debased country of England to a harder and more severe system, to fresh definitions of illegal practices, and to different modes of payment of election expenses. It would, in his opinion, be to the last degree inconvenient and undesirable to have an absolutely different electoral law applicable to England and to Ireland. He failed to see one single argument which could cause the Amendment of the hon. Member to commend itself to his judgment. It might be that in Ireland during recent years there had not been much occasion for resort to electoral law; it might be that there had not been much of corrupt and illegal practices; but that might also be the case in many parts of England, Wales, and Scotland. These practices only existed in a very few boroughs and counties, for the majority of the counties in England, Wales, and Scotland were not corrupt; yet it was deemed desirable, in the interests of the electoral laws generally, by those who proposed this Bill, to make new arrangements, not only with regard to portions of the country which had been open to suspicion, but also with regard to those which had been pure. The case of the hon. Member for the City of Cork was that Ireland need not be included, because in those counties where the hon. Gentleman and his Friends were elected there was no necessity for the Bill. If that was so, how could it work any injustice to the hon. Member or his Friends that such a reasonable reform should be instituted in other counties and districts which were not amenable to these beneficent influences? The only two other principal points to which the speech of the hon. Member was directed were those of undue influence and election agents. With regard to the first, he could not call to mind that there was anything whatever in the Bill that would interfere with the old law as to undue influence; and, therefore, the first of those argumenss was outside the question. As to the other point, as he read the Bill, it seemed that every candidate must have an election agent. He thought the hon. Member's objection to that well worthy of consideration. An election agent need not in all cases be necessary, and, that being so, if an Amendment were moved in Committee on that point, he should be disposed to support it. He regretted that the hon. Member for the City of Cork should have seen fit to go back and repeat the old attacks upon the Irish Judges. One of the Judges to whom he had referred was dead, and the other still living. He had the honour to know all the Judges, and he believed them to be able, upright, and impartial, and that they were thought to be so by those whose confidence and respect they sought to obtain. He could not hear the remarks of the hon. Member without standing up in defence of those gentlemen whom he had had for some time the honour of knowing. If the Bill was good for England, it was good for Ireland, and, therefore, he hoped the Amendment would not be accepted by the House.

MR. GLADSTONE: I will endeavour, Sir, to follow the example of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, in being brief on this occasion, as the question is a very narrow one, and it is very easy indeed to advert to the points which have been raised. Now, Sir, it is almost impossible for the hon. Member for the City of Cork, and must be quite impossible for the House, to accede to the proposition that Ireland should be exempted from a Bill not denied to be salutary in England on the ground that the Irish Judges cannot be trusted with its administration. If the Government from time to time appoint to the Bench in Ireland gentlemen whose integrity and judicial impartiality cannot be trusted, that is a subject which manifestly applies to every law which they are called upon to administer, and not to matters relating to elections only. I, of course, do not accept the statements of the hon. Member; but from his own point of view I think he must see it is impossible to consider that as a reason why we should not have the Law of Elections in Ireland as regards corrupt practices in the best possible condition. Now, Sir, the hon. Gentleman will, I think, see that the exclusion of Ireland from this Bill makes it a stigma upon England and Scotland. It is not to be expected of this House of Commons, which mainly represents England and Scotland, and having the preponderance of opinion, that we should be prepared to accept a proposition founded upon principles involving that result. But, Sir, there is one statement of the hon. Member for the City of Cork to which I think I may confidently appeal as invalidating entirely the ground upon which he has made this Motion, even if considered from his own point of view in every other respect. The right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Gibson) had already adverted to and made use of his argument, that he and his Friends will suffer no injury from this Bill. Let me look at the matter from another point of view. The hon. Member for the City of Cork said—"I object to your Bill; I object to the inclusion of Ireland in your Bill." And why? Because all elections in Ireland are pure? Because all election practices in Ireland are pure? Because the burden of enormous expenses does not attach to Irish elections? Is that his ground? No, Sir; that is not his ground. His ground is that to one portion of the candidates in Ireland this flattering description applies. Well, Sir, I must say it is highly honourable to the hon. Gentleman, and highly honourable to his Friends, if they can manage their elections on these principles. I am bound to say, in candour and in honesty, that although, to some extent, there appear to be a considerable number of instances in which these Gentlemen do not comply with the law by making Returns of their expenses, yet, looking at the Returns which have been made, they do, to a considerable extent, bear out the statement of the hon. Member. But surely he cannot possibly say, taking it upon his own showing, that because for one portion of the candidates in Ireland elections are cheap, and in the sense of which we are now speaking are pure, that therefore Ireland is to be altogether excluded from this Bill. The logical bearing of his argument is this—that he and all his Friends ought to be excluded from the operation of the Bill; but that all the other candidates in Ireland not connected with him or his Party ought to be brought within its operation. I have had recently brought to my notice the case of two counties in Ireland, one of which spent £4,000, and another has already paid £6,000, but has not yet settled its account. Another county, which is not a large county—with about 5,000 electors—spent £10,000 for a single candidate. Surely, that is a case which calls for the application of this Bill. How can the hon. Gentleman, rising in his place, or any Friend of his—if I grant the whole of his statements in the whole breadth of their application to himself and to the different candidates who are in the sacred band which he leads—deny to these other Gentlemen who have to pay £4,000, £6,000, and £10,000 for a seat the application of a Bill which he admits to be beneficial in England and Scotland? If the hon. Gentleman has made this Motion for the purpose of paying a tribute—which he is entitled, perhaps, to claim—to himself and those with whom he is associated, yet there is no reason why he should either inflict a stigma upon England and Scotland, or inflict a hardship upon candidates not associated with himself in Ireland by dooming them to pay these heavy, and, in many cases, these intolerable and scandalous expenses, which are now the great disgrace of many English constituencies.

MR. SEXTON said, the Prime Minister had spoken with more than his usual frankness; but he (Mr. Sexton) considered that it was rather hard upon the people of Ireland that because the conduct of constituencies in England and Scotland at elections was bad they should be harassed and annoyed by a Bill of this description. The sole reason for this Bill was the conduct of English and Scotch candidates and constituencies. They knew, from repeated Commissions of Inquiry and the contents of Blue Books, that there were large constituencies where the average voter was willing to sell his vote for a shilling or a pot of beer; and they had to complain bitterly, on the part of the people of Ireland, that a country which had retained purity of election should be exposed to a Bill of this kind, which would impose expense upon popular candidates because of the conduct of the people of England and Scotland. The Prime Minister had referred to one county, which he had not named, in which the expense of the candidate was £10,000. He was at a loss to know what county that could be. It was suggested to him that the expense was incurred in the county of Londonderry. They, however, knew that the right hon. and learned Gentleman who represented that county came from the North, and with that prudence which was characteristic of the North he was careful of the expenditure, while he was lavish with political promises. It was very hard upon Members of the Irish Party who had done faithful service to the people, and had not sought for themselves any political or financial advantages, that they should be subjected to a Bill which would impose upon them at election time officials whom they never employed before. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had informed them that he was returned for three different contested constituencies at the last election without any material expense. In his own small experience something of the same kind occurred; indeed, it was impossible for him to incur any legal expenses in his election, for the two other candidates had bought up every attorney and attorney's clerk in the place. He then dispensed with an election agent; but he supposed, if the present Bill passed, he would be compelled to employ one. [Mr. GLADSTONE: No!] The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) had spoken highly of the Irish Judges. They knew that lawyers were neither the most chivalrous nor Quixotic in the world; but he confessed that he realized the sophistication of life when he heard a learned Gentleman who had been an Attorney-General, and would be a Judge, get up and vouch, in pathetic tones, for the purity of the Irish Judges, saying that he knew them, and they were his friends. They knew them too. It was true they had not the same acquaintance with them as the right hon. and learned Gentleman, and if they had they would not be proud of it. One of the first acts of the late Attorney General for Ireland was to make his election agent at Mallow Registrar of his Court; and that was the sort of political purity which prevailed, and had prevailed for a long time past, in that borough. Mallow, for scores of years, had been the political hotbed in which claimants to the Judicial Bench were reared. Upon its roll of voters there were not more than 250 names, and for the last 15 or 20 years it had been regularly debauched by future Irish Judges. He could name 20 or 30 persons from the borough who had received public offices. [Mr. GLADSTONE: Hear, hear!] The Prime Minister seemed to think that an argument in favour of this Bill; but they had disposed of his Solicitor General, and had taught the whole hungry tribe of Irish lawyers it was no use to come there any more, and they had elected his hon. Friend (Mr. O'Brien) and purified the borough of Mallow without the aid of this Bill. They had taught the smaller electors, who depended upon the Party favours of the lawyers, that their interests depended upon purity of election. He objected extremely to the Bill because it subjected to the same punishment criminal acts and acts of a very different class; and he must own with shame, though the shame was not his but theirs, that he would not object to it so strongly if its administration were to be intrusted to English instead of Irish Judges. Everyone understood what was meant by bribery, or personation, or treating; but why was undue influence placed in the same category? He was very much afraid that when the offence of undue influence came to be tried by Irish Judges they would not forget that they were promoted politicians; they would bow to the Whig or Tory interest, according to the side they had taken, or, at any rate, would be adverse to the popular candidate. But what would amount to undue influence? An exhortation to "vote for Porter and fair rents?" It was not sufficient to say that it must be an offence recognized by the law of Parliament—that was, Statute Law or the Common Law—for whenever they had pressed the Attorney General on any legal point for which he was unable to find the authority of a Statute he always took refuge in the Common Law, and in that midnight darkness it was impossible to follow him. It would be difficult indeed for an Irish candidate to assure himself from fine and disability if such an undefined offence as undue influence were left to the interpretation of the Judges. For these reasons the case of Ireland should be reserved for separate consideration. He agreed with the second reading of the Bill, and was quite as anxious as anyone to limit and abolish everything that interfered with freedom and purity of election; but he objected to having disabilities placed upon their country on account of the political sins of others.

MR. HEALY said, when this Bill was debated last year they had a distinct promise that the objection of the Irish Members would be modified by having two Judges instead of one. Was that promise to be fulfilled?

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I have no right to speak for the Attorney General; but that is my view of the matter.

MR. HEALY: Were they to understand that they were to have two Judges? ["Yes!"] He was very glad to hear that. He did not object to the Bill as a whole; but he objected to various provisions which it contained. The Irish Members demanded legislation, and they were refused it. They did not demand this legislation, and therefore it was thrust upon them. That seemed to be the usual attitude of the British Legislature. Why should they not be consulted on this matter? The Prime Minister told them that this was not a Party question; but if they consulted the Front Bench opposite, why did they not also consult the Irish Members and meet their objections? The Prime Minister thought he made a tremendous point when he said that even if the Parnellites had not much expense, that was no reason why other candidates should have to pay large amounts. The right hon. Gentleman was needlessly solicitous, because in a very short time the great bulk of the Irish Representatives would be returned under the flag of his hon. Friend. What was the attitude of the Irish people towards the House? They regarded the House as a legislative smithy, where certain work was to be done, and they sent certain people to do it. What was the position of England? It was a country where men sold their votes for a pint of beer. The Irish people did not do that; but because the English were sinful the Irish were to have no more cakes and ale. Irish candidates would have to study the Schedule and every detail of this Bill with microscopic care. At present he could go down to a constituency and get a gentleman to nominate him, hand in his paper, and, presto! the thing was done. Under the Bill he would require to have an agent and sub-agents, make contracts through them, and so on through the miserable litany of the Bill. This was intolerable. If he failed in any one particular, some Mr. Justice Porter would come down upon him and inflict these penalties of fine and disqualification. What could be a more shameful thing than to sell a vote? The man who would it he would have scourged. But they put him upon the same footing as the man who made a speech that a Judge might consider intimidation. Undue influence would be what intimidation was to the Resident Magistrates under the Crimes Act; and intimidation was to the Resident Magistrates whatever the Government disliked. He objected to the public conscience of Ireland being regulated by the British barometer. He did not care a pin whether he was in the House or not; but if the constituents desired Members of a certain type they should not be debarred from sending them. Then the Irish Judges were wholly unfit to try political offences—though he did not deny that there were some of them who would endeavour to act impartially; but there were others he would not trust on any conceivable subject in which politics or passion could enter. They asked that the offences should be defined; and the difficulty as to undue influence might be met by its being defined as threats; but no candidate should be responsible for any threats uttered by anyone who was not a paid agent. He would not object to having political offences tried by English Judges, who would be welcomed in Ireland, and would not require police protection; and the Irish Judges, who were over-paid and underworked, might be sent over here. They certainly could not be trusted to decide on questions of undue influence. When his hon. Friend (Mr. O'Brien) was victorious over Mr. Naish, the Solicitor General for Ireland, it was suggested that one of the speeches in favour of his hon. Friend was a case of undue influence, and that a Petition might be presented against his return. But Mr. Naish answered—"If you put him out, they would immediately elect another ruffian just as bad." He appreciated the philosophy of Mr. Naish; but it should not depend upon the prejudice of any single Judge whether or not the penalties of such a Bill should be enforced. If the Bill were to be applied to Ireland, a very different scale would have to be applied to Irish voters than was contained in the Bill; and he would, therefore, support his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell).

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he thought the arguments used and the speeches made by hon. Members who sat near him deserved some reply from the Government, although he was quite sure that no effective answer could be given to any of them. He did not disapprove of the Bill as applied to England; and he was in favour of the most stringent action being taken against corruption, treating, and intimidation. The question of undue influence was, however, not defined, and until it was defined the door was left open for very unjust charges and sentences. As an instance of this, he might mention that in the celebrated Irish case of the Petition from the County of Galway undue influence was interpreted by the Judge to include the use of any arguments employed by the Catholic clergy to the effect that a man might, by voting against his conscience, imperil his salvation. That was held to be intimidation in a spiritual sense. It would, in his opinion, be unjust to extend all the provisions of the present Bill to Ireland, where the Judges were, in many instances, political partizans. It was by a strange perversity that the Prime Minister and the right hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Gibson) had used almost the same arguments about the necessity of making the law the same in England and Ireland, when Irish Members had been told over and again, when pleading for an assimilation of the law in Ireland to that of England, that the condition of the two countries was entirely different, and that they must be content under the law as it existed. The Prime Minister had seemed to think that the great objection of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) to the Bill was that some of the Irish Judges were thought to be unfair. His hon. Friend had, however, contended that the Bill was one which, in any case, Ireland did not want, because it was framed to deal with a state of things which in that country did not exist. Practically speaking, there was no bribery and no corruption in Ireland. He was aware, indeed, that there were certain small boroughs where bribery and corruption in various forms still existed; but he contended that every successive election had been purging even those small boroughs of bribery and corruption. If time and education were allowed to do their work, there would soon be no trace of bribery and corruption in any of the small Irish boroughs. In the last 12 months they had cleared out one of them, and never again would the borough of Mallow be given over to corruption. In the county constituencies in Ireland there was no thought or idea now of bribery or corruption at all. A candidate might be elected at a very small expense, even for a large county and after a sharp contest. Under such conditions, what want was there of a measure so stringent as that now under discussion? With regard to the Irish Judges, he did not believe that, as a rule, they were not upright men. He believed the great majority of them were upright men; but it was well known that Irish Judges were very often, if not always, chosen as political partizans, and that they retained on the Bench of Justice the feelings and the sentiments which had raised them to it. The late Judge Keogh was a remarkable example of this, and his judgment in the case of the famous Galway Petition had not yet been forgotten. He did not like to say anything about a man who was dead; but there were many men in the House who knew what were the charges against the political and judicial career of that Judge, whose appointment had been a scandal, and seemed like a gross practical joke at the expense of the whole judicial system. Even supposing that the imputations made against some of the Judges were wholly unfounded, it was not an advantageous thing to have Election Petitions tried by men in whose impartiality no one in the country believed. He did not assume that the popular feeling against the Judges as a body was justified by facts; but it existed, and had to be taken into account. As regarded intimidation, that offence had almost altogether ceased to exist in Ireland. There had, no doubt, once been intimidation—intimidation exercised by the landlord over the tenant—and to cope with that had sprung up the intimidation of the populace. The ballot had done a good deal to prevent intimidation, and, together with the Land Law Act of the present Government, had done much to relieve the tenant from any fear of oppression on the part of his landlord. Intimidation, as an offence, had therefore almost entirely ceased in Ireland, and he believed that the condition of things would go on improving from year to year. The Bill, however useful for England it might be, was entirely unnecessary for Ireland, and would only tend to intensify the feeling against the Judicial Bench in Ireland. Lastly, though this was by no means an argument on which he wished to lean too heavily, the Government might recollect that the acceptance of the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork would greatly facilitate the passing of their measure. He would, therefore, strongly urge the Government, for their own sake, to agree to the Amendment, and to detach Ireland altogether from the scope of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. PORTER) said, that the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) rested his Motion on the ground that election offences, such as bribery and undue influence, were practically unknown in Ireland, and that the electoral purity of the country was such that the Bill would be all but inoperative. If that were so, there could be no conceivable objection to the Bill, which, whatever its faults might be, could not by any possibility do any harm. Many forms of crime—wife-beating, for example—were extremely rare in Ireland; but that was no reason why the law should not forbid them. The hon. Member for the City of Cork must have regarded with mingled surprise and apprehension the line of argument of one of his Colleagues, who had stated that the borough of Mallow had been for a series of years thoroughly and utterly debauched. Probably that was not literally true of the borough; but small boroughs, whether in Ireland or in England, were very much alike, and there was no obvious reason why they should not be all treated in the same manner. The hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. Healy) had argued not against an extension of the English law, but against the application to Ireland of certain provisions of the Bill, and had dwelt very sensibly on the difficulty of defining the offence of undue influence. The difficulty was, no doubt, considerable; but it was not novel, and the present Bill could not in any substantial degree alter the existing definition. It was important to bear in mind, as an argument for assimilating the law of England and Ireland, that if the two countries had different laws on this important point, the Irish Judges would not be able to avail themselves of the definitions laid down by their English brethren. Reference had been made, he was sorry to say, to the conduct of some of the Irish Judges; and he almost despaired of ever inducing hon. Members opposite to desist from that course. He felt that the Judges needed no defence; but he was bound to ask hon. Members opposite to consider whether this practice should not be discontinued except in case of necessity. Neither the hon. Member for Longford nor the hon. Member for Wexford had included all the Judges in their denunciations; but the belief in the unfairness of the whole Bench was kept alive by the frequency of the allusions made to it in the House. The Judges, as public servants, were, no doubt, responsible for their conduct to Parliament; but no light charge ought to be made against them in Parliament for the reason that there was a proper and legitimate mode of testing the conduct of a Judge, and it was only proper that he should have an opportunity of defending himself. If it could be shown that any one among the Irish Judges was open to the observations that had been made in general terms, then he said that Judge was not fit to be upon the Bench, and the proper course would be to bring to the proof the allegations here made. It was impossible to grapple with mere generalities and statements, regarding which no facts were given. He did not ask the House to believe he was unprejudiced in the matter; but he did ask those who were influenced by expressions of opinion in that House to believe that they were not supported by any body of men outside the House who had any competent means of forming an opinion; and, notwithstanding all that was done to weaken their influence, the Judges occupied their right position in the public mind. As regarded political matters, he did not think that that objection could be seriously urged. The Irish Judges, like other Judges, were taken from different sections of the community, and some were hasty and some were not, and these differences must be looked for so long as men were men; but so far from their appointments being political, three Judges out of the last four never had seats in that House at all, and the fourth, the hon. Member for Wexford himself, said he would entirely trust as regarded his impartiality. As regarded their fitness to try Election Petitions, they must remember that they already tried them; and when, at the hon. Member's request, two Judges had been substituted for one, he thought it unreasonable that any further objections should be made. Even though hon. Members opposite might not have spent any large sums of money on their elections, they must remember that there were other Members not in the same happy category, and there could be no doubt that the legitimate expenses of candidates were largely in excess of the amount which might reasonably be allowed. Some other matters had been referred to. He did not complain of the allusions to himself; but he could only say that if there was anything in the way of undue influence or of bribery in the placards, "Porter and fair rent"—anything which was open to question—it would seem that the stricter and more definite they made the law the better for hon. Gentlemen opposite. He could assure those hon. Gentlemen that any Amendments they might suggest would receive attention in Committee; but it would be monstrous not to have one uniform system governing elections in England and Ireland.

Mr. DAWSON said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had almost allowed that there were no electoral offences in Ireland. That was the danger of this Bill, because the Judges who would find no offences could create them plentifully under the vast powers entrusted to them. He had referred also to small boroughs in Ireland with that threatening glance which seemed to intimate their hasty annihilation. English opinion was very likely to be deceived upon such a point as this, because it would, perhaps, be thought that these boroughs were small in regard to population, influence, and importance, compared with English boroughs with the same number of voters. But where in Ireland they saw 200 electors they had a town with as many people as a town in England that had 1,000 electors. This was an instance of how the right hon. and learned Gentleman put an extinguisher upon every fact that would lead to the information of the House. The right hon. and learned Gentleman admitted, too, with a strange want of consistency and logic, that this term of "undue influence" was indefensible. Why, then, did he seek to renew it in the Bill? The word was undefended and undefensible; and yet the right hon. and learned Gentleman kept it in a measure of a most drastic character, which he asked the House to pass. He (Mr. Dawson) was willing to see the laws of the two countries assimilated, so far as such assimilation gave increased freedom to Ireland; but he declined to shackle that country in order to follow the example of England and Scotland. This was a Bill of restrictions annihilatory of the rights of electors, and he would certainly oppose it. Though it was brought in for England, he thought it was meant for Ireland, because it was well known that the English Judges and the whole hierarchy of the law knew how to respect the rights and privileges of Englishmen, and that if the measure contained anything that was trivial or unworthy of being taken advantage of, the traditions of the Bench would be to defend the law, and not to degrade the Empire. Did the Attorney General not know that the tendency in Ireland was to pay Members, instead of Members debauching the constituencies? While he was anxious, like every other Irish Member, for purity of election, he declared that the extension of the provisions of the Bill to Ireland was totally unwarrantable. The proposal of the hon. Member for the City of Cork was not directed against purity of elections in Ireland, but in favour of a separate measure in view of the totally different position of the two countries. He hoped, therefore, the Government would see their way to accede to the request of Irish Members on both sides, and rather introduce a measure which would apply to Ireland with more cogency and justice.

Dr. COMMINS said, he approved of the Bill for England, believing that it would effect a very desirable reform in that country; but for Ireland it was totally unnecessary. Nothing had taken place in Ireland during the last 15 years that had contributed to the introduction of this Bill. There had been no electoral scandals there; but it was because of the electoral corruption at Chester, Sandwich, Macclesfield, and Wigan, and many other places in England, that this measure had been brought forward. It was for the sins of those peccant English boroughs that Ireland was to be subjected to a measure likely to be applied to most oppressive and unfair purposes, and in the way of stifling the small amount of liberty that at present existed in that country. They surely got enough coercive measures for themselves in Ireand without having this thrust upon them. The real remedy for electoral corruption was to do as they had done in England—where there was great improvement in this matter as compared with 40 or 50 years ago—namely, extend the franchise. Why not do for Ireland what they had done for England in that respect? Why not include it in the provisions of the Act of 1867? That would be the way to prevent any corruption that did exist, and prevent even any undue influence that might exist. As showing the way in which such a measure would be worked in Ireland, he might quote a *dictum* of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, who had laid it down that, in advocating the cause of candidates, a man must not hold out hopes of reward here or hereafter, or fears of spiritual or temporal injury. In laying down such a principle the learned Judge would preclude any man from saying it was a moral duty to give an honest vote. What was the standard of moral duty to be set up in Ireland under this Bill? Would it prohibit a man from advising or warning an elector that he was not to vote one way or the other unless there was a Circular from the Propaganda permitting him to do so? With the new relations that seemed now to exist with that famous College, such a thing might take place; but he objected to have such a decision authorized by this Act, and future decisions founded upon it. Ireland did not want the Bill, nor had she asked for it; and even if there was any necessity for applying a measure of this kind to that country, it should be a separate and distinct one altogether, adapted to Irish requirements.

MR. P. MARTIN said, he saw no reason why the discredit which the passing of this Bill necessarily imputed to England and to English constituencies should be thrown on the constituencies of Ireland. The justification of a measure of this character, which might admittedly inflict the most serious consequences on those who were innocent, but might have been incautious, could alone be rested on the proved inadequacy of the existing law to meet some pressing evil. Now, certainly, as related to England, such strong instances had been mentioned that he did not complain of English Members introducing such a stringent Bill as this to deal with the flood of corruption in England; but no necessity whatever had been shown for extending it to Ireland, where corrupt practices did not prevail to any extent. In 1875 a thoroughly well constituted Committee of the House sat to discuss this question of dealing with corrupt practices; and not only did that Committee not suggest that the stringency of the Acts applying to Ireland should be increased, but the evidence adduced before the Committee showed that, with the exception of a few cases of intimidation, other corrupt practices might be said to be matters of past history in that country, and did not now prevail. This was borne out by the fact that in 1871 there was not a single Election Petition presented; in 1872 there were only two, which were referred to the Judge for trial; and in 1874, after the General Election, there were only eight Petitions. Of those eight Petitions five raised questions of law alone for the decision of the Courts; and, with the exception of the case of one Northern borough, there was no allegation that any corrupt practice had been committed other than intimidation in any of the three other cases. Certainly it was noteworthy that, since the passing of the Act of 1868, with the exception of the City of Dublin and the remarkable decision made in Galway County, there had been no cases in which the Judges in Ireland reported that corrupt practices extensively prevailed. Again, after the General Election in 1880, only six Petitions were brought to trial; and, except in regard to intimidation, not one of the offences or charges proposed to be dealt with under this Bill was alleged against any of the persons petitioned against. He admitted that there was one slight case—that of the election for Dungannon; but the Member petitioned against was unseated for only one single act coming within the category of bribery; and surely one such case, after the election for 1880, was not sufficient to justify the application of such a Bill to Ireland? It was said the Bill would have a great tendency to diminish the expenses to candidates, and in that respect it might be necessary for England. The Attorney General had shown, by the Returns presented to the House, the election expenses were enormous in many places in England. But, so far as he knew, this was not shown in Ireland. It was true there had, in consequence of the Liberal efforts in the North to wrest seats from the Conservative gentry, been a lavish expenditure. But it was of an exceptional, and likely to be of a temporary character. Monaghan stood at the head of the list, the expenses of the two candidates amounting to £3,300.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Henry James) said, that the expenditure in Down was higher.

Mr. P. MARTIN said, he believed £10,000 had been spent in Down. But that was under very peculiar circumstances. If they looked at the Southern and adjoining constituencies they would find that there had been no unfair or unreasonable expenditure that anyone could complain of. This excessive expenditure, under the present circumstances of Ireland, might be well left to work its own cure. The proposal in the Bill was wholly inadequate. Political organizations and men of great wealth might safely risk, as before, illegal expenditure; for it was by a Petition alone that the return could be questioned. He should like to know where the poor man in Ireland was to find security for the purpose of prosecuting a Petition. A wealthy man might go down and expend as much money as he pleased, trusting to the inability of the poor man to find the deposit requisite to be lodged before the Petition could be entered. Where were poor men to meet the large fees necessary to pay counsel to argue the case before the Election Judges? If there was a sincere desire to practically check illegal expenditure, why should there not be a tribunal constituted which would, whether there was a Petition presented or not, in every case where the expenditure was shown to have been excessive, examine into and report to the House the manner, object, and purposes with which that expenditure had been made. In conclusion, he would ask why, because bribery and treating had been shown to have extensively prevailed in England, were Irish Members to be called to cast discredit upon their country by extending the provisions of this measure as proposed? Under the circumstances, he trusted the House would not force the provisions of a measure which was uncalled for and unnecessary on the people of Ireland, contrary to the wishes of a large majority of their Representatives.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, that the Government had shown a disposition to exclude Ireland from the Bankruptcy Bill, which she desired, and wished to include her in a Bill which she did not need, and which had no application to her circumstances. There were very few cases of bribery and corruption in Ireland; and when they occurred, according to his experience, it was generally in consequence of the advent of some adventurous Scotchman or Englishman. If the Bill would prevent a recurrence of the visits of these gentlemen he would give it his hearty support. Why, if this Bill was really intended for Ireland, was not the name of the Irish Attorney General on the back of the Bill? He was not afraid of the Irish Judges giving way to prejudice, as some of his hon. Friends were; but he thought they would much dislike, in respect to a class of offences carrying heavy penalties, solely created under that Bill, to be made both Judge and jury. The Irish Judges had already shown themselves adverse to assuming the duty of a jury. The Bill was wholly unsuited to Ireland. What could be more absurd, applied to a country where everybody treated everybody else, than the clause about treating? That clause might be made the occasion of grave injustice; and men might unjustly have penalties imposed upon them greater than those which in this country were visited on men who beat their wives or half-killed their stepmothers. The Irish people had no objection to any legislation for England and Scotland desired by those countries; but they strongly opposed such legislation as that applied to their own country.

Mr. O'BRIEN said, the Bill was regarded with great dissatisfaction in Ireland, where the one thing of which all classes were proud was the purity of electoral contests. Nowadays, nobody in Ireland ever thought of carrying an election by means of drink or money, or a gang of roughs or attorneys. The English people might learn a lesson from Ireland as to purity of election. The corrupt practices in Ireland were a thing of the past—a matter for Lever's novels. After the General Election in Ireland—a period of very great excitement—the Petitions in Ireland were infinitesimal; indeed, as the hon. Member for Kilkenny (Mr. P. Martin) had reminded the House, there was only one successful Petition, and that was from the unemotional North. Moreover, nobody had ever complained that the will of the people was not fairly and honestly expressed under the present system. The fact was this Bill would not strike at any real abuse in Ireland, but would be a direct incentive to men to present Petitions in the hope of getting some partizan Judge to try them, who, on some pretext or another, would be glad to upset the choice of the people. Undue influence might be all very well if they knew what undue influence was, and nobody appeared to know much on the subject; but if undue influence existed it could be punished under the Crimes Act. But undue influence in this Act would be what a Judge in Ireland chose to make it; and they all knew that although there were fair and impartial men on the Irish Bench—he had the honour of being tried before one recently—yet there were men on the Irish Bench also whose badness in their judicial capacity no words of theirs were able to describe. Why should such men as these be tempted in this Bill to use their positions to disfranchise political opponents? He hoped the House, if there was any use in hoping anything from it, would not add to the bitterness of its constant refusal to pass the measures that Ireland demanded by forcing on her a Bill which she did not want, and which would simply unsettle the only good and satisfactory institution which Parliament had planted in that country.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN said, that Irish Members had, in the course of the discussion, been taunted with inconsistency in opposing this Bill, because they had often asked for equal laws for England and Ireland. But Irish Members had never asked for equal laws as regarded the letter, but only as regarded the spirit. Laws equal in respect of the letter might act very differently in the two countries. What they wanted in Ireland were laws inspired by the same spirit as prevailed in the laws of England—laws favourable to justice and to the liberty of the people. But did the Government act on that principle? From day to day they were passing special laws for Ireland which they did not want, on the ground that the circumstances of that country were peculiar to it; they should, therefore, be consistent with their contention on this occasion. It was alleged that this Bill would reduce the costs of elections in England. It was very probable that it would increase them in Ireland. One reason why the Bill might imperil the liberties of Ireland was that the Judicial Bench in that country acted very differently from the Judicial Bench in England where the liberties of the people were concerned. Many of the Irish Judges had won their way to the Bench by political action in or out of that House, and were not to be trusted with the trial of political causes in Ireland. The Attorney General for Ireland had said that the offence of undue influence had not been created by the Bill, it existed already. But the right hon. and learned Gentleman omitted to mention that the penalty for this so-called undue influence was very much increased under the Bill. The penalty for a candidate who should be convicted of undue influence by himself or his agents was that he should be incapable of ever being elected for the county or borough in which the offence was committed, or of sitting in the House during a period of 10 years; and if undue influence was proved to have been practised by his agent without his knowledge or sanction, then he was to be excluded from Parliament during the Parliament for which the election was held. There were Irish Representatives whose exclusion from the House was desired by a large party both in this country and Ireland, and by the Government; and he should not be surprised if treacherous agents were found who would play candidates a trick in order to deprive them of their seats. Such agents would be amply repaid out of the Secret Service money of England. Considering all the circumstances, he believed that portion of the Bill would do much damage in Ireland; and he protested against it being applied to that country.

MR. MAYNE said, that no more extraordinary reason was ever given for a measure than that it would do no harm, especially at a time when the Empire was crying out for legislation which was much needed. If this Bill passed, the expenses in his county for agents and sub-agents would be enormous, whether the seat was contested or not; whereas hitherto, in the case of an uncontested election, the expenses for that county had been merely nominal. He might mention that when he contested Portarlington, a borough which had a very evil reputation for corruption in the old times, he found the most grateful remembrances there of a gentleman who was now on the Irish Judicial Bench;

and there were stories told of £120 having passed for votes, and was that gentleman, if he (Mr. Mayne) were a successful candidate, and a Petition was presented against his return, to be his Judge as to electioneering purity? If for no other reason, he would vote against the Bill on that ground.

MR. KENNY said, that if the Bill were persisted in the number of Amendments would have to be largely increased. [Mr. GLADSTONE: Hear, hear!] He was glad that the Prime Minister rejoiced at the prospect. He looked upon the Bill simply as a filibustering proposal to interfere with a very salutary and satisfactory state of things in Ireland; and the result would be that instead of its having the effect which all reforms should have of amending the condition of things, it would make them considerably worse. It had been said that the Irish Members had brought unfair charges against the Irish Judges. They had simply said that the Judges in Ireland were not as fair and impartial as those in England. It was impossible that men who depended for their position on political chances could be as fair as men appointed on their personal merits. They were told to call them to account in the proper way; but he thought there was no possibility of their being able to do that, as the only method by which it could be done was entirely out of the reach of the Irish Members and people. He hoped that at the eleventh hour the Government would yield to the remonstrances of the Irish Members, and not persevere in their determination to apply this Bill to Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir HENRY JAMES) said, it was expedient that he should, before the debate closed, take some notice of the strange development of Irish opposition. This was the third time the Bill had been before the House. It was first introduced in 1881; but, until to-night, he never heard of any opposition on the part of Irish Members. In 1881 no Irish Member made the slightest objection to the Bill being applied to Ireland. It was then a more severe measure than now, and the only Member from Ireland who addressed the House upon it complained that it contained no provision for placing the expenses of the Returning Officer on the constituency. In 1882 the Bill had no more enthusiastic supporter than the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), who had been cheering the opposition speeches of his Friends to-night. The hon. Member for Cavan, on that occasion, stated that the Bill deserved the support of everyone desirous of electoral purity. Had anything occurred since then? The Bill was the same, except that some of the penalties had been mitigated. The 5th clause was reached in Committee without any of the topics now urged being brought forward, and the Irish Members who voted gave their votes for the Bill. Therefore, he said, he never knew until now that the Irish Members objected to this measure; and for two years, by their silence, they had supported the measure as being applicable to Ireland. If the present Bill had not been made applicable to Ireland, Irish Members would have spoken still more loudly. It would have been said that the Government were making elections cheap in England, but were allowing wealth to retain power in Ireland. Had anything occurred since then? He supposed a mandate had been given to the Irish Party to change the policy they had pursued, and to oppose a Bill they had never opposed before. And what had been the attempted reasons to cover this new opposition? It was said that Ireland was so pure that there was no need for the Bill in Ireland; but, in 1874, England and Scotland, with 351 constituencies, produced 22 Petitions; and Ireland, with 64 constituencies, produced eight. And if England and Scotland had produced the same proportion as Ireland, the number would have been 48 instead of 22. [Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: How many of the Petitions succeeded in each country?] He had not got the figures; but, from the point of view of the Irish Members, it did not matter, because they said the Judges did not act justly. And it might be said that the whole truth was not discovered. In 1880 the English and Scotch proportion was still lower than that of Ireland; and yet that was the country which it was contended ought to be exempted from the operation of the Bill. Scotland could appeal to its purity—it had had, he believed, only three Petitions since 1868; but Scotland did not ask to be exempted from the Bill. It was said by hon. Members opposite that the Irish popular Party spent no money at election. If, however, the popular Party was very pure, some portion of the electorate of Ireland must be very impure. [*Cries of* "The Whig Party!"] If the Party to which hon. Members opposite belonged was so pure, they had nothing to fear from the Bill; and, therefore, they ought not to object to it. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) said that the popular Party in Ireland had had little or no expense in connection with the election of their candidates. He dared say that was the case; but the House had had very little opportunity of judging, because, though at the last Election 105 Members were elected in Ireland, 54 made no return at all of their expenses. The hon. and learned Member for Kilkenny (Mr. P. Martin) said that Monaghan was the county where the expenditure was the largest. He must have forgotten that in the county of Antrim four candidates spent £14,000, and that in the county of Down the candidates spent £12,000. If such great expenditure were allowed in Ireland and forbidden in England, wealthy candidates who failed at the elections in the latter country would flock to the former, in the belief that their wealth would enable them to be successful there. It was curious that the hon. Members who objected to the application of the Bill to Ireland were the very Members who were always praying for equal legislation for the two countries. They said that the law with regard to undue influence ought not to be altered for Ireland. They assumed that the Bill would alter that law, when, as a matter of fact, it would not. [An hon. MEMBER: It alters the penalty.] Well, the alteration of the penalty was agreed to last year, when no objection was raised. [Colonel NOLAN: I objected to it.] If the hon. and gallant Member objected to it, he certainly did not divide the House upon the question. There was some unexplained reason for the present opposition. The hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) had threatened that his Party would defeat the Bill by attempting to introduce a large number of Amendments. It would be contemptible to yield to threats of that kind. Those who had charge of the Bill could not possibly yield to an opposition springing from an unknown source, and supported by arguments which were nothing else than threats.

MR. LEAMY said, the hon. and learned Gentleman had asked why the Irish Members opposed the application of the Bill to Ireland now, no such opposition having been shown in the last two Sessions. The reason was that the Irish Party had no longer any confidence in the Liberal Government. They had seen the most unconstitutional acts taking place in Ireland with the sanction of the Government; and they believed that if such a Bill as this were passed in the present Parliament, all freedom of election would practically be taken away from Ireland. It was very well for the Attorney General for Ireland to defend the present Bench of Judges; but what guarantee was there that after the passing of the Bill the Ministry would not appoint a partizan Judge who would strain the law in order to get rid of an inconvenient political opponent, like the hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. Healy), for example, who was sent to gaol for four months only because he was an inconvenient opponent. Did anyone mean to tell him that any English Member would be sent to gaol on similar grounds? The reason why the Irish Members opposed the Bill was that, having talked it over fairly at a meeting which they held for that purpose, they came to the conclusion that it would not be safe to trust the Government with such a measure. The decision that had been given in the case of the Galway Election Petition, that the interference of priests in an election constituted undue influence, was repugnant to the feelings of the great majority of the Irish people. In these circumstances, seeing that the Judges on the Irish Bench were capable of giving decisions which were opposed to the opinion of the Irish people, he called upon the Government to give some clear definition as to the meaning of the term "undue influence," and as to the meaning of the word "agent." He would only add that he did not know where the mandate of the Irish Party alluded to by the Attorney General should come from. Recently there was a mandate sent to Ireland; but it was not sent through the wish of the Irish Members. He thought that the Treasury Bench was more responsible for it than they were.

MR. MACARTNEY said, the hon. and learned Attorney General objected that no Representative from Ulster had intervened in the debate. He (Mr. Macartney) believed himself that he was only expressing the opinion of all the Members for Ulster, when he said that the whole of that Province would rise in indignation if a different law on this subject were proposed for Ireland from that which was to prevail in England and Scotland. They objected to be subjected to different laws from those which prevailed in the rest of the Kingdom; and they would certainly resent the idea that corrupt practices and intimidation should be allowed to exist in Ireland, while they were put down by fine and other penalties in England.

MR. BIGGAR said, he must earnestly deny that he had on that, or any other occasion, received any mandate from his constituents, or from anybody else, as to the course he was to take with regard to any measures before Parliament. He had now been nine years in Parliament, and never, on any occasion, had his constituents found fault with his conduct. More than that, he had never received any instructions as to how he was to vote upon any particular question; and therefore he could say, with a clear conscience, that no mandate had been given to him as to how he was to act on this occasion. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Leamy) had stated, with fairness, that the Irish Party had consulted among themselves, and had come to a conclusion as to how they were to act. The Amendments which had been put down upon the Paper in his (Mr. Biggar's) name were all *bonâ fide* Amendments. He was prepared to defend them upon their merits, and he believed the House would accept them, if they were disposed to decide the question upon the arguments which might be advanced. The hon. and learned Attorney General asked how he (Mr. Biggar) could conveniently reconcile the course he was now taking with his conduct on a former occasion; but he would point out that, only that very night, the Prime Minister had set hon. Members an example by expressing his convictions in favour of a particular course, and winding up by voting on the other side. He (Mr. Biggar), therefore, thought that he was quite justified in changing his mind, even supposing that he had changed it. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that, in general terms, he (Mr. Biggar) had supported the provisions of the Bill last year. Well, he had also spoken, in general terms, in favour of the Bill this year, because he conscientiously objected to extravagance in election expenses, either in regard to England or Ireland. But, last year, he had stated that certain specific Amendments were desirable, and there was one particular Amendment which he thought most desirable, and which he believed he would be able to convince the Government they ought to give. If they refused to give that particular Amendment, then he thought the Bill would do more mischief than it would do good in those parts of Ireland with which he was directly interested. He had never seen the advantage of having paid election agents, and of having election committee rooms held in public-houses. Other electioneerers seemed to have different ideas, and were of opinion that it was desirable, in an election contest, to indulge in extravagant expenditure. He was satisfied that if the Bill, in its present state, were passed into law, its results would be disastrous to the Whig Party in the North of Ireland. He knew, by experience, that a great number of the electors were lukewarm and careless; and unless some influence was brought to bear upon them—he did not mean unfair influence—but unless some influence was brought to bear upon individual electors a large number of them would never go to the poll at all. He did not claim to possess the gift of prophecy; but he had a strong personal opinion that, if the Bill were passed, it would be altogether disastrous to the Whig Party; while, with regard to the Irish National and popular Party, they did not require to come into contact with the electors at all, being confident in the strength of their views. Since the last General Election some experience had been gained of the way in which the law was administered in Ireland. At one time it was thought that the so-called Liberal Party would be disposed to administer the law fairly in Ireland; but, since then, they had had experience of packed juries and partizan Judges, which had very considerably opened their eyes. In order to show what sort of men the Irish Judges were, and to justify the want of confidence felt in their administration of the law, he would only relate one incident that occurred at the last Assizes. A man named Finnigan was put on his trial for an offence committed against a land agent on a particular Sunday in July. But the man was able to show, by producing the books of a large firm in Glasgow, that he was in Glagow upon that particular day; and, therefore, it was impossible that he could have been in the county of Monaghan. But the Judge upon the Bench told the jury that it was quite possible for the informer to have made a mistake as to the day, and that it might have been some other day, and, therefore, that they ought to find him guilty of the charge. Under such circumstances, when a Judge sitting upon the Bench administered justice in that way, the Irish Party were justified in declaring their objection to have the rights and liberties of the Irish people controlled by Judges of that stamp.

MR. J. N. RICHARDSON said, that the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) occupied an unique position among his Colleagues. He was an Ulster man born and bred, and in the matter of election expenses the characteristic shrewdness of an Ulster man did not desert him. It was this quality, perhaps, which prevented him from publishing his election expenses. He (Mr. Richardson) could not find fault with that, however, because he saw that his own expenses were not returned. The only remark he had to make was, that he knew what they were himself, and he knew that they were a great deal too much. His only comfort was that the expenses of those other Gentlemen who contested the county of Armagh must have been larger still. However, after what the hon. and learned Attorney General had laid before the House in regard to the large expenditure which had been incurred in contesting constituencies in that abandoned Province of Ulster, he would appeal to the hon. and learned Gentleman to allow the Bill to apply to Ireland, so as to give the Ulster candidates and Ulster constituencies some protection against excessive expenditure. In regard to what the hon. Member for Cavan said, that the Bill, if passed into law, would be disastrous in its effect upon the Liberals of Ireland, that might be true, or it might not; but, whether it were true or not, he agreed with the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Macartney), that it was most desirable the law, both in England and Ireland, should be the same.

MR. CALLAN said, he was surprised to hear the speech they had just listened to from an Ulster Member. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Richardson) asked that this law should be applied to Ireland, in order to save the Ulster Whigs from illegal and immoral expenditure. Now, he (Mr. Callan) knew something of the county of Armagh, living, as he did, upon its borders, and knowing a good deal in regard to the circumstances which attended the election of the hon. Member who had just sat down. Pure Ulster Whig as the hon. Member was, his election agent had shown great discretion in not returning the election expenses of the hon. Gentleman. He (Mr. Callan) saw, some time ago, in a number of *Punch*, a picture representing an inebriated man standing outside a public-house. He was a Scotchman. [*Cries of* "Hear, hear!"] He was glad to hear that cry of "Hear, hear!" from the Scotch Representative of an Irish constituency. Well, this inebriated Scotchman was accosted by a friend in this way—"Sandy, where have you been, and what are you doing?" "Oh! I am getting on right well"—but the remark was made in a somewhat drunken tone—"I am very prosperous indeed." "Why, Sandy, how is that?" "Well, I am a temperance lecturer." "What! a temperance lecturer, and you in that state?" "Well, my brother is the temperance lecturer, and I am the awful example." He could only apply this story to the Ulster Members; and he could assure the House that when the corruption of Ireland was totalled up, the Whig Ulster Members would be found in every shape and form, the most awful examples of the corruption they denounced. Who were the worst examples of corruption in 1880 and at other General Elections? In 1869 who was the only Member representing an Irish constituency unseated for illegal and corrupt practices? It was the hon. Member for Drogheda (Mr. Whitworth), the Prime Minister of the temperance movement. If the Bill had a Preamble to it, reciting, "that whereas corrupt practices have extensively prevailed," it could not be said that they had prevailed extensively in Ireland; because in 1880 there was only one Petition presented, and that had relation to a Whig constituency. And in what Whig constituency was it proved that corruption did prevail? It was the borough of Dungannon, and the Member unseated was the hon. Gentleman the present Representative of the County of Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson). A Whig *par excellence* represented it, who lost his seat for illegal and corrupt practices. Even in this case, the expenses of the hon. Member were subscribed for him by the pure and incorruptible Radicals now sitting below the Gangway. Those pure and incorruptible Radicals below the Gangway subscribed and paid the expenses of the only Member for Ireland unseated in the last General Election for illegal and corrupt practices. Now, he (Mr. Callan) knew something of illegal and corrupt practices. [Mr. CAINE: Hear, hear!] He heard the cry of "Hear, hear!" from the Liverpool ironmaster.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to refer in that manner to a Member of the House.

MR. CALLAN said, he intended to refer to the hon. Member for Scarborough (Mr. Caine). Now, he (Mr. Callan) had gone through the ordeal of an Election Petition. He believed the expenses against him were subscribed, one-half by the United Kingdom Alliance, represented by the hon. Member for Scarborough; and the other half by gentlemen who belonged to the Irish National Land League. He had great satisfaction in saying that he beat both of them, and that Mr. Baron Dowse, having tried the Petition for six days, stated that the election was a pure election. The learned Judge, in delivering his judgment, said—

> "I know something of the House of Commons, and something of the practices of that House; and I must say that if a Petition was presented against every Member of the House, I do not believe, if the law were to be strictly carried out as it stands, you would have a House of Commons at all."

In that opinion he (Mr. Callan) fully and entirely concurred. In regard to the present Bill, what was it to do? One condition was that every candidate must appoint an election agent, and must be responsible for the acts of that agent. At the present moment, a candidate could go down and address a constituency, place his political career before that constituency, and be returned or rejected, as a good many persons were. But if a man was rejected, what was the result? He was not responsible for the acts of anybody but himself. Candidates were not obliged to be responsible for the acts of agents, because they need not appoint them unless they wished. But the hon. and learned Attorney General said that a candidate must appoint an election agent, for whose acts he must be held responsible. Now, he (Mr. Callan) did not believe that he could find in Ireland, or in any county in Ireland, so fit and so capable an election agent as himself. Then, why, in the name of common sense, should he be obliged to appoint some nincompoop as his agent, and be responsible, and probably unseated, for his acts? Not one single valid reason had been brought forward to show why this Act should be extended to Ireland. He knew that the hon. and learned Attorney General had a perverted mind upon this point, because he judged the Irish constituencies by his own acts, and those of his own constituency, which was the most corrupt constituency in England, and had long been a bye-word throughout the country. Every man knew that the return of the hon. and learned Gentleman had only been won by the indirect acts of his agents, and by the exercise of corrupt and undue influences. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: Do I correctly understand the hon. Member to charge another hon. Member of this House with indirectly using corrupt influences to obtain a seat?

MR. CALLAN replied in the negative. He had made no such charge, because he was aware that, although there was an Election Petition against the hon. and learned Gentleman, he was declared to have been duly elected. Therefore, he had not attempted to go behind the opinion of the Judges. He was only speaking of the general character of the hon. and learned Gentleman's constituency; but in regard to the hon. and learned Gentleman personally, he did not desire to go behind the opinion of the Judges. In regard to the Irish constituencies, there had been a unanimous concurrence of opinion from 1869 until 1880 that, as far as bribery or corrupt influences were concerned, they were perfectly pure. He thought that the House ought to be guided by that fact;

and as, in the opinion of the Irish Judges, the Irish constituencies were pure, they ought not to extend the Bill to Ireland.

Question put.

The House *divided :* — Ayes 243 ; Noes 31 : Majority 212.—(Div. List, No. 119.)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again." — (*Mr. Attorney General.*)

MR. RAIKES said, he wished to ask the Prime Minister what course he intended to take to-morrow, after the unexpected course the debate had taken that evening in regard to the present Bill? It was anticipated that the House would have gone into Committee, and have made some progress with the Bill. This expectation had, however, been defeated, and they had only been able to get into Committee. He would, therefore, ask the right hon. Gentleman if he still intended to take the Committee upon the Bill to-morrow, with probably only an hour or so for its consideration; and if he intended to proceed with so small a portion of the Bill before going on with the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill? He had understood the right hon. Gentleman to accept the position pointed out by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), that it would be inconvenient for the House to have the two Bills before it at the same time. He would, therefore, ask the right hon. Gentleman if he intended to go through with this Bill before he took up the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill, or whether, if he took this Bill to-morrow, he intended to go on with it also on Monday; and if he proposed to take it *de die in diem* before proceeding with the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill?

MR. GLADSTONE said, he proposed to take the Lord Alcester and Lord Wolseley Annuity Bills to-morrow. He apprehended, however, that there would be a considerable amount of time available to-morrow after these Bills were disposed of; and he did not think it could be better occupied than in getting on with the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill. To-morrow, at 2 o'clock, he would be in a position to inform the right hon. Gentleman what course he proposed to take with regard to the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he should have a word or two to say to-morrow upon the principle of the Annuity Bills. On a former occasion they had only discussed the question of the desirability of conferring pensions.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Postponed Resolution [31st May] *considered.*

(10.) "That a sum, not exceeding £57,263, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1884, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Said Resolution read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Resolution be now read a second time."

PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATIONS—MR. ERRINGTON.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL said, he rose to call attention to the circumstances of Mr. Errington's visit to Rome. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister for having put off the consideration of this question the other night, and for having afforded him a more convenient opportunity for bringing it forward; and also for not having pressed him, the other night, to bring the question before the House at a somewhat late hour. He was bound to say that, since the matter was last under the consideration of the House of Commons, a considerable change had come over the whole matter. It would probably be within the knowledge of the House that, on Thursday night, on the proposed Vote on Account, some hon. Members sitting in that quarter of the House, and also some hon. Members opposite, were anxious lest any money that the House of Commons were going to vote for Secret Service should, by any possibility, find its way into the pocket of Mr. Errington, either as remuneration, or re-imbursement for services he had rendered. He had put Questions as to the exact nature of Mr. Errington's Mission to Rome; and he had pressed upon the Prime Minister that, if there had been anything whatever about Mr. Errington's position at Rome of an official, or semi-official, or officious character, a clear and distinct record of the manner in which that position had been asserted and maintained, should be preserved in the archives of the Foreign Office; and if Mr. Errington had made representations to the See of Rome with respect to the views of Her Majesty's Government as to what might be good for Ireland, a clear and distinct record of those representations should be kept; because, undoubtedly, the result of Mr. Errington's stay at Rome had been to produce a document, from the College of the Propaganda, of a very remarkable character, in which the Pope undoubtedly came forward, in a most distinct and pronounced manner, as an ally and supporter of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland; and in which he pronounced, equally and decidedly, in favour of law and order, and against extreme popular agitation. No doubt, that would be accepted by many hon. Members on both sides of the House as decidedly a good result of any negotiation that might have taken place. However, those were the grounds upon which he pressed upon the Government—and if matters had not altered he would have pressed upon them again—that the clearest and most succinct record of all that had taken place should be preserved in the Foreign Office, in order that future Governments might have something to guide them, in case it might be thought advisable hereafter to enter into similar relations with the Holy See. That course was forced on himself, and those sitting near him, because they had heard it stated, on good authority, that whatever communications might have passed between Lord Granville and Mr. Errington, up to the present moment they had been of an extremely secret and confidential character. It had been impossible to ascertain their nature. All they knew was that there had been communications, and constant communications; and they were informed, on the best authority, that those communications had passed, not directly from Lord Granville to Mr. Errington, but through Lord Granville's Private Secretary to Mr. Errington, and that when Lord Granville should leave the Foreign Office every document relating to the transactions would be destroyed or carried away. Now, that was not the way in which the foreign policy of this country ought to be conducted, and he considered it a dangerous method. But another and a most surprising change had come over the whole matter since the House had briefly considered it on Thursday last, a change which had altogether revolutionized every idea they had been able to form in connection with it. Because, on Saturday last, a very surprising, and, in some ways, a very portentous event occurred, the chief actor therein being no less a person than the Prime Minister. On the day named the right hon. Gentleman went to Stafford House. That, if it stood by itself, he (Lord Randolph Churchill) should have considered a remarkable occurrence; for, although, no doubt, all the great and small houses in England were open to the right hon. Gentleman, still he thought a long time had elapsed since he went to Stafford House. But the right hon. Gentleman went to Stafford House for a particular purpose; and a more extraordinary purpose, considering what had taken place, he defied hon. Members to conceive—he went to Stafford House for the purpose of unveiling, or taking part in the unveiling, or witnessing the unveiling, of a monument, or a memorial, or a monumental tablet, or something of that nature, erected in Stafford House in honour of Garibaldi; and the Prime Minister, not content with either unveiling or taking part in the unveiling of this memorial, monument, or monumental tablet, proceeded to make an eloquent and lengthy eulogium upon that hero. He was bound to say that if the House would only consider what had occurred, they would come to the conclusion that it was extremely difficult to make out, on this point, as well as on others, the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government. For, undoubtedly, Mr. Errington had been at Rome as a recommended Agent; Mr. Errington had obtained from the Pope of Rome, by means of his recommendation as Agent of Her Majesty's Government, a Manifesto which had produced a remarkable effect in Ireland, an effect which they were in every way entitled to consider a good effect, and there was no doubt whatever that the Government received that document from the College of the Propaganda with feelings of satisfaction. This had been, in a great measure, brought about by the policy adopted by Lord Granville in sending Mr. Errington to Rome, and by communicating with Rome by means of Lord O'Hagan. Having done all that, having produced this effect by a policy which, if it were an open one, he should not in the least object to, he asked hon. Members, what could be the object of the Prime Minister in going to Stafford House, within a few hours of the production of the Manifesto, and eulogizing a man who had done more harm to the Church of Rome, both temporally and spiritually, than any man in the history of his country since the days of the Constable of Bourbon? Garibaldi, who drove the Pope from Rome; Garibaldi, who, long before M. Gambetta, raised the cry *L'Ennemi c'est le Cléricalisme;* Garibaldi, who, if not an infidel, was certainly anything but a follower of the Romish Church; and Garibaldi, who, on more than one public occasion, eulogized the Goddess of Reason—this was the man for whom the Prime Minister went to Stafford House, as far as he could make out, to conciliate a Whig Duke, who, for a long time, had been frowning upon him; this was the man whom the right hon. Gentleman eulogized and panegyrized as he only could eulogize and panegyrize, and whom he held up to the admiration of assembled nations. When, on Sunday morning, he (Lord Randolph Churchill) read the account of these proceedings in *The Observer*, a Liberal newspaper, he was, so to speak, knocked head-over-heels with astonishment. The idea suggested itself that they must have been mistaken throughout; that they had indulged more than usual in disordered imagination; that there could not have been any such person as Mr. Errington, any such thing as a recommended Agent; that the document from the Propaganda was a myth, and that Cardinal Jacobini and the Pope had never, in any way, interfered in Ireland, because the Prime Minister was the last man who would repay blessings with injuries, or would meet kindness with ingratitude. Let the House bear in mind that no ingratitude could be more deep than that, having received assistance from the See of Rome in the shape of the document referred to, the Head of the Government should proceed at once to laud to the skies the deadliest enemy the See of Rome ever had. He had been unable to arrive at the faintest conclusion on this matter; and he should be really obliged to the Prime Minister if he would not take any notice whatever of the remarks he had made, if he would on no account venture on any explanation, because he confessed that his mind was in a perfect whirl, and he was unwilling to accuse the right hon. Gentleman of conduct so bad as it would be if the statement referred to were correct. He should ask the House to consider, if this marvellous inconsistency were true, that Mr. Errington was in Rome, that his presence there had produced a document such as that which had appeared in the public Press, and that within a few days the Prime Minister made a public return for that document by pronouncing this panegyric on Garibaldi. But he would beg hon. Members, if they wished to preserve their reasoning faculties, to dismiss the matter from their minds; because he was perfectly certain that no person except the Prime Minister—and he doubted, in this respect, even the capability of the right hon. Gentleman himself—could offer anything like an intelligible explanation of what had taken place.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, I intended to rise exclusively for the purpose of redeeming my pledge given to the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) with regard to Mr. Errington's Mission, the circumstances of his visit to Rome, and on the point that some record of the proceeding should be kept at the Foreign Office. The noble Lord, in the course of his speech, adverted, from time to time, to some astonishing changes in the political atmosphere, and in the whole situation of affairs with regard to our foreign relations, which had taken place since Thursday last. I will not say that I was knocked head-over-heels, or that my mind was in a whirl, nor will I resort to any other of those figurative expressions in which the noble Lord has abounded to-night; but I will say that I was obliged to ask my noble Friend near me what it was that the noble Lord was referring to in the latter part of his speech; I am bound to say I was greatly surprised to hear that it was to my visit to Stafford House and the lengthy speech which, according to the noble Lord, I made there. Well, Sir, I do not admit that it was a lengthy speech. Mr. Canning was once asked by an unfortunate Gentleman, who had made a speech in the House of Commons, whether his speech was a long one. Mr. Canning said it had not been long. "Oh," said the Gentleman, "I was afraid it was tedious." Mr. Canning looked as if that were quite another matter. Whether my speech was tedious or not I do not know; but it occupied little more than five minutes, and cannot, therefore, be looked upon as long. The noble Lord has seen a connection between that speech and Mr. Errington's visit to Rome, which, I confess, I do not at this moment perceive. It was rather in the nature of a personal than a political speech; and the noble Lord will find, if he refers to it, that it dwelt entirely, except in a single sentence, upon the personal qualities of Garibaldi. The personal qualities of Garibaldi were exceedingly remarkable and exceedingly attractive, as they were displayed in this country at the time of his visit. There was not a word in that speech, if it may be dignified by the term, with reference to the political services rendered by Garibaldi, except in a single sentence in which I combined Garibaldi, Count Cavour, and Victor Emmanuel, and spoke of them as having done a great and splendid work in the reconstruction of Italy. ["Hear, hear!"] With regard to Garibaldi, I do not deny that, like Cavour, like Victor Emmanuel, and like many other persons who have been sincere and fervent Roman Catholics—and I am very far from saying that Garibaldi was one—he was opposed to the temporal Government of the Pope. But Garibaldi had no connection with the driving of the Pope out of Rome. He drove the King of Naples out of Naples; but it was the people who drove the Pope from Rome. It does seem to me to be a strange and very extravagant interpretation of the language I made use of with reference to Garibaldi, Cavour, and Victor Emmanuel, to connect it with communications going on between Mr. Errington and the Vatican. I now proceed to redeem my pledge given to the noble Lord, and that also made to the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen). I agree that there ought not to be any mystery about a matter of this kind; but there is nothing mysterious in the declarations concerning it which have been made, from time to time, on the part of the Government, either in this House or the other, and I will briefly refer to what has taken place. Mr. Errington made known to Lord Granville his disposition and intention to go to Rome. He went there for his own personal vocations. A Roman Catholic gentleman going to Rome, and taking a great interest in private affairs, very naturally has communications with the Head of his Church, and with the persons surrounding that Head. We have not catechized Mr. Errington as to the purpose he had in going to Rome. We had confidence in his abilities and his general views; and, therefore, we felt glad that he was going, and obliged by his offer to represent, as well as he could, the true state of things in Ireland. We entertained that sentiment exclusively in the interest of public order, peace, and legality; and no question connected with politics, as distinct from order, peace, and legality, entered in the slightest degree into our contemplation. But when it is considered what kind of countenance has been given within recent times in Ireland to breaches of the law, and to a state of things menacing to both public and private security, I think it was right that the Government should feel an interest in all means likely to convey just, impartial, authentic and independent information to the Head of the Roman Catholic Church naturally in communication with members of that Church, and, I presume, entitled, as the Heads of all Churches are entitled, to advise the members of his own Church upon the performance of their duties in obeying the law of the land. [*Laughter from the Irish Members.*] I am not surprised at the manner in which hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite receive these remarks; it is too much, I am sorry to say, their habit to indulge in this mode of proceeding, which can hardly be termed Parliamentary. These are the motives of the Government, and the limits of the interest they felt in Mr. Errington's Mission to Rome. It has been stated, over and over again, that Mr. Errington has had, and will have, no pay; that he received from the Government no instructions; and that we made no demands either of him or from the Pope through him; but Lord Granville gave him such information with regard to the state of affairs in Ireland as he might, with perfect propriety, give to him or to any other person in whom he had confidence, and who had confidence in him. The noble Lord made some slight allusion to Lord Granville's Private Secretary. I am not sure that I understood him. [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: It had been told me.] Lord Granville's Private Secretary had no other share whatever in these matters than such as necessarily devolves on a Private Secretary with regard to communications which are not carried on through the regular machinery of the Foreign Office. Such was the attitude of the Government relative to Mr. Errington, and such was the independent part with regard to this matter which Mr. Errington was to take upon his own judgment and upon the information he had. The use he might make of that information, and the recommendations he might make, were matters for his own consideration, and were conducted by him on the basis of his own judgment with regard to Irish affairs. But the admission I make to the noble Lord is, that, although I think it was quite right and natural that this should be treated without any reference whatever to transmission when Mr. Errington first went to Rome, I am of opinion—and my Colleagues are of opinion—that the prolonged and repeated visits of Mr. Errington to Rome—always, I must say, at his own suggestion—have tended to give another character to his visits; and, therefore, I have to say that a record will be made and kept of these proceedings for the purpose of transmission to future Secretaries of State. Then, I have a few words to say with regard to a question by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen). I have communicated with my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and likewise with Earl Spencer himself. The Chief Secretary informs me that his communications with Mr. Errington amount to *nil.* He does not say he never made any; but that is the result. Earl Spencer describes his own communications sufficiently in these words—

> "With respect to Mr. Errington, I have seen him several times when he has passed through Dublin. He has called upon me, and we have talked over Irish affairs; but I have never asked him to take any particular line or action at Rome."

That is the nature of the instructions. I think I have now said as much as will meet the points which have been raised.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF said, he would trouble the House with a few words with regard to what had fallen from the Prime Minister. If this concession had been made before, as it ought to have been—namely, that the subject-matter of Mr. Errington's Mission would be placed on record—it would have saved a great deal of trouble and useless discussion in that House. The only complaint he had made on the subject was that there was to be no continuity of information in the Foreign Office on the subject of Mr. Errington's Mission to Rome. It was perfectly well known that he was in communication with the Foreign Office, and the right hon. Gentleman never denied that. [Mr. GLADSTONE: Through his Private Secretary.] Yes; but in his public capacity at the Foreign Office. The right hon. Gentleman wished to divide Lord Granville into two parts, as was done with M. Roustan. In the course of the winter he (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) had had the satisfaction of seeing Mr. Errington and others in relation with him at Rome, and he must say that Mr. Errington was highly respected at the Vatican; and he believed Mr. Errington's word had constantly been taken by all the authorities at the Vatican upon Irish matters, whereon they had previously been misinformed. He always had considered it hard that Mr. Errington should be practically repudiated by the Treasury Bench. All he and his hon. Friends had contended for had been satisfied. Their demands had been met. Mr. Errington's Mission was recognized as that of an Envoy, inasmuch as a record of his Mission was to be kept at the Foreign Office, and, by Order of that House, could be laid upon the Table. The Government could not deny that in any way. The archives of his Mission was no longer to be hidden away in Lord Granville's pigeon-holes or despatch box; but the Government were now about to record, in a public manner, that Mr. Errington had their confidence—that he had made representations to the Pope in a public manner. The Government now recognized that the services of this Special Envoy had been crowned with success, and that they owed a great deal to having sent him to Rome.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I abide by all the words I have said with regard to the instructions.

Mr. SEXTON said, he thought the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) was very easily satisfied if the promised records afforded him satisfaction; but if the records were conceived in the same spirit of reserve as his speech had been, they would not give much satisfaction to future Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs. It was very instructive to Irish Members to hear the cheers from Radical Members when the Prime Minister endeavoured to minimize his speech at Stafford House with reference to Garibaldi. Irish Members were under no mistake as to the most prominent characteristics of Garibaldi. They did not include respect for the sanctity of human life; and he was one of the most prominent of foreign conspirators and revolutionists. It was very instructive to Irish Members to find English Radicals cheering the name of a man whose personal characteristics, if they meant anything in politics, resolved themselves into the condensed characteristics of the political assassin; while they had nothing but horror and detestation for a similar type of character when it made its appearance in Ireland. It was not so long since the Prime Minister presented a very remarkable pamphlet to the world. The Holy See had a proverbial long memory, and it did not forget the pamphlet called *The Vatican*, which startled the public life of England a little time ago, not only because of its own ability and research, but also because it proceeded from the pen of the eminent right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister. In that pamphlet the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the "rusty and mediæval weapons of Rome;" of its "rusty armour re-furbished for modern use;" and he had nothing but scorn and contempt for the "puny Pontiff of an outworn Creed," daring to interfere in the political affairs of free and independent Protestant nations. The right hon. Gentleman had shown, on many occasions, how his convenience could effect remarkable transitions in his views. To-day they could see how the Pontiff, who, a little while ago, was in the right hon. Gentleman's eyes only a figure for scorn and contumely, could be treated with condescension more insulting to that ancient Sovereign than even the scorn of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman had thoroughly justified the attack of the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), which was courteous, but, at the same time, substantially severe. The noble Lord had pointed out that one day the right hon. Gentleman was glad to receive the assistance of the Pope, and another day passed a eulogy upon the man who was responsible for the overthrow of the temporal power of the Pontiff. It was idle to say that Garibaldi did not take part in the entry into Rome. He was, in fact, the political engineer of the events which led to the abolition of the temporal power of the Pope; and, however Pope Leo XIII. might be deceived by that speech, he could not be deceived as to the force of Garibaldi's action on the temporal character of the Holy See. The right hon. Gentleman had behaved with singular ingratitude with regard to any assistance he might have received; though, in reality, he (Mr. Sexton) did not think the right hon. Gentleman had received any service. He believed that, in Ireland, this matter would be attended with three effects. The first was personal, with respect to this Roman Catholic Gentleman, Mr. Errington, who had sent his letters home in the official bags of the British courier, and had been received at Rome next after the Representatives of Foreign Powers. Whatever might be said here, at the Vatican Mr. Errington was received, if not as a regular Ambassador, at least as an Envoy—that was, between the regular Ambassadors and those who had no official position. The Prime Minister had been driven from his position of obstinate silence, and the public had been irritated by the action of the Government. The first effect of this proceeding in Ireland would be the ruin of Mr. Errington's political position. The Government might give him a Peerage; but that would be poor compensation. Peerages were rather cheap, and he might not be eligible for a Peerage. He had not faced his constituents, and dared not appeal to a public tribunal in Ireland; and yet this Roman Catholic Gentleman, who dared not show his face in Roman Catholic Ireland, was said to be a fit Envoy to the Pope. He was ruined politically; and if the right hon. Gentleman was not as ungrateful to Mr. Errington as he was to the Pope, he had better look after that Gentleman's interests. The second effect would be to intensify the success of the man against whom this action had been directed; and the mean, furtive, intriguing character of the means by which the Pope had been moved to issue his Circular was shown by the fact that the Holy See had departed from tradition and dignified usage, and turned that Circular into a personal attack upon a politician. He challenged the history of the Roman Catholic Church to show any occasion when the authority of that ancient and still powerful Church had been used in a manner unworthy of the dignity and usage of the Church as it had been in this instance. The third effect would be, no matter what the momentary effect of the voice of this ill-used authority might be, to produce a greater cohesion and union among all the forces of public politics in Ireland against any pretence or claim to undue domination over the affairs of that country by the British Government.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN said, he very much regretted that the name of Garibaldi had been, as he thought, unnecessarily dragged into this discussion. The House would do him the justice to admit that he had never endeavoured to distinguish between an Italian and an Irish patriot. He had recognized the merits of Garibaldi and of other Italians, and he had never ceased to acknowledge the merits of Wolfe Tone, or Michael Davitt; and the reference made by the right hon. Gentleman had no effect so far as he was concerned. One remark, however, he wished to correct. Garibaldi did not drive the Pope from Rome in 1848. The Pope had left Rome, in consequence of the assassination of Count Rossi, before Garibaldi was made Commander; but, allowing that to pass, he was sure the House would receive with satisfaction the explanation of the Prime Minister. It fully confirmed the suspicions in which hon. Members opposite had indulged, as to the action of Mr. Errington. They said he was an informal Envoy, and was practically representing the English Government at Rome, and the declaration of the Prime Minister confirmed their suspicions. His only regret was that it was not made at first. It was a fairly debateable question whether the English Government should be represented at the Vatican or not; but if the Government had acted in an open manner, the informal discussions with which the House had been troubled this Session and last would not have taken place. He had one personal observation to make, and that was with reference to the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice); and, as they were now leaving the subject, he thought it was only fair that it should be made. Through the noble Lord's Answers to the Questions which he (Mr. Joseph Cowen) and others had asked, an impression was created that the noble Lord was not absolutely stating the whole case, but was intentionally keeping something back. He thought there was no ground for such a suspicion. The noble Lord was comparatively new to the Office he now held, and any communications respecting Mr. Errington took place when he was not in a position to know of them. The noble Lord was simply the spokesman of Lord Granville in that House, and had in no way acted disingenuously in the matter. The Government now acknowledged that Mr. Errington was in Rome, to a large extent, in the character of an Envoy, and had been recognized as their Representative there. He did not say that the English Government wished to be so represented; but, throughout all these transactions, he had been so recognized. When he went to the Vatican he had gone along with the other diplomatic Representatives. Undoubtedly, the impression was created at Rome that Mr. Errington was the spokesman of the English Government. Now, he (Mr. Joseph Cowen) submitted that it was humiliating to the English Government to seek the assistance of a foreign Ecclesiastic in the management of affairs in Ireland. Irish society was in a state of solution, and grave disaffection existed in the country; the land was ruled by a rigorous system of coercion. There was a state of despotism existing there which was almost equal to that which existed in Russia. England governed Ireland with soldiers and policemen, and behind the soldiers and policemen there were the informers and the hangman. These were the instruments and implements of despotism. It might be necessary for us to rule by superior force in Ireland; but we ought to rule it ourselves. We should not seek the aid and assistance of a foreign ecclesiastical Power. Reference had been made to the affairs of 1848; but did not English Liberals remember what a cry of indignation was raised in this country when, during the Hungarian struggle for independence, Austria sought the assistance of the Pope. Let us judge ourselves as we judge other people; and if we condemned Papal interference then, we ought to condemn the interference of Mr. Errington in Rome. As an Englishman, he regarded the negotiations with the Pope as humiliating. Mr. Errington had been the means of extracting from the Papal authorities a condemnation of a political opponent. His hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had fought the battle of his country honourably and well. What did they see? They saw an Irish Gentleman throwing himself into political agitation, giving his services, his time, and his health—suffering both in purse and person—to the interest of his country. His countrymen sought to recompense him as English Free Traders recompensed Mr. Cobden. We used an Envoy of Her Majesty's Government to get from the Pope a Mandate to prevent the testimonial to the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork being successful. The Archbishop of Cashel had been distinctly censured for the part he took in the agitation. He (Mr. Joseph Cowen) submitted that that was a mean way to fight a political opponent. To seek the assistance of a foreign Ecclesiastic in the government of Ireland was humiliating; and it was mean to seek to ruin a political opponent by such means.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he did not rise for the purpose of entering into the subjects of the discussion that had occurred during the last hour; but he merely rose for the purpose of taking note of the observations and statement of the Prime Minister, that, for the future, there would be a note made of communications between Earl Granville or between other Members of the Government and Mr. Errington. He thought that, so far as it went, was satisfactory, and relieved the House and the Government from a very embarrassing position, which they had seen illustrated for some time past. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) and the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill) were to be congratulated upon the result of the frequent questions they had put in regard to this matter. He (Sir Stafford Northcote) could only say that he thought the decision of the Government in this matter had been rightly advised; though he was bound to say he agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Joseph Cowen), and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Portsmouth, that it would have been well if the decision could have been arrived at earlier.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, that, so far as events had gone, the House had reason to be satisfied with the explanation which had been made that evening. They had had something like an open confession from the Government—a confession, indeed, extorted under pressure of what in old times was called "the question." He only rose on the present occasion to state that, while he had no very high opinion of the means which Her Majesty's Government had employed, he still certainly thought that Irish Members ought to have been prepared for the employment of those means. Her Majesty's Government had had so much of the field to itself at Rome, that the Irish National Party ought to adopt means of counteracting the unscrupulous representations which had been made to Rome on behalf of the Treasury Bench. He hoped that not only Englishmen would take a lesson from the proceedings to which the Government had been a party, but that Irishmen also would take a lesson. He would point out that Mr. Errington was by no means the first sort of secret Envoy who had been employed at Rome. He remembered reading a denunciation by Mr. O'Connell of the employment of a Mr. Petre, an English Catholic, some 50 years ago, for similar purposes. It was mere affectation to conceal the fact that the Papal tribunal was continually beset by the Representatives of every Power in the world. He should, therefore, certainly have been very much surprised if the English Government had not their Representative at Rome. He was, however, sorry to find that that Representative was an Irish Catholic. But the Irish National Party ought to enter into the lists of diplomacy just as well as Her Majesty's Government. He thought his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) rather overshot the mark in stating that that was the first time that a personal attack had been made by a Roman document. He (Mr. O'Donnell) had already expressed his opinion as to the impropriety of the measure which was recommended to the Papacy, and of the false information supplied to the Papacy; but, at the same time, there was nothing extraordinary or unparalleled in the action of the Papacy. He meant to say that personal interference was a thing for which hundreds of parallels could be found in the history of the Roman Catholic Church, and that, on many other occasions, the Roman Catholic tribunal had in its action been quite as unjust as in the present instance. He hardly agreed with the statement of his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo that the Papal *prononcement* was obtained by means of that secret description referred to by his hon. Friend. It was a matter of public notoriety that, for months past, Mr. Errington had been at work in Rome. The character of his work everyone knew very well, and he and his hon. Friends had had full warning to take proper steps in the matter. They also knew that Mr. Errington was by no means alone; that he was supported by a considerable number of other persons; and he (Mr. O'Donnell) could assure his hon. Friends of the Irish Party that they would be devoting their abilities to something like a task of crushing a small nut with a Nasmyth hammer if they expended much more of their attention upon Mr. Errington, who was only a small thing in the machinery which England had put in force for the purpose of damaging the Irish cause in the eyes of the Papacy. He hoped that much more comprehensive means would be set on foot to counteract the intrigues of the Treasury Bench against Irish nationality, both in Ireland, Rome, and in other parts of the Continent. He was sorry to say that an enormous amount of slander had been allowed to get in circulation throughout Europe; and he thought the Irish Party would be responsible for the future of their country if they did not take adequate means to defend Ireland outside of Great Britain as well as within the walls of that House.

Mr. O'BRIEN said, that, after the eloquent speeches of his hon. Friends the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) and the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen), he only desired to say a very few words indeed to express his satisfaction that the "iron masked mystery" was at length revealed. They knew now that Mr. Errington is or was a more or less reputable Envoy of England. Up to the present, he was represented as very little better than a busy-body, a kind of tourist, amusing himself by dabbling in amateur diplomacy. They knew, however, now that he was an official, or a semi-official, or a demi-semi-official, Representative of Ireland. As the hon. Member for Newcastle had said, he (Mr. O'Brien) did not see why the people of England, as well as the people of Ireland, need have been left in the dark until Mr. Errington had done his work in Rome, and had obtained a Vatican decree, which, if it be loyally observed, would not only restore the relations between the Holy See and England, but would restore those relations to the footing they were on before the Reformation. He said "loyally observed;" but he did not mean observed in the spirit of last Saturday's speech at Stafford House, but be observed in the spirit of Mr. Errington's private assurances in Rome for a month past. It was for the people of England themselves to make up their minds whether they wanted to restore the temporal power to the Pope. Was the Pope to prescribe and proscribe a political Leader of the Irish people? Let the people of England settle that with the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Government. The people of Ireland would show they were pretty well able to take care of themselves. He was afraid it was not a very productive work to confront the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister with old declarations he had himself made. Certainly, one-half of his eminent career had been passed in making great speeches, and the other half had been passed in explaining them away. His speech to-night showed that there was no decline in his power in that respect. It was for the House to say whether the right hon. Gentleman had receded from the standpoint from which he denounced the Vatican 10 years ago, and denounced the "rusty tools" with which it went to work. Undoubtedly, upon this occasion, the right hon. Gentleman had revived one of those "rusty tools" which, in his renowned pamphlet, he so vehemently denounced. He (Mr. O'Brien) would not detain the House further than to say that he thought a careful study of that debate in Rome would show the Pope and the Sacred College of the Propaganda what crooked and humiliating intrigues had been going on all round; and would show what a poor compensation the insulting patronage and the contemptuous applause of the eulogist of Garibaldi would be for the estrangement of the tried loyalty of the Irish people.

Mr. MARUM said, a certain amount of fair play ought to be exhibited in this matter. His Holiness the Pope was not present. No notice had been given him of the discussion. There was no official appearance on his behalf; and yet, in his absence, his action was very freely criticized and condemned. What, he (Mr. Marum) asked, did the Circular which had been so much condemned amount to? It was merely declaratory of the common law of the Catholic Church, so to speak, and not in any sense enactive; it was conversant with disciplinary admonition alone, and did not touch the laity, nor travel out of matter of ecclesiastical cognizance. The Pope was clearly within his rights in its issue, and the law he promulgated bound himself as absolutely and stringently as the humblest curate in Christendom, and was equally immutable whether dormant or active. He showed that the allegation that the Pope was a Foreign Prelate or Potentate betrayed only ignorance of the vital principles of Catholicism—universality and unity; that the Pope was an Irish Bishop as absolutely as any ecclesiastic who had ever borne an Irish crozier, at the same time being Head of the Irish Hierarchy and Premier Bishop of Christendom, and not merely of special nationalities alone, but of all nationalities in the universe, blended together in the ecclesiastical sense. He submitted that there was nothing in the document itself intrinsically giving it political incidence so far as the Pope was concerned. What proof or evidence had been given of the complicity of the Pope in any of the supposed movements which had been condemned? He did not want to defend the Government in the matter. Let them look to themselves; but he certainly thought that before His Holiness, who was the absent party, was condemned, it ought to be shown that he was guilty of complicity in the supposed movement. As to matters external to the Circular, what proofs of the complicity of the Pope with the British Government were adduced? The noble Lord alluded to the Prime Minister's speech at Stafford House. Why, that utterance struck at the very root of the temporal power, and was an argument quite the other way altogether. He had formerly defended the Pope against the Prime Minister, and was the first layman who had forwarded him a pamphlet reply to *Vaticanism* duly acknowledged. He ridiculed the "unification" doctrine and revivalism of effete Empires, as propounded by the Prime Minister. He asked what page of history recorded a former Kingdom of Italy with Rome as its capital; and was Britain yet to fall under a new Roman Empire? Could the Pope be conceived to be in complicity with the authors, aiders, and abettors of the plunder and confiscation of his own—the Papal territories? It was absurd! Again, what further proofs of complicity were adduced? Was it the Prime Minister's fulsome laudation of the Papal spoliators?—of the bandit Garibaldi, whom the French nation, exercising European police, expelled ignominiously from Rome, re-instating the loyal Sovereign—Pope Pius IX.—of the usurper Victor Emmanuel, who, without declaration of war, and in violation of International Law, had invaded the territories of, and sacrilegiously seized upon, the most venerable dynasty in the universe — of Cavour, his unscrupulous Prime Minister; and lastly of Panizzi, the convicted felon or Carbonaro, condemned to death at Modena as such, member of an infamous secret society! Could the Pope be imagined to be in complicity with a Government, the foreign policy of which, within the past week, was announced from its Chief, the Prime Minister, at Stafford House, as utterly subversive of Papal rights and in favour of the Papal spoliators? Even if Pope Leo were disposed to condone the spoliative acts, the law of the Church would not empower him to release the universal glebe or mensal lands —*non possumus!* He submitted that in the Circular itself, intrinsically or in matters external, there was not a particle of proof of complicity in the Pope, but the evidence was entirely the other way; and, as an Irish Catholic, he protested against the groundless imputations cast upon the Head of the Catholic Church not officially represented, and made *ex parte*, and as a piece of Party tactics in the House by the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock. The Premier Bishop of Christendom, exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction within Her Majesty's Dominions in Ireland, was perfectly justified—nay, it was his bounden duty—to obtain information from every available quarter, including the Civil Governors of the country, as to matters of fact for his guidance. The Judge and jury should hear the perjured witness as well as the just and truthful man; and was it, therefore, to be solely deduced that the verdict found, in any possible direction, was thereby unduly influenced by the false evidence adduced. That would be *post hoc propter hoc* with a vengeance. Such contention was insensible and repugnant—it was illogical and absurd. In behalf of the absent—in behalf of His Holiness, he might almost say for the absent defendant—he must protest against these imputations being cast upon him, unless some stronger evidence than that which had been adduced was forthcoming.

MR. BELLINGHAM said, he wished to enter a protest against the suggestion that His Holiness the Pope had acted at the dictation of the British Government. The thing was absurd, and not to be credited for a moment. The Prime Minister was led to believe that by his negotiations with the Pope he had offended a large number of his Protestant supporters, who regarded what had occurred as a Papal intrigue; and he, therefore, went to Stafford House to assist in a Garibaldi celebration, and made a good Protestant speech to appease them. His (Mr. Bellingham's) object in rising, however, was simply to enter a protest against the absurd allegation that the Pope had acted at the dictation of the British Government.

MR. CALLAN said, he wished to make a few observations on this subject, as an Irish Catholic. He did not speak on behalf of His Holiness the Pope, nor as his hon. Colleague (Mr. Bellingham) had done, but he spoke as one born in the faith. As an Irish Ultramontane, he had to express his regret at the course of the debate generally, and also his pleasure at one portion of it. He was very glad that the veil had been torn aside, and that it was now made known that it had been not merely Mr. Errington who had been engaged in this intrigue. Mr. Errington was only a fly upon the wheel; in fact, he (Mr. Callan) thought Mr. Errington did not go to Rome expressly on behalf of the British Government. He believed the popular rumour was correct, that Mr. Errington had gone to Rome, as many men went on the Cup Day to Ascot, to look out for a wife. ["Question!"] That was the question—what took Mr. Errington to Rome. He believed Mr. Errington went to the Eternal City, not as the accredited Ambassador of the British Government, but, like a celebrated character, in search of a wife. What was his career in Rome? He had been made a scapegoat, the real Envoy, the real intriguer, who had discharged his functions with Machiavellian audacity, having been the Lord Chancellor, Lord O'Hagan. That was the man who had worked the oracle, and whose finger was to be found in the pie. Mr. Errington was a very good mam—a very good man—a frequenter of the classic regions of Pimlico.

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to address himself seriously to the Question before the House.

MR. CALLAN: I wish to do so, Sir. I desire to show that Mr. Errington's life in London has been of so trifling a nature as to render it altogether improbable that he would have been selected for a mission of this kind.

MR. SPEAKER: Again I must call on the hon. Member to address himself seriously to the Question before the House.

MR. CALLAN said, he would confine himself, on this point, merely to saying that he believed Lord O'Hagan to have been the real intriguer in this matter. He would not say anything about Mr. Errington, who was a most respectable Gentleman, who would never sit in the House again, either for an Irish or an English constituency. The work had been done by Lord O'Hagan, under the shadow of Mr. Errington's name. As an Ultramontane, he (Mr. Callan) paid every respect to the authority of Rome. He had done so in the past, and he should continue to do so. He should not subscribe to the Testimonial Fund, the Sacred College having condemned it. But, whilst that was the position he took up, he had not been ignorant of what was going on around him. He knew the usual method by which the Court of Rome communicated with the heads of the Church in Ireland. When she communicated with these heads, she did so by a secret missive; that missive was considered by the Bishops called together for the purpose, and presided over by the Papal Legate, or whoever was, for the time being, at the head of the Episcopal authorities. After considering the missive, the Bishops, as their wisdom dictated, published the Roman Pastoral with their own instructions to the clergy. But what had been done in the present case? Had the Irish Bishops received a Pastoral, and had it been communicated by them to the Irish people? ["Question!"] He was addressing himself, he believed, to the Question. He was endeavouring to point out the difference between this missive under discussion, alleged to have been sent out with the concurrence of the Pope, and the other missives which His Holiness from time to time addressed to the Bishops of the Church. All communications from the Pope concerning the discipline of the Church came through the Bishops; but how did this communication come—how did it first see the light? Why, by Mr. Errington's communicating it to the Roman Correspondent of *The Times* newspaper. Had they ever known in Ireland such an important document being sent to the Irish Bishops through journals which had stigmatized the priests of Ireland as "surpliced ruffians?" Certainly not. No; the cloven hoof was visible in this matter, and it was plain enough to see that this missive had been obtained, not in the regular course of ecclesiastical discipline, not from the Pope, but from certain Italian Cardinals, who had sent it to Mr. Errington. One of the best known of Italian characteristics was duplicity. How did the missive come? Through *The Times*——

Mr. HORACE DAVEY rose to Order. He wished to ask Mr. Speaker whether the difference between the method of publishing the recent letter from the Pope, and other missives, was the Question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already informed the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Callan) that he is not addressing himself to the Question before the House, and I am sorry he has not attended to my direction in the matter.

Mr. CALLAN said, it seemed he was in error in believing it to be essential in this debate to show that the missive communicated by Mr. Errington to *The Times* was different to all other letters sent for the guidance of the Catholic Bishops and people, and must have been obtained through British influence at the Holy See. As Mr. Speaker held that he was not in Order in going into that matter, he would not do so further. He would simply refer to the speech delivered by the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. Joseph Cowen) in a sentence. The hon. Member had said, and said most justly, correcting some hon. Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House, that the Pope was driven from Rome not by Garibaldi, but by the assassination of Count Rossi. The assassins of Count Rossi were paid out of an English Fund belonging to a society called "The Friends of Liberty," to which one of the most generous subscribers was the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (Mr. W. E. Forster).

Mr. DAWSON said, that, as one who was deeply attached to the traditions of a spiritual character which bound the people of Ireland to the Holy See, he knew more than hon. Gentlemen opposite would, perhaps, be prepared to admit, of what the Holy See and the Church had done for the promotion of literature and science, and the many temporal as well as spiritual blessings Ireland possessed. It was only just to state what he knew of the feeling of the Irish people on the subject under discussion; and he was glad of the opportunity, for statements such as this—made in such a place—in fact, the debate altogether would do a great deal towards clearing the atmosphere all round, both in Rome and Ireland. The Holy Father would see—if he did not see already—that he had been, he (Mr. Dawson) would not say duped, but, to some extent, misled. He would be surprised to find that the information he had received from Mr. Errington and the British Government had been of a hopelessly incorrect character, and one-sided in the extreme. Hon. Members opposite, who were not Catholics, would remember that the Pope acted in two capacities. He said nothing binding on Catholic consciences when he spoke on political matters. Letters which had been issued by the Sacred College on political subjects had never had any binding effect upon the consciences of Catholics, and they never would have. A man could not, as a Catholic, pronounce a greater heresy, and one more dangerous to the Church, than that the Pope was supreme in political matters. [" Question ! "] Nothing, he maintained, could be a greater heresy than to ascribe infallibity to a communication from the Sacred College on political matters. [" Question ! "] It was clear that hon. Members who made that demonstration knew very little about Roman history or literature, or anything connected with the subject of the debate. This debate would clear the atmosphere in Rome, because the Holy Father would have an answer from Ireland, telling him that the representations which had been made to him were altogether unworthy of his great and supreme consideration. He (Mr. Dawson) would point out to the British Government how useless was the attempt to seek to rob Ireland of her religion by political movements of this kind. They had sought to wring Ireland from Rome by contumely and abuse; but they had not done it, and now they sought, by deceit, to rend Rome from Ireland, but they would miserably fail. If they thought that, by appealing to Rome, they were going to silence the voice of Ireland against their misrule, they were mistaken. That voice, in the future, would be louder than it had ever been before; and Rome would hear it as well as them. Rome would look deeper into the matter, and the Government might rest assured that their intrigue for the separation of Rome and Ireland would not succeed. To their confusion, the result would be greater unity. As a Catholic, and knowing the opinions of millions of the people of England, he said that, although the Government had gone in the face of the nation, and of the doctrines of those men—Garibaldi and the rest—whom they had received with jubilation, and had demeaned themselves and stultified themselves by negotiating with the Power these men had sought to overthrow, they would learn that there was no Power on earth—not even that of Rome—capable of dictating to Ireland a political course of action. Did the Government wish to create more trouble in Ireland, they could not have gone more surely to work than to have dared to hold over the Irish people the threat of spiritual Rome in these temporal matters. Ireland would pursue her course on every point, no matter what Circular was issued by the spiritual Propaganda. It was only when they coincided with the messages from the Holy See politically that they would agree to follow her dictates. One great Pontiff, Sixtus the Sixth—

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member (Mr. Dawson) that he is not confining himself to the Question before the House.

MR. DAWSON said, he understood that the Question before the House was the influence of an English Envoy at Rome. He thought it was left by the Prime Minister to be understood that the issue and outcome of that agency was the Circular to which reference had been made. The right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had congratulated the House upon the result of that affair; but he (Mr. Dawson) would tell him, as a responsible Minister of the Crown, and as a Member of the House of Commons, that he had made a mistake in using such an Envoy for a purpose which he would not achieve. He thought, with very great respect, that he (Mr. Dawson) was outside the ruling of the Chair; but, however, he would not pursue the matter further.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution read a second time, and *agreed to.*

MOTIONS.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRADE, SHIPPING, AND MANUFACTURES.

RESOLUTION.

MR. GOSCHEN said, he was instructed, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, to move the following Resolution :—

> "That the Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures have leave to sit on Mondays till half-past Four of the clock, and on Fridays till half-past Two of the clock, during the Sitting of the House."

As Morning Sittings had now commenced in the House, the Committee were anxious to utilize, as far as possible, the interval before the commencement of Public Business; but the House would bear in mind that when the Standing Committees were originally formed, a Standing Order was passed declaring that—

> "The said Committees shall not sit while the House is sitting without the Order of the House."

Under that Standing Order, the Committee over which he had the honour to preside were anxious to obtain the leave of the House to sit for an extra half-hour on two days of the week.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That the Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures have leave to sit on Mondays till half-past Four of the clock, and on Fridays till half-past Two of the clock, during the Sitting of the House."—(*Mr. Goschen.*)

MR. BERESFORD HOPE said, he was rather surprised that this Motion should be made—a Motion so important—at a time when the House was unprepared for it. The circumstances under which the Standing Order which the right hon. Gentleman now called upon them to vary was made were fresh in the recollection of the House. When these Standing Committees were proposed, they necessarily occasioned a good deal of discussion during that Autumn Session which had been forced upon an unwilling House. They were accepted by the House loyally, but with considerable misgiving, and qualified by a strong desire that they should not spoil the Business of the House by interfering with the Sittings of the House. After long debates, in which the right hon. Member for South-West Lancashire took a prominent part in opposing them, an agreement was come to, in terms suggested by the Prime Minister; and the operative Standing Order was framed, of which the important words were these—

> "The said Committees shall be excluded from the operations of the Standing Order of July 21, 1856, and the said Committees shall not sit, whilst the House is sitting, without the Order of the House."

That was passed on the 30th November last. No doubt, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon was strictly within his rights in making the Motion which had now been submitted to the House; but he was not within the spirit of those rights; he was not within the spirit in which the House assented to the formation of these Grand Committees. Those Committees were still in their most tender infancy. They were an innovation, and already his right hon. Friend wished to vary that innovation. Why did he wish to vary it? In order to bolster up another innovation which gave up Tuesdays and Fridays to the Government in a much more wholesale manner than had ever been done before. The right hon. Gentleman had given no good reason for the change; and he (Mr. Beresford Hope) thought that such a change, so counter to the assurances which had led to the autumnal capitulation, ought not to be granted by an exhausted House at 2 o'clock in the morning, especially when hon. Members had to be there again at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. He would move the Adjournment of the Debate.

MR. WARTON said, he thought it was impossible that they should go on extending the work beyond the powers of an average Member of Parliament. The Government were trying to carry their measures by a process of sheer exhaustion. These Committees were agreed to under solemn promises given; but it was the habit of the Government to break all their promises; it was a regular plan with them. When the New Rules were made, they said the Committees were not to sit during the Sitting of the House, and what was now proposed was a clear breach of faith. If the Resolution now proposed was carried, hon. Members who sat on the Grand Committees would be deprived of the opportunity of hearing prayers. The Government, which tried to foist an Atheist on the House, might not have a very good opinion of prayers; but it was the duty and the privilege of hon. Members to pray. He would, therefore, second the Motion for the Adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he would have liked to make a few observations on the subject; but he understood that, under the New Rules, it was impossible for him to do so. He was, therefore, reluctantly compelled to vote for the Adjournment.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, he should have thought that the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken (Mr. Sclater-Booth) would have done the exact opposite. He (Mr. Chamberlain) was precluded from answering the observations of the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), because the Motion now before the House was one for the Adjournment of the Debate; and he thought it was desirable that that right hon. Gentleman should withdraw his Motion, so that a discussion could be taken on the Main Question.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he should have agreed with the view just expressed, had it not been for the fact that it was now 2 o'clock in the morning. He had a good deal to say on the subject that he could not say now, and he did not think the House was in a proper condition for discussion.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 34; Noes 99: Majority 65.—(Div. List, No. 120.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, he could not help thinking that the right hon. Gentleman who made the last Motion (Mr. Beresford Hope) was under some misapprehension; because he said that the object of the Government in this matter was to vary the Standing Order, which, as the hon. and learned Gentleman who seconded that Motion (Mr. Warton) said, constituted something like a breach of faith with the House. He (Mr. Chamberlain) desired to call attention to the words of the Standing Order, which were that—

> "The said Committees shall not sit, whilst the House is sitting, without the Order of the House."

Now, if those words had any meaning at all, the Standing Order distinctly contemplated that there were circumstances in which the leave of the House might be applied for, and the direction of the House obtained. Both the Mover and Seconder of the Motion for Adjournment complained of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen) for having introduced this subject at that period of the evening; but he (Mr. Chamberlain) would point out that his right hon. Friend had no alternative in the matter. His right hon. Friend had not acted for himself, but only by the direction and on behalf of the Committee. It had been arranged, with the consent of the House, that Morning Sittings would be taken on Tuesdays and Fridays. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Beresford Hope) said that that was an innovation at this period of the year. He thought, however, that the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken; because it had been the practice, under the late Government, to take Morning Sittings on those days earlier in the Session. For instance, the Valuation Bill was taken at Morning Sittings which began on the 6th of May. There was nothing, then, unusual in the Government asking the House to commence Morning Sittings on Tuesdays and Fridays. He considered it convenient, under the circumstances, to ask that the Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures should not sit on those days; and he accordingly made a proposition in the Committee that it should sit on Mondays and Thursdays. Objections were taken to that proposal, on the ground that the Members of the Committee had made all their arrangements, which it would be extremely inconvenient to alter. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) then proposed that the Committee should sit three-quarters of an hour longer on Mondays, and half an hour longer on Fridays, thus giving the Committee an hour and a-quarter, in place of the two hours and a-half, which he showed was the whole time gained by sitting on the other days. As that appeared a fair compromise, he (Mr. Chamberlain) withdrew his proposition, and accepted that of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets. The hon. Member for West Essex (Sir Henry Selwin - Ibbetson) proposed that their application to the House should be to sit till 5 o'clock on Monday, because he said it would not be a serious matter to miss a few of the earlier Questions; but it was pointed out that that would be inconvenient, among other reasons, because Members of the Government might have to attend in their places to answer Questions. The proposal of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets was then put and accepted, *nemine contradicente.* It was under these circumstances that his right hon. Friend the Member for Ripon had made the Motion before the House, and which, as it represented the unanimous wish of the Members of the Standing Committee, he trusted would be agreed to.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he made no complaint whatever of the course taken by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Goschen) in making this Motion, because he was only acting in accordance with the wish of the Standing Committee; but it was quite another question whether the House should agree to the Motion at that hour (2.5). It was a question whether, under the Standing Order, the Committee had any power to make the suggestion at all, which the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Chamberlain) described as a compromise, although he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) agreed that the proposal was made in the least objectionable form. When the Standing Committees were appointed it was certainly the understanding eventually arrived at that they were not to continue to sit while the House was sitting. Now, if the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon were carried, and the principle were admitted that, simply by the wish of the Members, these Grand Committees might go on sitting, and so overlap the Sittings of the House, there was nothing to prevent another Motion being made next year that they should sit continuously. He wished to show that if they once admitted the principle in an easy case it would be absolutely impossible to resist it in a more difficult one. He doubted whether the interpretation given by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade of the Standing Order was the correct one. When that Order was before the House there was great discussion as to whether the Standing Committees should go on the principle of the Select Committees, and the decision was that the procedure should be the same as that of Select Committees, unless the House should otherwise order. That he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) understood to mean that the Committee might come to the House and ask for an extension of time on a special occasion. But no Select Committee that ever sat had thought of coming to the House to ask for leave to sit continuously. The Standing Order went on to say—

> "Provided also, That the said Committees shall be excluded from the operation of the Standing Order of July 21st, 1856, and the said Committees shall not sit, whilst the House is sitting, without the Order of the House."

He imagined that the spirit of those words was that the Order of the House on every special occasion should be obtained. That matter came about on a Motion of his own. In view of the difficulty which would result from the Committee sitting during the Sitting of the House, he moved to insert the words, "which shall only sit whilst the House is not sitting." The House debated the question throughout the evening, and the Government were very strong in their opposition to the proposal. The Prime Minister was absent on the occasion; and he remembered saying that had he been in his place he would have given way on the point raised. The hon. Member for Bedford, who was present, said he thought it was only reasonable to add to the Amendment the words, "except by leave of the House obtained on each occasion." The next day the Prime Minister came down to the House and made a statement, in which he said he had considered the matter, and eventually the Order was passed in its present form. But he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) believed it was generally understood by the House that it was only on special occasions that the Committee should ask leave to sit while the House was sitting. It was all very well to say that only an hour was involved in the one case, and three-quarters of an hour in the other; but the proposal would entail upon hon. Members many inconveniences that he was sure they would not like; for instance, there would be no interval whatever between the times of attendance in the Committees and in the House, and then there would be a great difficulty in securing their seats in the House. Moreover, the proposal before the House was only a matter of compromise; and he was, therefore, bound to say that he did not attach much weight to the fact that the Committee were unanimous upon it. The proposal would never have been made had it not been for the Morning Sittings to be held on Tuesdays and Fridays; and had it been made under other circumstances, he believed that a very different opinion with regard to it would have been expressed. For those reasons he protested against the principle sought to be established, and because he was certain that if it were adopted a future Minister might use it as a precedent for some more inconvenient form of procedure.

MR. WHITBREAD said, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had reminded him (Mr. Whitbread) of a suggestion he had made, he might be permitted also to remind him that that suggestion was not accepted by the House, and that the right hon. Gentleman himself had said that the proposal would not get rid of the difficulty. The Prime Minister, who, as the right hon. Gentleman had stated, was absent on the occasion, came down on the 30th of November, and, in the course of his statement, said that it was the general feeling of the House that the Grand Committees should, not be sitting during the Sitting of the House; but he added that there could be no doubt that it was in the power of the House to authorize any one of its Committees to sit during the Sitting of the House. He (Mr. Whitbread) thought it advisable to accede to the Motion before them at a time when the House was doing its best to get through Business. The proposal was not that the Standing Committee should sit during the debating hours of the House; but that it should take advantage of the time when Private Business and other formalities were gone through. If the House was disposed to get through its Business, he thought that the Motion which, with the unanimous voice of the Committee, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon had been instructed to make should be agreed to.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, there were many things permissible under the Standing Orders which were not expedient, and the proposal before the House appeared to him to be one of them. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Goschen) and the Committee should so early think it necessary to depart from the understanding of the House with regard to these Committees. If the Standing Committees had had any success—and he thought their success had been considerable—it was owing to the fact that they had departed as widely as possible from the practice of Select Committees, and had conformed as nearly as possible to that of the Committee of the Whole House. The immediate result of the change proposed by his right hon. Friend would be to assimilate the practice in respect of the Standing Committees to that of Select Committees and Committees of less important character. These Standing Committees consisted of 80 or 90 Members; and he thought it was too much to ask the House to discharge so large a number of its Members from attending in their places at the proper time. He desired to see a future of great usefulness attending the institution of the Standing Committees, and he believed they would do much to relieve the House of a large amount of Business that would be less well done by Committees of smaller dimensions; but if they were to allow them to sit concurrently with the House of Commons, he was sure that by so doing they would very materially interfere with its powers.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, he did not think there was much difference of opinion on either side of the House with regard to this proposal. The spirit of the original Standing Order was quite clear; it was that when the House was really in active Session the Committees should not sit upstairs; but what was the extremely limited proposal now made? They all knew what generally happened at this period of the Session. Private Bills had, to a considerable extent, run out, and the Speaker had to remain sometimes half-an-hour doing nothing; and the suggestion now made was that during that time, when their presence in the House was not required, hon. Members should be allowed to sit upstairs in Committees. Members might suffer some inconvenience by not taking their places; but they were quite willing to sacrifice that consideration. As he thought they all felt it was necessary to keep to the spirit of the Standing Order and to use the time that was now wasted, he believed the House was nearly unanimous upon this moderate proposal.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he thought the proposal of the President of the Board of Trade was very objectionable, for it disarranged all the arrangements hon. Members had made. If he went to a division, no doubt the right hon. Gentleman could carry his proposal; but this proposal was not the desire of the Committee.

Mr. W. FOWLER said, there had not been a word of dissension in the Committee upon this proposal. The proposition was, not that the Committees should sit when the House was practically sitting, but simply while the House was doing what it could perfectly well do without the presence of the Members of the Committees. If they were willing to continue sitting, he hoped the House would not insist upon refusing this moderate request.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT said, he had given the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Chamberlain) warning that this proposal would not pass without challenge. The proposal was that the Committees should have leave to sit till half-past 4, and the argument was that that was the time when Private Business was being dealt with; but this was a time of the year when Private Business ceased to occupy much time. What would happen? In a short time it would be proposed that Public Business should begin at a quarter past 4; and then the Committees would be sitting for a quarter of an hour during Questions. Besides that, at the Morning Sittings, Public Business might begin as soon as the Private Business was got through; and so, both on Monday and Friday, the Committees would be sitting while Public Business was proceeding. The Government had, in the person of the right hon. Gentleman who took the chief part in one of these Committees (Mr. Chamberlain), one of their most energetic Members; but was it right to tax human endurance to this extent? What happened now in the case of the right hon. Gentleman? Very often most important Questions were addressed to him in the House. If this proposal were adopted he would have to sit upstairs from 12 o'clock to half-past 4. The Committee had lately passed a Rule which deprived the right hon. Gentleman of his luncheon, for which they had previously given him a quarter of an hour; and now he would have to come straight to the House and find a number of impetuous Gentlemen ready with Questions which he would have to answer. It was not fair to him, full of vigour as he might be, to expect him to devote all his time from 12 o'clock at noon to this late hour—2 or 3 in the morning—to the House. Hon. Gentlemen were trying to drive a willing horse too hard and too far. If they wanted these Committees to work they must work them in the manner originally proposed. Whatever hon. Gentlemen might say about the spirit of the law, as proposed by the Prime Minister and accepted by the House, it meant that the Committees should not sit while the House was sitting. This proposal was the thin end of the wedge; and if it was agreed to now by the House—and, of course, the Government could carry it—the Standing Committees would receive a serious blow, because the understanding arrived at last year was not being properly carried out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir Farrer Herschell) said, he thought that if the hon. Member (Mr. J. G. Talbot) had intended to convey a warning that this arrangement would not be assented to, he was unfortunate in not conveying that intention to the Members of the Committee when the proposal was accepted *sub silentio*. If it was his intention to upset the proposal, it would have been only fair to have let those who made the proposal understand that. Whatever the hon. Member intended, that intention was not conveyed.

Mr. DIXON-HARTLAND said, he did not think any hon. Members on the other side of the House would say that he was accustomed to support the Government in any measure they brought forward; but, upon this point, he could not help feeling that, if he did not support the Government, he should be committing a breach of faith. At the beginning of the Committee certain days were fixed, and he was the Member who had proposed that the days should be fixed. Upon that, every Member of the Committee made his arrangements; and when the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain), the other day, tried arbitrarily to alter the days, it was thought that that would cause such inconvenience that many Members would not be able to attend, and a compromise was effected. As it was a compromise, he thought hon. Members sitting on the Committee were bound to support the proposal, and he should have no option but to do so.

Original Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 97; Noes 30: Majority 67.—(Div. List, No. 121.)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JOHN HOLMS, Bill for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under "The Electric Lighting Act, 1882," relating to Cambridge, Canterbury, Chelsea, Folkestone, Gravesend, Greenock, Greenwich, Finchley, High Wycombe, Ipswich, Maidstone, and Sunderland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JOHN HOLMS and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 216.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JOHN HOLMS, Bill for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under "The Electric Lighting Act, 1882," relating to Aston, Birkdale, Dudley, Saltley, Ulverston, West Bromwich, and Wolverhampton, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JOHN HOLMS and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 217.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (NO. 3) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JOHN HOLMS, Bill for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under "The Electric Lighting Act, 1882," relating to Balsall Heath, Birmingham, Redditch, and Walsall, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JOHN HOLMS and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 218.]

RAILWAY PASSENGER DUTY, &C. BILL.

On Motion of Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, Bill to amend the Law relating to Railway Passenger Duty, and to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the conveyance of the Queen's Forces by Railway, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Sir ARTHUR HAYTER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 219.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT AND ILLEGAL PRACTICES) [PAYMENT OF COSTS AND EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the Expenses of the Director of Public Prosecutions, including the remuneration of his representative, and of the costs of prosecution on indictment, in like manner as the costs of the prosecution for felony in Ireland, and for crimes in Scotland are paid; and the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, in the first instance, of any costs (not being costs of prosecution or indictment) payable by a county or borough, under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for the better prevention of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

[INDEX.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

VOLUME CCLXXIX.

FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1883.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—1*st. Div.*, 2*nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY—NAVY—INDIA—IRELAND—SCOTLAND—PARLIAMENT—POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS—CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EDUCATION—CRIMINAL LAW—LAW AND JUSTICE—TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABERCORN, Duke of
Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 369, 370

ACLAND, Sir T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Pay and Allowances, 852, 870

Africa (*South*)
LORDS
The Transvaal—The Transvaal Convention, Question, Observations, Viscount St. Vincent; Reply, The Earl of Derby; Observations, The Marquess of Salisbury *May* 31, 1285

Africa (*South*)
COMMONS (*Questions*)
The Transvaal
The Transvaal Convention, Questions, Sir William Hart Dyke, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 10, 411
The Loan, Questions, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *June* 7, 1903

Africa (*South*)—*The Transvaal*—cont.
Aggression of the Boers on Native Tribes, Questions, Mr. Guy Dawnay, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 31, 1309
Murder of Mr. J. S. M'Gilloray, Question, Mr. J. G. Hubbard; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 7, 28

Basutoland, Questions, Mr. Bourke, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Gorst, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *June* 4, 1644

Zululand
Cetewayo—The Native Tribes, Questions, Sir Henry Holland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 24, 754
Cetewayo, Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 25, 895
Natal, The Bishop of, Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 8, 221
Langalibalele, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 7, 22

Africa (*South*)—cont.

Her Majesty's Dominions—Policy of the Government, Notices, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Gorst *May* 28, 962

Provision for the Displaced Chiefs, Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 8, 235; *May* 29, 1104;—*Vote in Supply*, Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 7, 1922

Africa (*West Coast*)

River Congo—Action of Portugal, Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 7, 18; Question, Mr. Slagg; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 31, 1326

The Gold Coast—The French at Porto Novo, Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 29, 1098

Affairs of Ashantee, Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *June* 7, 1903

Agricultural Holdings Bill [Bill 42]
(*Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Monckton*)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 9, 321; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Heneage*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

Agricultural Holdings (*England*) *Bill*

Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gladstone *May* 10, 419; Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answers, Mr. Dodson *May* 31, 1328

Incorporation of Clauses of the Act of 1875, Question, Mr. Newzam-Nicholson; Answer, Mr. Dodson *June* 7, 1917

Leaseholders in Urban Districts, Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *June* 7, 1923

Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Solicitor General*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Dodson*) *May* 10, 512; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered *
Read 1° *May* 10, 519 [Bill 186]
Read 2°, after long debate *May* 29, 1110

Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)

c. Motion for Leave (*The Lord Advocate*) *May* 10, 516; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 190]
Read 2°, after long debate *June* 5, 1762

Agriculture—Report of the Royal Commission

Question, Mr. Round; Answer, Mr. Dodson *May* 24, 770

ALCESTER, Lord

Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, 1462

ALEXANDER, Colonel C., *Ayrshire, S.*

Army—Royal Warrant, 1882—Pensions of Officers' Widows, 1742
Army (India)—Indian Staff Corps, 1099
Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 803, 814
  Militia Pay and Allowances, 844
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 8, 1068
Scotland—Court of Criminal Appeal, 1484, 1485
Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 263
Supply—Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1032

ALLEN, Mr. H. G., *Pembroke, &c.*

Maintenance of Main Roads (South Wales), 1901

ANDERSON, Mr. G., *Glasgow*

Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), 1617
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure—Rule of Blocking Notices, 49, 1756
Post Office—American Mails, 1634
Stock Exchange—Report of Royal Commission, 1627

ARCHDALE, Mr. W. H., *Fermanagh*

Supply—Public Works in Ireland, 1360

ARMY (*Questions*)

Armoured Railway Trains—Lieutenant Colonel Campbell Walker, Question, Sir Joseph M'Kenna; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 29, 1098

Army Medical Inquiry—Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Puleston, Dr. Cameron, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone *May* 24, 760; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *May* 25, 894

Cavalry Regiments in Ireland, Question, Colonel O'Beirne; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 10, 403

Guards and Sentries, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 31, 1308

Lieutenant General Wilby, C.B., Question, Captain Price; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *May* 28, 962

Militia Officers with Line Regiments, Question, Earl Percy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 4, 1635

Musketry Instructors, Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 10, 382

Recruiting—"Waste" of the Army, Observations, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Reply, The Marquess of Hartington; debate thereon *June* 1, 1522

Army Enlistment—The New Regulations, Questions, Colonel Stanley, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 4, 1641

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

- *Rifle Ranges at Wormwood Scrubbs,* Question, Mr. Tatton Egerton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 31, 1317
- *Roman Catholic Soldiers on Board the "Euphrates" Troopship,* Questions, Mr. Bellingham, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 29, 1096
  - *Parading of Roman Catholic Soldiers for Divine Service on Holy Days,* Questions, Colonel Colthurst, Mr. Macartney; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter *June* 7, 1907
- *Royal Warrant,* 1882—*Pensions of Officers' Widows,* Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *June* 5, 1742
- *Soldiers' Illegitimate Children,* Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 7, 30
- *The Royal Engineers—Promotion,* Question, Mr. Greer; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 10, 402

Army (*India*)

- *European Soldiers at Barrackpur,* Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 21, 582
- *The Indian Establishment,* Questions, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter *May* 28, 957
- *The Indian Medical Service—Junior Medical Officers,* Questions, Mr. Leamy; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 28, 954; *June* 4, 1638
- *The Indian Staff Corps,* Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 29, 1099
- *Troops in India* (*Numbers*), Question, Lord George Hamilton; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *June* 7, 1907

The Auxiliary Forces

- Observations, Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Reply, The Earl of Morley; debate thereon *June* 4, 1574
- *Forage Allowance—Militia Officers' Horses,* Question, Earl Percy; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *June* 4, 1635
- *Militia Uniforms,* Question, Mr. Bellingham; Answer, Mr. Brand *May* 21, 584
- *Roman Catholic Militiamen,* Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 24, 777
- *The Adjutant of the Antrim Artillery,* Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Brand *May* 21, 587; Questions, Mr. Biggar, Earl Percy; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 31, 1305
- *Use by the Volunteers of the Butts at Wormwood Scrubbs,* Question, Admiral Egerton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 24, 784

Army and Navy Expenditure—"Extra Receipts"

- Questions, Mr. Salt, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 31, 1330

Arnold, Mr. A., *Salford*

- Africa (South)—Cetewayo, 895
- Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1155

[*cont.*

Arnold, Mr. A.—*cont.*

- Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 350
- Madagascar—Protection of Lives and Property of British Subjects, 1647
- Parliament—Lord Alcester's and Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bills, 527
- Russia—Trans-Caucasus Transit Duties, 763
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1218
- Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 251
- Supply—Land Commissioners for England, &c. Amendt. 1382, 1388
  - Local Government Board, 1403
  - New Courts of Justice, &c. 654
  - Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 461
  - Public Offices Site, 589
- Turkey—New Tariff, 783

Arrears of Rent (*Ireland*) *Act,* 1882

- *Section* 17—*Annual Drainage Instalments,* Questions, Observations, The Marquess of Waterford, The Earl of Belmore; Reply, Lord Carlingford *May* 7, 14
- *Case of James M'Gowan, Junr., Conacloon, Co. Leitrim,* Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 380

Ashley, Hon. E. M. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Isle of Wight*

- Africa (South)—Questions
  - Cetewayo, 896
  - Langalibalele, 23
  - Zululand, 754, 755;—Bishop of Natal, 221
- Africa (South)—Transvaal—Questions
  - Aggression of the Boers on Native Tribes, 1309, 1310
  - Loan, 1904
  - Murder of Mr. J. S. M'Gilloray, 28
- Africa (West Coast)—Affairs of Ashantee, 1903
  - French at Porto Novo, 1098, 1099
- Egypt—Egyptian Exiles in Ceylon, 1633
- India (Ceylon)—Privilege of Franking Letters—Bishop of Colombo, 934
- Jamaica and the Leeward Islands—Commission of Inquiry, 947
- West Indies (Jamaica)—Exports and Imports, 1851 to 1882, 962
- Western Islands of the Pacific—Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland, 1335

Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. E., *Eye*

- Armenia and European Turkey, Res. Amendt. 915, 918
- Egypt—Trial of Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 565, 567
- France and China, 1487, 1911
- India—Criminal Code Procedure Amendment—Reports of Local Governments, 1325
  - Law and Justice—Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, 1747
- Madagascar—The French Invasion, 1103
- Parliament—Business of the House, 899, 900; Ministerial Statement, 1109
- Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 250

[*cont.*

ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Turkey (Asiatic Provinces)—Governorship of the Lebanon, 402
Viceroy of India—Criminal Code Procedure Amendment Bill, 412, 413

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir H. JAMES), *Taunton*
Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, 1631
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences) (Ireland), 525
Judicature Acts—New Rules, 1335
Law and Justice—Court of Criminal Appeal—Opinion of the Judges, 1306, 1307
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 1650; 2R. 1660, 1696, 1699, 1707; Comm. 1967, 1971
Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879—"Queen *v.* Taylor and Boynes," 1748, 1749
Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 554, 555

AYLMER, Captain J. E. F., *Maidstone*
Supply—New Courts of Justice, &c. 642, 651
  Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 458, 461, 462, 470
  Science and Art Department, 680
  Surveys of the United Kingdom, 659
Theatres Regulation, 2R. 337

BAILEY, Sir J. R., *Herefordshire*
* Manchester Ship Canal Bill, 17

BALFOUR, Lord
Parliament—Parliamentary Procedure, Res. 1, 8, 11

BALFOUR, Right Hon. J. B. (Lord Advocate for Scotland), *Clackmannan, &c.*
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), Leave, 516, 518; 2R. 1793, 1806
Fishery Board (Scotland) and Post Office (Telegraph) Department — Extension of Telegraph to Outlying Fishing Stations, 1479
Lunacy Acts—Case of Hugh Flanagan, 887
Scotland—Questions
  Irish National League in Glasgow, 1484, 1485
  Law and Justice—Procurators Fiscal and Private Practice—Case of W. Meikle, 26
  Scottish Legal Friendly Society — Dishonesty of Officials, 776
Supply—Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland, 1037
  Registry of Friendly Societies, 1374, 1378

BALFOUR, General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. 1769
Army—Guards and Sentries, 1308
Army Estimates—Divine Service, 793
  Militia Pay and Allowances, 829
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 717
India—Duty on Jewellery, 1094
  Hall Marking — Gold and Silver Plate 389

[*cont.*

BALFOUR, General Sir G.—*cont.*
Supply—Furniture of Public Offices, Great Britain, 610
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 982, 984, 987, 997
  New Courts of Justice, &c. 650
  Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 468
  Public Works in Ireland, 1358, 1359
  Revenue Department, Great Britain, 611
  Surveys of the United Kingdom, 659

BALFOUR, Mr. A. J., *Hertford*
Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1565
Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 811, 816
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. 728
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. Amendt. 195
Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 762
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1424
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 985, 992
  Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 424
  Local Government Board, 1411

Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment Bill (*Sir Charles Dilke, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 10, 388
Committee deferred, after short debate *June* 1, 1571 [Bill 5]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 5, 1806; after short debate, Debate adjourned

BARCLAY, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Agricultural Holdings, 2R. 331
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), Leave, 516, 518; 2R. 1770, 1771, 1786
Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 742
Fishery Board (Scotland) and Post Office (Telegraph) Department — Extension of Telegraph to Outlying Fishing Stations, 1479
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Report of Select Committee, 1299, 1301; Consid. 1830

BARTTELOT, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex W.*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1110, 1126
Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1522, 1549, 1552
Army Estimates, 587
  Administration of Military Law, 806, 812
Contagious Diseases Acts—Metropolitan Police, 29; Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 68, 69
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 976, 977
Parliament — Public Business, Ministerial Statement, 1926

[*cont.*

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B.—*cont.*
Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 760, 761
Supply—British Museum, &c. 687
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, Amendt. 1425, 1429
Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 983, 984
Local Government Board, 1389
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1035
Public Offices Site, 602
Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1190
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1836

Bath, Marquess of
Tithe Rent-charge, 2R. 1282

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-, *Gloucestershire, E.*
Africa (South)—Questions
Cetewayo, 895, 896
H.M. Dominions—Policy of the Government, Notice of Motion, 962
Provision for African Chiefs, 1104, 1922
Transvaal, 235, 411, 412;—Aggression of the Boers on Native Tribes, 1310
Zululand, 754, 755;—Bishop of Natal, 221
Africa (West Coast)—The French at Porto Novo, 1198, 1199
Agricultural Holdings (England), 419; 2R. 1175, 1328
Parliament—Business of the House, 508
Public Business, Ministerial Statement, 410, 534, 1106, 1108, 1925
Western Islands of the Pacific—Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland, 1334

Beauchamp, Earl
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1270

Bellingham, Mr. A. H., *Louth*
Army—Roman Catholic Soldiers on Board the "Euphrates" Troopship, 1096
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Militia Uniforms, 584
Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 2001

Belmore, Earl of
Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882—Section 17—Annual Drainage Instalments, 15
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Law Adviser, 379

Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish, *Whitehaven*
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 72, 74
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1229, 1239
South Kensington Museum—Painting by Sir Frederick Leighton, 898, 899
Supply—British Museum, &c. 685
Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 421, 436

[*cont.*

Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish—*cont.*
New Courts of Justice, &c. 639, 642, 653
Science and Art Department, 668, 669, 676, 678
Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1188

Beresford, Mr. G. De La Poer, *Armagh*
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1251

Betting Act—Arrests at Newcastle
Questions, Mr. John Morley, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 29, 1100

Biddell, Mr. W., *Suffolk, W.*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1153, 1154
Supply—Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1018

Biggar, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Adjutant of the Antrim Militia, 587, 1305
Army Estimates—Divine Service, 801
Militia Pay and Allowances, 849
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), 2R. 687, 690, 691, 693; Comm. 1041; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1051, 1060; *cl.* 8, 1068, 1069, 1071; *cl.* 9, 1072; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1430, 1431; *cl.* 15, 1433; *add. cl.* 1439; Schedule 1, Amendt. 1445, 1446; Schedule 2, Amendt. 1448, 1449, 1450, 1451, 1452
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, 485, 487; 3R. Motion for Adjournment, 728
Inland Revenue—Excise Permits, 774
Ireland—Questions
Arrears of Rent Act, 1882 — James M'Gowan, jun., Case of—Conacloon, Co. Leitrim, 380
Commissioners of National Education—Mr. Owen Ryan, Assistant Teacher in the Belfast National School, 10
Irish Land Commission — Sub-Commissioners—Cavan, 577
Law and Justice—Dublin Murder Trials, 532
Law and Police—Belfast Police, 1328
Magistracy—Mr. W. Carson, 1621
National School Teachers, 1622
Poor Law—Belfast Workhouse — Irregularities in Book-keeping, 391;—Election of Guardians, Co. Leitrim, 577
Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Sec. 14—Police Searches, 52
Royal Irish Constabulary—Suicide of Sub-Constable Coleman, 938
Ireland—Post Office—Questions
Belfast Post Office, 775
Mail Service in Sligo Co. 578
Telegraph Department—Telegraph Clerks, Belfast, 21
Lord Alcester's Annuity, Comm. 1455
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 147
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1937, 1975
Registry of Deeds (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1711, 1712

[*cont.*

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Scotland—Highland Crofters—Royal Commission (Easter Ross), 1625
Supply—British Museum, &c. 686, 687
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1420
Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 988, 989, 998
Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 432
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1035
Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1018
Public Offices Site, 601, 609
Public Works in Ireland, 1345, 1352, 1356, 1359, 1362, 1364
Registry of Friendly Societies, 1377, 1380, 1381
Report, 1076
Revenue Department Buildings, 628
Science and Art Department, 677, 680, 684
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 663, 667, 668

BLAKE, Mr. J. A., *Waterford Co.*
Army Estimates—Divine Service, 790, 797
Supply—Public Works in Ireland, 1346

Board of Trade—See title *Lighthouse Illuminants*

Board of Works (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 8 [Bill 178]

BOORD, Mr. T. W., *Greenwich*
Metropolitan Improvements—Proposed Park for Paddington, 1628

BORLASE, Mr. W. C., *Cornwall, E.*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R.* 1116, 1131, 1134

BOURKE, Right Hon. R., *Lynn Regis*
Africa (River Congo)—Action of Portugal, 18
Africa (South)—Basutoland, 1644, 1646
Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, 234

BRABOURNE, Lord
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, 1088, 1089, 1091

BRAMWELL, Lord
Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. Amendt. 1277, 1279

BRAND, Right Hon. Sir H. B. W. (*see* SPEAKER, The)

BRAND, Mr. H. R. (Surveyor General of the Ordnance), *Stroud*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Adjutant of the Antrim Militia, 587
Militia Uniforms, 584
Army Estimates, 587, 588
Divine Service, 801
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Major Carré (Purchase of Saddlery), 1325
Supply of Flour for the Troops, 1901, 1902

BRASSEY, Sir T. (Civil Lord of the Admiralty), *Hastings*
Navy—Dockyards—Shipwrights, 886
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 101, 106

BRINTON, Mr. J., *Kidderminster*
Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 350

BRISE, Colonel S. B. RUGGLES-, *Essex, E.*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 820

BROADHURST, Mr. H., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 1923
Canal Boats Act (1877) Amendment, 2R. 694
City of London Livery Companies Commission, 1326
Elementary Education Acts—Ashford Magistrates, 1624
Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 343
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1970
Supply — Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, Amendt, 427, 430
Public Offices Site, 590, 592

BRODRICK, Hon. W. St. J. F., *Surrey, W.*
Burial Acts—Consecration of Cemeteries—Rhos, Denbighshire, 697
Ireland—Land Law Act, 1881—Judicial Rents —"Chaine *v.* Nelson," 780
Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 974, 975
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1249

BROGDEN, Mr. A., *Wednesbury*
Lunacy Acts—Mr. Joseph Berry, 755
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 427

BROOKS, Mr. M., *Dublin*
Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1756, 1759

BRUCE, Hon. T. C., *Portsmouth*
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 71

BRUCE, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1443; 3R. 1571
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1250

BRYCE, Mr. J., *Tower Hamlets*
Armenia and European Turkey, Res. 902, 928
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 208

BUCCLEUCH, Duke of
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner—Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1293
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1079; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1080; *cl.* 3, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1081; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1084; *cl.* 8, 1088

BUCHANAN, Mr. T. R., *Edinburgh*
- Ireland—National School Teachers—Grants to Training Colleges, 414
- Parliament—Business of the House—Labourers (Ireland) Bill, 1761
- Supply—Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1030

BULWER, Mr. J. R., *Cambridgeshire*
- Theatres Regulation, 2R. 340

BURGHLEY, Lord, *Northamptonshire, N.*
- Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 844

Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 191]

Burial Acts
- 15 & 16 *Vic. c.* 85, & 16 & 17 *Vic. c.* 134—*Consecration of Cemeteries—Rhos, Denbighshire*, Questions, Sir Robert Cunliffe, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 22, 696; Question, Sir Robert Cunliffe; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 25, 890
- *Nonconformist Burials*, Questions, Mr. Richard, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 31, 1311

BURT, Mr. T., *Morpeth*
- Supply—Registry of Friendly Societies, 1380

BURY, Viscount
- Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1608

BUXTON, Mr. F. W., *Andover*
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 7, 474
- Egypt—Diplomatic Arrangements—Major Baring, 1303

CADOGAN, Earl
- Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 932

CAINE, Mr. W. S., *Scarborough*
- Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1530, 1532, 1534, 1536, 1538
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 220

CAIRNS, Earl
- Criminal Law Amendment, 1R. 1295
- Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 356
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1270, 1271
- Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1083, 1084
- Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 175; Amendt. 189, 190, 191

CALLAN, Mr. P., *Louth*
- Channel Islands—French Claims, 1620
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), 2R. 691; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1042; *cl.* 3, 1050; *cl.* 7, 1052, 1057, 1058, 1061; Amendt. 1062, 1065, 1066, 1067; *cl.* 8, 1068, 1069, 1070; *cl.* 10, 1072, 1073; *cl.* 12, 1074; *add. cl.* 1442, 1443; Motion for reporting Progress, 1444, 1445; Preamble, 1453, 1454
- Forest of Dean (Highways), Nomination of Select Committee, 1455
- Hall-Marking (Gold and Silver Plate), Report of Select Committee (1878-9), 384
- Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 968
  - Poor Law—Election of Guardians, Mallow, 1484
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 2001, 2002, 2004
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1650; Comm. 1978, 1979, 1980
- Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 762
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1238
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Yorkshire), 2R. 1263
- Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1630
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 445
  - Public Works in Ireland, 1352

CAMBRIDGE, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
- Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1601, 1606
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-Enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses—Action of the Government, 375
- Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner — Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1290

CAMERON, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
- Army (Egyptian Expedition) — Veterinary Report, 886
- Army Medical Commission—Supplies for the Army in Egypt, 1095
- Egypt (Military Expedition)—Questions
  - Compensation for breaking Contracts, 1096
  - Major Carré (Purchase of Saddlery), 1325
  - Military Hospitals in Cyprus, 1927, 1929
  - Supply of Flour for the Troops, 1901, 1902
- Public Documents — Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 762, 894
- Scotland — Law and Justice — Procurators Fiscal and Private Practice—Case of W. Meikle, 26
  - Scottish Legal Friendly Society — Dishonesty of Officials, 775
- Supply—Local Government Board, 1411, 1412
  - Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland, 1039
  - Registry of Friendly Societies, Amendt. 1371, 1379

CAMPBELL, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
- Armenia and European Turkey, Res. 922
- Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1562

[cont.

Campbell, Sir G.—*cont.*
- Civil Servants of the Crown in Connection with Financial Undertakings, 753, 754
- East India (Financial Statement), Res. Amendt. 715, 717, 725
- Egypt—Trial of Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 569
- India—Law and Justice—Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, 1747
- Parliament—Business of the House, 900, 901
  - Palace of Westminster—Westminster Hall (Western Side), 389
- Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879—"Queen *v.* Taylor and Boynes," 1748
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 435

Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. H. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Stirling, &c.*
- Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment Bill, 1906, 1907
- Navy—Questions
  - Blue Ribbon, 388
  - Engine-Room Artificers, 18
  - Examination of Naval Cadets—The "Britannia," 956
  - First-Class Petty Officers, 889
  - H.M.S. "Clyde"—The Court Martial on Captain F. Maxwell-Heron, 51, 1307
  - H.M.S. "London," 535
  - Iron-Clads for Foreign Powers, 27
  - Victualling Accounts, 405
  - Warrant Officers, 756
- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 89, 93, 127, 131, 141, 147

Camperdown, Earl of
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1268

Canada, Dominion of — The Governor General — H.R.H. the Duke of Albany
- Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 4, 1643

Canal Boats Act (1877) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Burt, Mr. Samuel Morley, Mr. John Corbett, Mr. Pell, Mr. Broadhurst*)
- *c.* Read 2°, and referred to the Select Committee on Canals *May* 21, 694 [Bill 139]

Canterbury, Archbishop of
- Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1733

Carbutt, Mr. E. H., *Monmouth, &c.*
- Egypt (Re-organization) — Irrigation Works, 1909
- India—Private Employment of Indian Officials, 51
- Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1860
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1667
- Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1630
- Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1835

Carlingford, Lord (Lord President of the Council)
- Ireland—Questions
  - Arrears of Rent Act, 1882 — Sec. 17—Annual Drainage Instalments, 15, 16
  - Arterial Drainage, 1465
  - Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 361
  - Law and Justice—The Law Adviser, 378, 379
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 356
- Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Compensations, Motion for Papers, 1473, 1476

Carlisle, Bishop of
- Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1718, 1736
- Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1282

Carnarvon, Earl of
- Criminal Law Amendment, 1R. 1295
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1268
- Malta — Refugees from Egypt, Motion for Papers, 1899
- Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1459
- New Guinea, Paper presented, 881
- Pluralities Acts Amendment, Comm. 17
- Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. Motion for Adjournment, 187, 191, 192

Cartwright, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
- Armenia and European Turkey, Res. 921
- Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 543
- Supply—Science and Art Department, 672

Cathedral Statutes Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle*)
- *l.* Presented; read 1ª* *May* 10 (No. 58)
- Read 2ª, after debate *June* 5, 1717

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G., *Essex, W.*
- Army Enlistment—New Regulations, 1642
- Army (India)—Indian Establishment, 957, 958
- Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1538, 1553, 1555
- Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 810
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 830

Census Returns, 1881—The Canal Population
- Question, Mr. Salt; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *June* 7, 1927

Chamberlain, Right Hon. J. (President of the Board of Trade), *Birmingham*
- Corn Sales, 2R. 1715
- Emigration (England and Wales), 527
- Fishery Reports, 699
- Harbours of Refuge, Nomination of Select Committee, 518
- Lighthouse Illuminants — Board of Trade—Resignation of Professor Tyndall, 28, 29, 521, 1745, 1746

[*cont.*

CHAMBERLAIN, Right Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Mercantile Marine—Passing Tolls Act—Collection of the Light Dues, 699
- Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1854, 1886
- Registry of Deeds (Ireland), 2R. 1712
- Sea Fisheries Commission, 1334
- Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2009
- Stock Exchange—Report of Royal Commission, 1627
- Supply—Privy Council for Trade, &c. 1709
  - Science and Art Department, 680, 682, 683
- Trade and Commerce—Sugar Duties, 413
- Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1823, 1825, 1835, 1836

CHAMBERS, Sir T., *Marylebone*
- Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), Amendt. 1616, 1617

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Earl of SELBORNE)
- Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords—“ Bradlaugh *v.* Clarke,” 192
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses—Action of the Government, 376, 377
- Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 369, 370
- Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1079 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1080 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1081 ; *cl.* 5, *ib.*, 1082 ; *cl.* 7, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087 ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*, 1089, 1090, 1091 ; Schedule, 1093 ; Report, *ib.*
- Stolen Goods, 1R. 1737
- Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 167, 191
- Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1282

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, The (Right Hon. H. C. E. CHILDERS), *Pontefract*
- Army and Navy Expenditure—“ Extra Receipts,” 1330, 1331
- Civil Servants of the Crown in Connection with Financial Undertakings, 753
- Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, 316 ;—Local Collectors of Income Tax, 48, 49
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 7, 474 ; *cl.* 8, 480, 483, 484, 486 ; *cl.* 11, 487, 488 ; *cl.* 13, *ib.*, 505, 508
- East India (Expenditure), Res. 309, 311, 315
- Hall-Marking (Gold and Silver Plate), Report of Select Committee (1878-9), 385
- Income Tax — Assessment of Profits made Abroad, 22
- Inland Revenue—Questions
  - Cultivation of Tobacco, 420
  - Excise Permits, 774
  - Financial Statement—Railway Duties, 1650
  - Income Tax on Foreign Investments, 1333, 1741
- Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1497, 1510, 1511, 1513
- Ireland—Loans to Irish Railways, 754
  - Railways—West Clare Railway, 1759
- Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Case of John Rafferty, 770

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, The—*cont.*
- London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1271
- Metropolis—Coal and Wine Duties—Application for Renewal, 959
- Metropolitan Improvements—Communications across the Thames, 960
- National Debt Bill, 1648
- Parliament—Business of the House, 418, 419, 782
- Public Works Loans, 1910

Channel Islands
- *Fisheries*, Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross ; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *June* 7, 1924
- *French Claims on certain Islands*, Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross ; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *June* 4, 1620

CHAPLIN, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
- Agricultural Holdings (England), 419 ; 2R. 1133, 1134, 1170
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts — Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Orders in Council, 945
- Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 740

Charitable Trusts Bill

(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 179]

CHILDERS, Right Hon. H. C. E. (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Chili and Peru—Treaty of Peace
- Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 943

CHURCHILL, Lord R. H. S., *Woodstock*
- Africa (South)—Basutoland, 1646
  - Cetewayo, 896
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 14, 1431
- Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 57, 58 ;—Provisional Arrangements, 40, 41
- Egypt—Questions
  - Administration of Justice — Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 47, 48, 562, 563, 564
  - Diplomatic Arrangements—Major Baring, 1304
  - Military Expedition—Military Hospitals in Cyprus, 1929
- Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 351
- Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1496, 1497, 1504, 1507, 1509, 1510, 1511, 1513, 1518, 1519
- Ireland—The Castle, Dublin—St. Patrick's Hall, 1904
- Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. 153
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 766, 893, 1315, 1982, 1989
- Parliament—Questions
  - Business of the House, 782, 1922

[cont.

[cont.

Churchill, Lord R. H. S.—*cont.*
    Lord Alcester's and Lord Wolseley's Annuities Bills, 528
    Privilege—Parliamentary Oath (Mr. Bradlaugh), 237
    Public Business, Ministerial Statement, 409
  Parliamentary Oath (Standing Orders), Withdrawal of Motion, 1335
  Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1415, 1416, 1417; Motion for reporting Progress, 1419, 1421; Amendt. 1422
    Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 430, 436, 437, 439
    Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 453, 456, 458; Amendt. 468
    Report, 1707

City Livery Companies Commission
  Question, Mr. J. R. Yorke; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 31, 1308; Questions, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Mundella, 1326

Civil Servants of the Crown in Connection with Financial Undertakings
  Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 24, 753

Civil Service (Re-organization)—Promotion
  Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 10, 407

Clarke, Mr. E. G., *Plymouth*
  Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 60, 65
  Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1687

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
  East India (Financial Statement), Res. 724
  London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 219
  Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, 713

Collings, Mr. J., *Ipswich*
  Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 408, 409
  Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1938
  Southport Foreshore, 38, 39, 40, 230, 231; Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 238, 239, 252, 255, 257
  Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1418

Colthurst, Col. D. La Zouche, *Cork Co.*
  Army—Parading of Roman Catholic Soldiers for Divine Service on Holy Days, 1907
    Recruiting—"Waste" of the Army, 1544
  Army Estimates—Divine Service, 792, 799
  Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1053; *add. cl.* 1439
  Ireland—Questions
    Fishery Piers and Harbours — Rosslare Pier and Harbour, 23, 386

Colthurst, Colonel D. La Zouche—*cont.*
    Irish Land Commission—Appointment of Additional Commissioners, 28
    Poor Law—Outdoor Relief, 521, 522
  Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1245

Colville of Culross, Lord
  London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1268

Commins, Dr. A., *Roscommon*
  Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1964

Commons and Inclosure Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill
  (*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Story-Maskelyne*)
c. Ordered * *May* 30

Companies (Colonial Registers) Bill
  (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Macnaghten, Mr. Salt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 185]

Consolidated Fund (No. 3) Bill
  (*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney*)
c. Resolution in Committee * *June* 4
  Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered * *June* 5
  Read 1° * *June* 6
  Read 2° * *June* 7

Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions) Bill
  (*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 21, 687; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Justin M'Carthy*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
  Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 171]
  Committee—R.P., after short debate *May* 28, 1041
  Committee; Report *May* 31, 1430
  Read 3°, after short debate *June* 1, 1568
l. Read 1^a * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 4
  Read 2^a *June* 7, 1895 (No. 75)

Contagious Diseases Acts
  Provisional Arrangements, Questions, Mr. Puleston, Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. Gorst; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir William Harcourt *May* 7, 40; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Puleston*) *May* 7, 52; after debate, Motion withdrawn
  Non-Enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses —Action of the Government, Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook; short debate thereon *May* 10, 371;—*Withdrawal of the Police from Protected Districts*, Questions, Mr. J. G. Talbot, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 10, 381; Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Puleston; Answers, Sir William Harcourt, 401

[cont.

Contagious Diseases Acts—cont.
Protection of Women and Young Persons—Legislation, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 21, 584
The Metropolitan Police, Questions, Mr. Gorst, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 7, 29

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts
Foot-and-Mouth Disease
Question, Mr. Duckham; Answer, Mr. Dodson *May* 24, 764
The Metropolitan Cattle Market, Question, Sir Sydney Waterlow; Answer, Mr. Dodson *May* 28, 943
The Orders in Council, Questions, Mr. Heneage, Mr. James Howard, Mr. Chaplin; Answers, Mr. Dodson *May* 28, 945

Detached Districts, Question, Mr. Hastings; Answer, Mr. Dodson *June* 7, 1912

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (Ireland) Acts
Infected Districts in the Counties of Louth and Meath, Question, Mr. Sheil; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1324
Westport, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1627

Convict Prisons—Pay and Position of Warders—Report of the Committee
Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 24, 771

Coope, Mr. O. E., *Middlesex*
Criminal Law—Wife-Beating, 757
National Gallery and British Museum—Electric Lighting, 756

Copyright Bill
(*Mr. Hastings, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy, Sir Gabriel Goldney, Mr. Agnew*)
c. Read 2°* *May* 24 [Bill 141]

Corbet, Mr. W. J., *Wicklow Co.*
Ireland — Law and Justice — Conviction at Wicklow Assizes, 889
Mr. J. F. L. M'Farlane, J.P. 24, 942
Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
Election of Guardians—Shillelagh Union, 889
John Flanagan, Case of, a Lunatic, 42, 887, 888
Rathdown Guardians, 892

Cork, Earl of
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 1270

Corn Sales Bill (*Mr. Rankin, Sir Joseph Bailey, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Biddell, Mr. H. T. Davenport, Mr. Williamson*) [Bill 95]
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 4, 1712; after short debate, Moved,

[*cont.*

Corn Sales Bill—cont.
"That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. J. G. Talbot*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned

Courtney, Mr. L. H. (Financial Secretary to the Treasury), *Liskeard*
Civil Service (Re-organization)—Promotion, 407
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1441
Ireland—Questions
Arterial Drainage — River Shannon — Drainage Works at Meeluk, 30
Bowling Green Mills (Galway)—Compensation Case, 1744
Customs Duties—Port of Galway, 899
Dispensary Houses Act, 1879—Sec. 8—Pallaskenry Dispensary, 1903
Dublin—The Castle—St. Patrick's Hall, 1904
Education Department—Assistant Clerks, 1318
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Rossclare Pier and Harbour, 23, 386
Inland Navigation—Upper Shannon, 417
Inland Revenue—Income Tax—Drumduff, Co. Leitrim, 699
Sale of Crown Lands—Maryborough Heath, 950
Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 879, 880, 1454
Law and Justice—Dormant Funds in Chancery, 386
Literature, Science, and Art—The Reputed "Raphael," 1486
Lord Alcester (Grant in Lieu of Annuity), Res. 1075
Lord Alcester's Annuity, Comm. 1455
Lord Wolseley (Grant in Lieu of Annuity), Res. 1076
Medals, 2R. 873
Parliament—Business of the House, 232, 1343
Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1752
Registry of Deeds (Ireland), 2R. 1711
Russia—Coronation of the Czar—Embassy to Moscow, 52
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1424
Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 983, 984, 985, 987, 989
Land Commissioners for England, &c. 1384, 1386
Lighthouses Abroad, 1367
Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 635
Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 452, 473
Public Works in Ireland, 1347, 1353, 1356, 1359, 1360, 1361, 1365
Rates on Government Property, 999, 1000
Registry of Friendly Societies, 1382
Revenue Department Buildings, 630
Royal University, Ireland, 1366
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 660, 663, 665, 668
Western Islands of the Pacific—Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland, 382

Court of Chancery of Lancaster Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 3ª* *May* 7 (No. 43)

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill
Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 4, 1631

Courtown, Earl of
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1270

Cowen, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Betting Act—Arrests at Newcastle, 1100
Chili and Peru—Treaty of Peace, 943
Explosive Substances Acts—Certificates, 1327, 1328
Orders in Council, 771, 1909
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 977
Prisons—Mr. Healy, M.P., Mr. Davitt, and Mr. Quinn, Prisoners in Richmond Gaol, 759
Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 765, 769, 952, 1314, 1315, 1993
Parliament—Business of the House—Count-out of Friday, May 25, 964
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1668
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1415, 1417, 1420, 1425
Land Commissioners for England, &c. 1385
Local Government Board, 1402
Public Offices Site, 592
Revenue Department Buildings, 621

Cowper, Earl
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 173

Craig, Mr. W. Y., *Staffordshire, N.*
Law and Police—Case of Francis Redfern (Uttoxeter), 1330
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1219

Cranbrook, Viscount
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1582
Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1731
Parliament—Parliamentary Procedure, Res. 7, 8

Criminal Code (Indictable Offences Procedure) Bill (Ireland)
Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 11, 525

Criminal Law Amendment Bill
(*The Earl of Rosebery*)
l. Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *May* 31, 1294 (No. 69)

Criminal Law Amendment—Bill for the Better Protection of Young Girls
Question, Earl Cairns; Answer, Earl Granville *May* 29, 1077

Criminal Law—Wife-Beating
Questions, Mr. Coope, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 24, 757

Cropper, Mr. J., *Kendal*
Great Britain and Madagascar, Governments of—Agreement for Regulating the Traffic in Spirituous Liquors, 894
Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), 1618
Supply—Local Government Board, 1406
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1034

Cross, Right Hon. Sir R. A., *Lancashire, S.W.*
Channel Islands—Fisheries, 1924
French Claims, 1620
Contagious Diseases Acts—Provisional Arrangements, 41
Duchy of Lancaster—Lands Act, 1875—Council of the Duchy, 526
East India (Expenditure), Res. 310, 311
Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 352
Income Tax—Assessments of Profits made Abroad, 22
Parliament—Business of the House—East India (Expenditure), 511
Ministerial Statement, 46, 1105, 1108
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 962; 2R. 1692, 1706
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1235
Southport Foreshore, 231
Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 512, 535, 552, 554, 558
Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2009, 2011
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1428
Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 426, 427
Local Government Board, 1401, 1410
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1034

Cross, Mr. J. K. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Bolton*
Army (India)—Questions
European Soldiers at Barrackpur, 582
Indian Medical Service—Junior Medical Officers, 955, 1638
Indian Staff Corps, 1099
Troops in India (Numbers), 1907
East India (Expenditure), Res. Amendt. 277
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 718
India—Questions
Bengal—Ryots of Meherpur, 582
Code of Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, 936, 1634;—Reports of Local Governments, 1325
Duty on Jewellery, 1095
Ex-Gaikwar of Baroda, The late, 221
Hall-Marking (Gold and Silver Plate), 390
Indian Penal Code—Newspapers—"Calcutta Englishman," 36
Legislative Council, Calcutta—Misleading Telegram, 581
Madras Civil Service, 583

[*cont.*

Cross, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
  Private Employment of Indian Officials, 51
  Salem Riots—Mr. Maclean, 586
 India—Law and Justice—Questions
  Alleged Ill-treatment of an Englishman, 1621
  Alleged Severity of Sentence, 1900
  Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, 1747
  Courts of Law—Mr. Justice Norris—Conditions of Admission for Natives, 36
  Treatment of Europeans and Natives, 585, 770

Crown Lands Bill [Bill 122]
 (*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
c. Report of Select Committee * *May* 24

Cubitt, Right Hon. G., *Surrey, W.*
 Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), 1618

Cunliffe, Sir R. A., *Denbigh, &c.*
 Burial Acts—Consecration of Cemeteries—Rhos, Denbighshire, 696, 890

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill
 Question, Mr. Hicks; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. W. H. Smith *May* 8, 316
 Local Collectors of Income Tax, Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Hicks; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, 48

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill
 (*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney*)
c. Committee; Report *May* 10, 473 [Bill 140]
 Considered* *May* 21
 Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *May* 22, 726; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Biggar*); Question put, and negatived
 Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl Granville*) *May* 24
 Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *May* 25
 Read 3ª * *May* 28
 Royal Assent *May* 31 [46 *Vict.* c. 10]

Dalhousie, Earl of
 London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1267

Dalrymple, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
 Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. 1790
 Parliament — Ministerial Arrangements — Scotch Business, 1919

Davenport, Mr. H. T., *Staffordshire, N.*
 Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 867
 Law and Police—Case of Francis Redfern (Uttoxeter), 1329
 Supply—Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1036

Davey, Mr. H., *Christchurch*
 Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 2003

Dawnay, Colonel Hon. L. P., *Thirsk*
 India—Law and Justice—Alleged Ill-treatment of an Englishman, 1620, 1621

Dawnay, Hon. G. W. C., *York, N.R.*
 Africa (South)—Transvaal—Aggression of the Boers on Native Tribes, 1209

Dawson, Mr. C., *Carlow*
 Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 2004, 2006
 Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1963

De Ferrieres, Baron, *Cheltenham*
 Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1671

De La Warr, Earl
 Malta—Refugees from Egypt, Motion for Papers, 1896, 1899

Denman, Lord
 Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords —"Bradlaugh *v.* Clarke," 192
 Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner — Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1291
 Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1460
 Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. 1078
 Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 191

Derby, Earl of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
 Africa (South)—Transvaal—The Convention, 1287
 Malta — Refugees from Egypt, Motion for Papers, 1897, 1899
 New Guinea, Paper presented, 881

De Worms, Baron H., *Greenwich*
 Africa (South)—Basutoland, 1644, 1647
 Dominion of Canada—The Governor General —H.R.H. the Duke of Albany, 1643
 Egypt—Quarantine, 956
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1232, 1234

Dickson, Mr. T. A., *Tyrone*
 Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1046; *cl.* 7, 1057, 1058; *add. cl.* 1438
 Ireland—Questions
  Land Law Act, 1881—Judicial Rents—"Chaine *v.* Nelson," 778, 781
  Loans to Irish Railways, 754
  Public Works, 1356

Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W. (President of the Local Government Board), *Chelsea, &c.*
 Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, 389; Comm. 1572, 1573

[*cont.*

Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W.—*cont.*
- Burial Acts—Consecration of Cemeteries—Rhos, Denbighshire, 697, 891
- Census Returns, 1881—Canal Population, 1927
- Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 353
- Ireland—Poor Removal, 1321, 1322
- Maintenance of Main Roads (South Wales), 1904
- Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. 147; *cl.* 3, 148; *add. cl. ib.* 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154; 3R. 317
- Parliament — Public Business, Ministerial Statement, 1925
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1956
- Poor Law (England)—Questions
  - Guardians of the Poor, Westminster, 892
  - Metropolis—Re-vaccination of Females, 1322
  - Repayments for Pauper Relief, 1097
  - St. James's Workhouse, 1094
  - William Davis, Case of, 937
- Public Health—Nazareth House, Hammersmith—Report of Mr. Spears, 1927
- Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 542, 548, 549, 552
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1415
  - Local Government Board, 1392, 1394, 1403, 1405, 1412
  - Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1019, 1021, 1028, 1030
  - Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1010
- Theatres Regulation, 2R. 341
- Vaccination Acts—Questions
  - Calf Lymph, 698
  - Prosecutions—Bristol, 1740
  - Syphilitic Infection, 1918, 1919

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
- Africa (South)—Zululand—Bishop of Natal, 221
- Literature, Science, and Art—South Kensington Museum—The Art Gallery, 1910
- Poor Law (England)—St. James's Workhouse, 1094
- Supply—Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, 1369
  - Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 443
  - Land Commissioners for England, &c. 1386
  - Public Offices Site, 588, 606
  - Royal University, Ireland, 1366
  - Science and Art Department, 671, 676
- Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1191

Dixon-Hartland, Mr. F. D., *Evesham*
- Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2016
- Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1009
- Theatres Regulation, 2R. 331, 343
- Treaty of Berlin—Article X—Varna Railway Claims, 938, 939

Dodson, Right Hon. J. G. (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), *Scarborough*
- Agricultural Holdings (England), Motion for Leave, 512; 2R. 1184, 1329

[*cont.*

Dodson, Right Hon. J. G.—*cont.*
- Agricultural Holdings (England)—Incorporation of the Clauses of the Act of 1875, 1917
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Questions
  - Detached Districts, 1912
  - Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 764
  - Metropolitan Cattle Market, 943
  - Orders in Council, 946
- Duchy of Lancaster — Lands Act, 1855—Council of the Duchy, 526
- Royal Commission on Agriculture, Report on, 771
- Southport Foreshore, 38, 39, 231, 232; Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 239, 252, 253, 255, 257, 778

Donaldson-Hudson, Mr. C., *Newcastle-under-Lyne*
- Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1170
- Explosive Substances Acts, 1316;—Orders in Council April 20th, 1883—Explosives, 407, 773

Douglas, Mr. A. Akers-, *Kent, E.*
- Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. *add. cl.* 148, 151; Amendt. 152

Drainage (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill (*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Trevelyan*)
- *c.* Report * *May* 9 [Bill 144]
- Read 3° * *May* 10
- *l.* Read 1^a* (*The Lord President*) *May* 10
- Read 2^a * *May* 31 (No. 60)
- Committee *; Report *June* 1
- Read 3^a * *June* 4

Duchy of Lancaster Lands Act, 1855
- *Council of the Duchy*, Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Dodson *May* 11, 526
- *Foreshores—The Corporation of Southport*, Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, Mr. Dodson *May* 7, 38; Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, Mr. Dodson *May* 8, 230; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Jesse Collings*), 238; after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, Mr. Dodson *May* 24, 777

Duckham, Mr. T., *Herefordshire*
- Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1173
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 764
- Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 741
- Supply — Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1025
- Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Report of Select Committee, 1302

Dunraven, Earl of
- Sunday Opening of Museums and Galleries, Res. 155

Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W. H., *Kent, Mid*
- Africa (South)—Transvaal Convention, 411

EARP, Mr. T., *Newark*
Supply—Registry of Friendly Societies, 1381

East and West India Docks Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)
c. Read 2°, and committed *May* 24, 753

ECROYD, Mr. W. F., *Preston*
Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 352

Education Department (*Questions*)
Absence of a Senior Examiner, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Mundella *May* 8, 227
Assistant Clerks, Question, Mr. R. N. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 31, 1318
Educational Standards (*Wells Union*), Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, Mr. Mundella *May* 8, 226
The "Blue Ribbon" in Board Schools, Question, Mr. S. Morley; Answer, Mr. Mundella *June* 1, 1485

Education (*Wales*) — *Carnarvon Training College*, Questions, Mr. Richard, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answers, Mr. Mundella *May* 31, 1310
School Attendance—The Ashford Magistrates, Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, Mr. Mundella *June* 4, 1624

EGERTON, Admiral Hon. F., *Derbyshire, E.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Use by the Volunteers of the Butts at Wormwood Scrubbs, 784
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 143

EGERTON, Hon. A. F., *Wigan*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 866
East India (Expenditure), Res. 313

EGERTON, Hon. Alan de Tatton, *Cheshire, Mid*
Army—Rifle Ranges at Wormwood Scrubbs, 1317
Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. Schedule 2, Amendt. 148
Theatres Regulation, 2R. 339

Egypt
Military Expedition
Army Medical Commission—Supplies for the Army in Egypt, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 29, 1095
Compensation for Breaking Contracts—Muleteers, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *May* 29, 1096
Major Carré (*Purchase of Saddlery*), Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. Brand *May* 31, 1325
Military Hospitals in Cyprus, Questions, Dr. Cameron, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Gorst, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Sir Arthur Hayter *June* 7, 1927

[*cont.*

Egypt—COMMONS—*cont.*
Supply of Flour for the Troops, Questions, Dr. Cameron, Sir Henry Tyler; Answers, Mr. Brand *June* 7, 1901
The Veterinary Report, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *May* 25, 886

Re-organization
Mr. Sheldon Amos, Questions, Mr. Molloy; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 7, 50; *May* 8, 230
The Earl of Dufferin's Despatch, Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gladstone *May* 8, 232
Reform of Criminal Procedure, Questions, Mr. Gorst, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 950; Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 31, 1331
Irrigation Works, Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *June* 7, 1909

Administration of Justice—Said Bey Khandeel, Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 7, 47
Hassan Bey Sadyk, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 950
Toulba Pasha, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 948
Diplomatic Arrangements — Major Baring, Questions, Mr. Buxton, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 31, 1303
Quarantine, Question, Baron Henry De Worms; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 956
The Daira Lands, Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 29, 1102
The Egyptian Exiles in Ceylon, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *June* 4, 1633
The Massacre at Alexandria, Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 22, 701
Suez Canal—Proposed Second Canal, Questions, Mr. Norwood; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 25, 897

ELCHO, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Fishery Reports, 699

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (Cambridge, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 7 [Bill 216]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) (Ashton, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 7 [Bill 217]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) (Halsall Heath, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 7 [Bill 218]

Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cummersdale, &c.) Bill [H.L.]
c. Read 2°* *May* 8 [Bill 163]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Committee* *June* 5 (No. 31)
Report* *June* 7

ELLENBOROUGH, Lord
- Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1462
- Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 191

ELLIOT, Hon. A. R. D., *Roxburgh*
- Parliament—Business of the House, 777
  - Ministerial Arrangements—Scotch Business, 1919, 1921

ELLIOT, Sir G., *Durham, N.*
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1228
- Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 986

Emigration (England and Wales)
- Questions, Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 11, 527
- *State-aided*, Resolution, Mr. Rankin *June* 5, 1809 [House counted out]

EMLYN, Viscount, *Carmarthenshire*
- Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 1109

EVANS, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*
- Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 861

EWING, Mr. A. ORR-, *Dumbarton*
- Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. 1780

EXETER, Bishop of
- Pluralities Acts Amendment, Comm. 17

Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway Bill (by Order)
- *c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now considered" (*Mr. Dodds*) *May* 24, 732
- Amendt. to leave out "now considered," add "re-committed to the former Committee" (*Viscount Folkestone*); Question proposed, "That 'now considered,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 69, N. 177; M. 108 (D. L. 98)
- Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Bill re-committed to the former Committee

Explosive Substances Acts
- *Certificates*, Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 31, 1327

[*cont.*

Explosives Substances Acts—cont.
- *The Orders in Council, April* 20, 1883—*Explosives*, Question, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 10, 407; Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 24, 771; Question, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *June* 7, 1909
- *Licences*, Question, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 31, 1316

Factory Acts (Inspectors)—Mr. William Paterson
- Questions, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 10, 405

Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Broadhurst, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Burt, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Rowley Hill*)
- *c.* Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 9, 343
- Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Monckton*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 44, N. 124; M. 80 (D. L. 89)
- Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off [Bill 91]

FARQUHARSON, Dr. R., *Aberdeenshire, W.*
- Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 60
- Poor Law (England and Wales)—Guardians of the Poor, Westminster, 891

FAWCETT, Right Hon. H. (Postmaster General), *Hackney*
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 203
- Post Office—Questions
  - American Mails, 1634
  - Contracts (Irish Mail Service), 402, 1317, 1757, 1758, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917
  - Mail Carts and Newspaper Parcels, 20
  - Parcels Post, 886;—Appointment of Officials, 21
  - Postal Service (Scotland), 1748
  - Telegraph Department — Accommodation, 25, 26
- Post Office (Ireland)—Questions
  - Belfast Post Office, 775
  - Ennis Post Office, 1636
  - Mail Service in Co. Sligo, 578
  - Telegraph Clerks, Belfast, 21
  - Telegraph Office, Dundalk, 401
- Supply—Public Works in Ireland, 1363, 1364, 1365
  - Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 615, 618, 621, 622, 626, 632

FEILDEN, General R. J., *Lancashire, N.*
- Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1515

FINDLATER, Mr. W., *Monaghan*
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1439
- Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1316
- Registry of Deeds (Ireland), 2R. 1710

FIRTH, Mr. J. F. B., *Chelsea*
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 205
- Metropolis—Coal and Wine Duties—Application for Renewal, 958
- Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), 1617
- Metropolitan Improvements—Proposed Park for Paddington, 1629
- Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 45
- Supply—New Courts of Justice, &c. 657

Fishery Reports
- Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 22, 699

FITZGERALD, Lord
- Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 368
- Law and Justice (Ireland)—Law Adviser, 379

FITZMAURICE, Lord E. G. P. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Calne*
- Africa (West) (River Congo)—Action of Portugal, 10, 1326
- Armenia and European Turkey, Res. 908, 918
- Chili and Peru—Treaty of Peace, 944
- Egypt—Questions
  - Daira Lands, 1102
  - Diplomatic Arrangements—Major Baring, 1304
  - Hassan Bey Sadyk, 950
  - Massacre at Alexandria, 701
  - Quarantine, 957
  - Toulba Pasha, 948
- Egypt (Re-organization)—Questions
  - Earl of Dufferin's Despatch, 232
  - Irrigation Works, 1909
  - Mr. Sheldon Amos, 50, 230
  - Reform of Criminal Procedure, 951, 1331
- France and China—Rumour of Impending Hostilities, 1911
- Great Britain and Madagascar, Governments of—Agreement for Regulating the Traffic in Spirituous Liquors, 894
- Italy—Renewal of Commercial Treaty, 385
- Madagascar—Questions
  - Bombardment of Mayunga, 783
  - French Invasion, 1103
  - Protection of the Lives and Property of British Subjects, 1647
- Morocco—Questions
  - Renewal of Diplomatic Relations, 753, 1323
  - Slavery, 403
  - Slavery and Slave Dealing at Tangier, 1317
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 765, 767, 768, 769, 893, 953, 1312, 1313, 1314
- Portugal—International Sailing Code—"City of Mecca," 401

FITZMAURICE, Lord E. G. P.—*cont.*
- Russia—Trans-Caucasus Transit Duties, 763
- Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 557, 558, 559, 1647;—Colonel Maceo, 406, 1908
- Treaty of Berlin—Article V—Religious Liberty in Bulgaria, 758
  - Article X—Varna Railway Claims, 938, 939
- Treaty of Washington—"Alabama" Claims—Geneva Award, 1638, 1639
- Turkey—Asiatic Provinces—Governorship o the Lebanon, 402
  - New Tariff, 783

FLETCHER, Sir H., *Horsham*
- Army Estimates, 587
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 828

FOLKESTONE, Viscount, *Wilts, S.*
- Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 861
- Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. Amendt. 732, 736
- Oxford, Aylesbury, and Metropolitan Junction Railway, Notice of Res. 1303
- Supply—Public Offices Site, 605
  - Science and Art Department, 672, 682
- Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. Amendt. 750; Report of Select Committee, 1279, 1301; Amendt. 1809, 1825, 1835, 1836, 1837

Forest of Dean (Highways) Bill
(*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
- c. Select Committee nominated *May* 31; List of the Committee, 1455 [Bill 148]

FORSTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
- Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1249
- Madagascar—Bombardment of Mayunga, 783

FORSTER, Sir C., *Walsall*
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 194
- Parliament—Rules and Orders—Petitions—Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) Amendment—Proxy Signatures, 408, 940

FORTESCUE, Earl
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1267
- Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 932

FOWLER, Mr. H. H., *Wolverhampton*
- Education (Wales) — Carnarvon Training College, 1311
- India (Ceylon)—Privilege of Franking Letters—Bishop of Colombo, 934
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1675
- Supply—Land Commissioners for England, &c. 1388
  - Local Government Board, 1391, 1392
  - Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1022, 1036
  - Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1008
  - Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 448, 454; Amendt. 470

FOWLER, Mr. R. N., *London*
Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, Comm. 1573
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 714
Education Department—Assistant Clerks, 1318
Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 880
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 220
Lord Wolseley (Grant in Lieu of Annuity), Res. 1075
Medals, 2R. 878
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1705
Supply—British Museum, &c. 685
Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1425
Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 431
Report, Res. 7, 1566

FOWLER, Mr. W., *Cambridge*
Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2015

France and China—Rumour of Impending Hostilities
Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett ; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 1, 1487 ; Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *June* 7, 1911

Friendly, &c. Societies (Nominations) Bill (*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Mr. Burt, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Northcote*)
c. Committee—R.P. *May* 29, 1192 [Bill 117]

FRY, Mr. T., *Darlington*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1194, 1234

GALLOWAY, Earl of
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1604
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. 1077 ; *cl.* 1, 1079 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1082 ; *cl.* 7, *ib.* ; Amendt. 1083, 1084, 1086 ; *cl.* 8, 1090 ; Report, 1093

Gas and Water Provisional Orders (Bilston Gas, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 21 [Bill 165]
Report * *June* 1
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Sudeley*) *June* 5 (No. 76)

Gas and Water Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill—See title
Water Provisional Orders Bill

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Broughty Ferry Paving) Bill (*The Lord Rosebery*)
l. Read 1ª * *May* 7 (No. 55)
Read 2ª * *May* 28
Committee * ; Report *May* 29
Read 3ª * *May* 31

Gibraltar—See title *Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees*

GIBSON, Right Hon. E., *Dublin University*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1066 ; *cl.* 8, 1068
India—Madras Civil Service, 583
Ireland—Dublin Metropolitan Police and Royal Irish Constabulary—Committee of Inquiry, 229
Land Law Act, 1881—Judicial Rents—"Chaine *v.* Nelson," 780
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1256
Lighthouse Illuminants—Board of Trade—Resignation of Professor Tyndall, 28, 29, 520
Parliament—Alleged Candidature of Mr. Sub-Commissioner Wylie, 940
Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1750, 1752, 1755
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1950
Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1758, 1916

GIFFARD, Sir H. S., *Launceston*
Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 552

GILES, Mr. A., *Southampton*
Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 997

GIVAN, Mr. J., *Monaghan*
Ireland—Land Law Act, 1881—Judicial Rents—"Chaine *v.* Nelson," 779

GLADSTONE, Right Hon. W. E. (First Lord of the Treasury), *Edinburghshire*
Africa (South)—Questions
Basutoland, 1644, 1646, 1647
Provision for African Chiefs, 1104, 1922
Transvaal, 236, 411, 412
Agricultural Holdings (England), 419, 420, 1924
Armenia and European Turkey, Res. 923
Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1566
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 64, 65, 66, 68
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Suspended Boroughs, 1103
Dominion of Canada—The Governor General—H.R.H. the Duke of Albany, 1644
Egypt—Questions
Administration of Justice — Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 48, 563, 564, 566
Earl of Dufferin's Despatch, 232
Suez Canal—Proposed New Canal, 897, 898
France and China, 1487
General Assembly of the Church of Scotland—Lord High Commissioner, 1361
India — Viceroy — Criminal Code Procedure Amendment, 412
Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1516, 1518, 1519
Ireland—Questions
Land Law Act, 1881 — Judicial Rents — "Chaine *v.* Nelson," 780, 781

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*

    - Law and Justice — Execution of Myles Joyce, Convicted of Murder, 410
    - Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 975, 977
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 766, 767, 768, 1315, 1316, 1488, 1986, 1990, 1991
- Parliament—Questions
    - Adjournment—Derby Day, 234, 531
    - Department of Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, 47
    - Grand Committees—Report of Proceedings, 529, 530
    - Lord Alcester's and Lord Wolseley's Annuities Bills, 528, 529, 901, 902
    - Ministerial Arrangements—Scotch Business 1921
    - Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1340, 1489, 1494
    - Rules of Debate—Questions, 782
- Parliament—Business of the House—Questions 418, 509, 532, 781, 782, 900, 901, 960, 1104, 1343, 1344, 1487, 1488
    - Count-out of Friday, May 25, 963, 964, 965
    - Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1753
    - Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill, 1922
    - Ministerial Statement, 45, 46, 409, 533, 534, 535, 1105, 1106, 1108, 1109, 1648, 1649, 1925
    - Police Superannuation Bill, 1923
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill, 962;—Recommendation of Parliamentary Candidates, 235
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1932, 1952, 1955, 1981
- Parliamentary Representation — Disfranchised Irish Boroughs, 1334
- Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 761, 762
- South Kensington Museum—Painting by Sir Frederick Leighton, 898, 899
- Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 259
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1422, 1423, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430
    - Report, 1707

Glebe Loans (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill (*The Lord O'Hagan*)

l. Read 2ª * *May* 7 (No. 35)
Committee *; Report *May* 10
Read 3ª * *May* 24
Royal Assent *May* 31 [46 *Vict.* c. 8]

Goldney, Sir G., *Chippenham*

- Supply — Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1020, 1029
    - Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1017
- Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 749; Amendt. 1739, 1816

Gordon, General Hon. Sir A. H., *Aberdeenshire, E.*

- Agricultural Holdings (England), 1329
- Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. 1805, 1806
- Ground Game Act, 1880—Spring Traps (Scotland), 221

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*

- Africa (South)—Questions
    - Basutoland, 1646
    - H.M. Dominions—Policy of the Government, Notice of Motion, 963
    - Langalibalele, 22
    - Transvaal Convention, 412;—The Loan, 1903, 1904
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Metropolitan Police, 29
    - Provisional Arrangements, 41
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, 485
- Egypt — Military Expedition — Military Hospitals in Cyprus, 1929
    - Re-organization—Reform of Criminal Procedure, 950, 951
- Ireland—Sale of Crown Lands—Maryborough Heath, 950
- Navy — Examination of Naval Cadets (the "Britannia"), 956
- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 143
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 767, 1316
- Parliament—Business of the House—Questions
    - Count-out of Friday, May 25, 965
    - Lords Alcester's and Wolseley's Annuities Bills, 46
    - Ministerial Statement, 1649
    - Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill, 584, 782
- Supply, 981
    - County Court Buildings, 634
    - Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 434
    - Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 446; Amendt. 448, 469, 472
    - Public Offices Site, 596, 605
    - Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 623, 625, 630
    - Science and Art Department, 679, 680, 682

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., *Ripon*

- Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2006

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*

- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 145, 146

Gower, Hon. E. F. L., *Bodmin*

- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1239

Grantham, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*

- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1678
- Southport Foreshore, 777
- Sunday Trading (London), 227

Granville, Earl (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)

- Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1730
- Criminal Law Amendment—Bill for the Better Protection of Young Girls, 1077
- Criminal Law Amendment, 1R. 1295
- Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners) —Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 371
- Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1460
- Parliament—Parliamentary Procedure, Res. 8

GRANVILLE, Earl—*cont.*
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 181, 189, 190, 191
Treaty of Berlin—Article X.—Bulgaria, 1477

GRAY, Mr. E. D., *Carlow Co.*
Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1913, 1915, 1916

GREER, Mr. T., *Carrickfergus*
Army—Royal Engineers, 402

GREGORY, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Metropolis—Obstructions in Main Thoroughfares, 956
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1858
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1674
Supply—Land Commissioners for England, &c. 1377
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1024
New Courts of Justice, &c. 646

Ground Game Act, 1880—*Spring Traps (Scotland)*
Questions, Sir Alexander Gordon, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Sir William Harcourt *May* 8, 221

GUEST, Mr. M. J., *Wareham*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 864
Literature, Science, and Art—The Tapestries at Hampton Court, 1486
Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. 147, 149; Amendt. 150, 151, 154; 3R. 317

Hall-Marking (Gold and Silver Plate)—Report of Select Committee (1878-9)
Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 10, 384

HAMILTON, Lord C. J., *Liverpool*
Emigration (England and Wales), 527
Mercantile Marine—Signal Watch-house at Dungeness, 1323
Metropolitan Improvements—Widening of the Road at Knightsbridge, 1627
Post Office—Irish Mail Service, 402

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord G. F., *Middlesex*
Army—Troops in India (Numbers), 1907
East India (Expenditure), Res. 288, 315
Egypt—Law and Justice—Trial of Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 568
Metropolis—Coal and Wine Duties—Application for Renewal, 959
Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 1108

Harbours of Refuge
List of the Select Committee *May* 10, 518

HARCOURT, Mr. E. W., *Oxfordshire*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R.* 1162

HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V. V. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Derby*
Betting Acts—Arrests at Newcastle, 1100, 1101
Burial Acts—Nonconformist Burials, 1312
Channel Islands—Fisheries, 1925
French Claims, 1620
City Livery Companies Commission, 1308, 1326
Committee on Technical Education—The Report, 230
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 8, 1069
Contagious Diseases Acts—Questions
Metropolitan Police, 29
Non-enforcement of Compulsory Examination—Withdrawal of the Police from Chatham—Action of the Government, 381, 401, 402
Protection of Women and Young Persons, 584
Provisional Arrangements, 40, 41
Convict Prisons—Pay and Position of Warders—Report of the Committee, 771
Criminal Law—Wife-Beating, 757
East India (Expenditure), Res. 312
Explosive Substances Acts, 1316
Certificates, 1328
Orders in Council, April 20, 1883—Explosives, 407, 772, 774, 1909
Factory Acts (Inspectors)—Mr. W. Paterson, 406
Ground Game Act, 1880—Spring Traps (Scotland), 222
Law and Police—Questions
Francis Redfern, Case of (Uttoxeter), 1330
"Infernal Machines," 1926
Ireland—Martin Nash, 390, 391
Thomas Jones, a Convict, 1743
Wandsworth Police Court, 886
Lunacy Acts—Mr. Joseph Berry, 755
Magistracy (England and Wales)—Portsmouth Borough Magistracy, 755, 756, 1478, 1479
Medals, 2R. 876
Metropolis—Obstructions in Main Thoroughfares, 956
Parliament—Business of the House, 584, 777, 1263
Ministerial Arrangements—Scotch Business, 1919, 1921
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1893
Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879—Director of Public Prosecutions—Regulations, 955, 956
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1223, 1224, 1229
Scotland—Highland Crofters—Royal Commission (Easter Ross), 1625
Sunday Closing (Wales), 1630
Sunday Trading (London), 227
Supply—Local Government Board, 1409

HARDINGE, Viscount
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1606
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner — Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1289
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 189

HARDWICKE, Earl of

- Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses—Action of the Government, 373, 377

HARRINGTON, Mr. T., *Westmeath*

- Army Estimates—Divine Service, 799
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 852
- Ireland—Questions
  - Hunting in Carlow Co. 397
  - Irish Land Commission—Kerry Sub-Commission, 949;—Sub-Commissioners—Mr. Philips Newton, 37
  - Law and Police—Conduct of the Police, 392
- Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
  - Execution of Myles Joyce, 410, 411
  - Execution of Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey, 44, 45
  - Phœnix Park Murders—Patrick Delaney, 577
  - Sentence on James M'Claskey, 37, 38
- Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Questions
  - Sec. 12—John O'Connor, Case of, 948
  - Sec. 14—Police Searches, 397, 398, 399
  - Sec. 16—Private Examinations, 224, 234
  - Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 784, 785, 967; Motion for Adjournment, 968, 971, 974, 981
  - Prisons—Limerick Gaol, 942;—Mr. Healy, M.P., Mr. Davitt, and Mr. Quinn, Prisoners in Richmond Gaol, 759
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 769
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 445

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of (Secretary of State for War), *Lancashire, N.E.*

- Army—Questions
  - Armoured Railway Trains — Lieutenant Colonel Campbell Walker, 1098
  - Army Enlistment—New Regulations, 1642, 1643
  - Army Medical Commission—Supplies for the Army in Egypt, 1095
  - Cavalry Regiments in Ireland, 403
  - Guards and Sentries, 1308
  - Militia Officers with Line Regiments, 1635
  - Musketry Instructors, 382
  - Recruiting—"Waste" of the Army, 1546, 1549, 1552, 1553, 1555, 1558, 1559
  - Rifle Ranges at Wormwood Scrubbs, 1317
  - Roman Catholic Soldiers on Board the "Euphrates" Troopship, 1097
  - Royal Engineers, 403
  - Soldiers' Illegitimate Children, 30
- Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Questions
  - Antrim Artillery, 1305, 1306
  - Forage Allowance—Militia Officers' Horses, 1636
  - Roman Catholic Militiamen, 777
  - Use by the Volunteers of the Butts at Wormwood Scrubbs, 784
- Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 813
  - Divine Service, 791
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 841, 844, 851
  - Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 868

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*

- Contagious Diseases Acts—Provisional Arrangements, 40, 42; Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 54, 55, 58
- Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. 727
- East India (Expenditure), Res. 306, 314
- Mercantile Marine—Signal Watch-house at Dungeness, 1324
- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 143, 146
- Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 760, 762, 763
- Supply—Public Offices Site, 608
- Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1190

HASTINGS, Mr. G. W., *Worcestershire, E.*

- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Detached Districts, 1912
- Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 352

HAY, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Wigtown, &c.*

- Navy—H.M.S. "London," 535
- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 105, 106, 108, 136, 141

HAYTER, Colonel Sir A. D. (Financial Secretary to the War Office), *Bath*

- Army—Questions
  - Lieutenant General Wilby, 962
  - Parading of Roman Catholic Soldiers for Divine Service on Holy Days, 1907
  - Recruiting—"Waste" of the Army, 1559, 1566
  - Royal Warrant, 1882—Pensions of Officers' Widows, 1742
- Army (Egyptian Expedition)—Questions
  - Compensation for Breaking Contracts, 1096
  - Military Hospitals in Cyprus, 1928, 1929, 1930
  - Veterinary Report, 887
- Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 815
  - Divine Service, 796
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 831
- Army (India)—Indian Establishment, 957, 958
- Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 895

HEALY, Mr. T. M., *Wexford*

- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1940, 1956
- Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1917

HENEAGE, Mr. E., *Great Grimsby*

- Agricultural Holdings, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 329, 1165, 1166
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease, 764
  - Orders in Council, 945
- Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 747

[cont.

Heneage, Mr. E.—*cont.*
  Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, 705
    Business of the House, 781
  Sea Fisheries Commission, 1334
  Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1419
    Local Government Board, 1400, 1404

Henry, Mr. Mitchell, *Galway Co.*
  Ireland—Irish Land Commission—Marquess of Clanricarde's Tenants, 1632, 1633
    Magistracy—Mr. William Carson, 1622
  National Debt Bill, 1648
  Parliament—Business of the House, 418, 532
    Grand Committees—Report of Proceedings, 529, 530
  Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1917
  Supply—Public Works in Ireland, 1348, 1353, 1360, 1361

Herbert, Hon. S., *Wilton*
  Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. 152, 154

Herschell, Sir F. (*see* Solicitor General, The)

Hertford, Marquess of
  Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1609

Hibbert, Mr. J. T. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board), *Oldham*
  Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1238
  Supply—Local Government Board, 1390, 1395, 1406, 1410
    Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales), 1034

Hicks, Mr. E., *Cambridgeshire*
  Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, 316;—Local Collectors of Income Tax, 49
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 11, 487, 488
  Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 746
  Theatres Regulation, 2R. 338
  Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1820, 1821

High Court of Justice (Service of Writs) Bill (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Cochran-Patrick, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. James Campbell, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Armitstead*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 184]

Hill, Mr. A. S., *Staffordshire, W.*
  Agricultural Holdings, 2R. 321, 331
  Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 354
  Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 980

Holland, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
  Africa (South)—Zululand, 754
  Africa (West Coast)—Affairs of Ashantee, 1903
  Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879—Director of Public Prosecutions—Regulations, 955
  Supply—Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, 450

Hollond, Mr. J. R., *Brighton*
  London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 210

Holms, Mr. J. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Hackney*
  Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 991, 992, 993, 997
    Lighthouses Abroad, 1367

Hope, Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
  Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, Comm. 1807
  Parliament—Business of the House—Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1754
    Ministerial Statement, 1925
  Parliament—Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. Motion for Adjournment, 2007
  Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 427
    Public Offices Site, 591

Hopwood, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
  Army—Roman Catholic Soldiers on Board the "Euphrates" Troopship, 1096
  Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of Compulsory Examination—Withdrawal of the Police from Chatham—Action of the Government, 381
  Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1657
  Vaccination—Syphilitic Infection, 1919
  Vaccination Acts—Calf Lymph, 697

Howard, Mr. J., *Bedfordshire*
  Agricultural Holdings, 2R. 330
  Agricultural Holdings (England), Leave, 519; 2R. 1132*, 1140, 1166
  Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), Leave, 516
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease—Orders in Council, 945
  Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 736
  Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, 713
  Parliament—Department of the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, 47

Howard, Mr. G. J., *Cumberland, E.*
  Supply—Science and Art Department, 676

Hubbard, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
  Africa (South)—Transvaal—Murder of Mr. J. S. M'Gilloray, 28
  Customs and Inland Revenue Bill—Local Collectors of Income Tax, 49
  Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, 478, 483

[*cont.*

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G.—*cont.*
Income Tax—Assessment of Profits made Abroad, 22
Parliament—Business of the House, 418
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1888

ILLINGWORTH, Mr. A., *Bradford*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 871
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1943
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1420
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1033
Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1189

Inclosure Provisional Order (Hildersham) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 1 [Bill 209]

INDERWICK, Mr. F. A., *Rye*
Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. *add. cl.* 149

INDIA (*Questions*)
Criminal Code (Procedure) Amendment Bill (Mr. Ilbert's Bill)
The Debates in the Legislative Council, Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 28, 935; Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *June* 4, 1634
The Legislative Council, Calcutta—Misleading Telegram, Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 21, 581
Reports of Local Governments, Questions, Mr. Pugh, Mr. E. Stanhope, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 31, 1324
The Viceroy of India, Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 10, 412

Law and Justice
Contempt of Court—Mr. Justice Norris—Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 7, 35; Questions, Mr. Macfarlane, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross *June* 5, 1747
Indian Penal Code—Newspapers—The "Calcutta Englishman," Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 7, 36
Treatment of Europeans and Natives, Questions, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 21, 585; *May* 24, 769
Alleged Ill-treatment of an Englishman, Question, Colonel Dawnay; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *June* 4, 1620
Alleged Severity of Sentence, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *June* 7, 1900

Bengal—The Ryots of Meherpur, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 21, 582

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*
Ceylon—Privilege of Franking Letters—The Bishop of Colombo, Question, Mr. H. H. Fowler; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 28, 934
Debates on Indian Affairs, Question, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answer, The Chairman of Ways and Means *May* 7, 27
Hall-Marking (Gold and Silver Plate), Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 10, 389
Duty on Jewellery, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 29, 1094
Madras—The Madras Civil Service, Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 21, 583
The Salem Riots—Mr. Maclean, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 21, 585
Private Employment of Indian Officials, Question, Mr. Carbutt; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 7, 51
The late Ex-Gaikwar of Baroda, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Mr. J. K. Cross *May* 8, 220

India—East India (Expenditure)
Observations, Mr. E. Stanhope *May* 8, 238
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that early steps be taken to reduce the expenditure of India" (*Mr. E. Stanhope*) *May* 8, 264
Amendt. to leave out all after "House," add "every effort should be made to effect economy in the Government of India" (*Mr. J. Kynaston Cross*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question again proposed, 306
Amendt. at end of Question, add "and this House regrets the decision arrived at by Her Majesty's Government to cast a further burden upon the Revenues of India in order to meet the extraordinary charges incurred by that Government on account of the Military expedition to Egypt" (*Mr. Onslow*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Marjoribanks*); after further short debate, Question put; A. 77, N. 17; M. 60; (D. L. 87); Debate adjourned

India—East India (Financial Statement)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the statement of the financial affairs of India should be made at a period of the Session when it can be fully discussed" (*Mr. R. N. Fowler*) *May* 22, 714
Amendt. to leave out "fully," insert "referred to a Select Committee, and after examination properly" (*Sir George Campbell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That 'fully,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question put, and agreed to

Inland Revenue (Circular)
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 1, To leave out from "That," add "the General Order of the 3rd January, issued by the

[*cont.*

Inland Revenue (*Circular*)—cont.
Board of Inland Revenue, is an unwarrantable interference on the part of a Public Department in the relations between Members of Parliament and their constituents, and an invasion of the privileges of this House" (*Lord Randolph Churchill*) *v.*, 1496; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 120, N. 37; M. 83 (D. L. 115)

IRELAND (*Questions*)
Audit of Accounts—The Wexford Corporation, Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1637
Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, 1857—*Transfer of Funds*, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 580
Borough Boundary Commission—The Report, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 944
Customs Duties—The Port of Galway, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 25, 899
Dispensary Houses Act, 1879—*Section* 8—*Pallaskenry Dispensary*, Questions, Mr. Synan; Answers, Mr. Courtney *June* 7, 1902
Dublin Metropolitan Police and the Royal Irish Constabulary—The Committees of Inquiry, Questions, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 8, 228
Hunting in Carlow Co., Questions, Mr. Kenny, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 395
Inflammatory Language—The Rev. Charles Flynn, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 579
Inland Revenue—Selling Porter without a Licence, Question, Mr. J. N. Richardson; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1304
Landlord and Tenant—Corporation of Wexford—Reductions of Rent, Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1323
Licensing Acts—Dublin, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 34
Registration Acts—Registered Charges on Estates, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 11, 530
Sale of Crown Lands—Maryborough Heath, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 28, 950
State-Aided Emigration, Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Questions, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Mayne; [no reply] *May* 10, 383; Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 935
[See title *Emigration*]
The Bowling Green Mills (*Galway*) *Compensation Case*, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Courtney *June* 5, 1744
The Castle, Dublin—St. Patrick's Hall, Question, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answer, Mr. Courtney *June* 7, 1904
The Phœnix Park Murders—Memorial to the late Mr. Burke, Notice, Mr. O'Brien *June* 4, 1650
The Royal University of Ireland, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1641

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*
Utilization of Natural Resources, Observations, Dr. Lyons *May* 25, 929 [House counted out]

National Education
Commissioners of National Education—Mr. Owen Ryan, Assistant Teacher in the Belfast National School, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 19; Question, Mr. Moore; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1319;—*The Vote for Model Schools*, Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 24, 775; Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 953
National School Teachers—Grants to Training Colleges, Questions, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 414;—*Legislation*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1622

Inland Navigation and Drainage
Arterial Drainage, Question, Observations, Lord Monteagle, The Earl of Longford; Reply, Lord Carlingford *June* 1, 1462
The River Shannon—Drainage Works at Meeluk, Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 7, 30
The Upper Shannon, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 10, 417

Fishery Piers and Harbours
Rossclare Pier and Harbour, Questions, Colonel Colthurst; Answers, Mr. Courtney *May* 7, 23; *May* 10, 386

Law and Justice
Convictions at Wicklow Assizes, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 25, 889
Execution of Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey, Convicted of Murder, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 44
Execution of Myles Joyce, Convicted of Murder, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 10, 410
Irish Crown Solicitorships, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1319
Sentence on James M'Claskey, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 37
The Law Adviser, Question, The Earl of Limerick; Answer, Lord Carlingford; short debate thereon *May* 10, 378

The Murder Trials at Dublin
Fees to Counsel, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; [no reply] *May* 28, 951
Patrick Delaney, Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Harrington; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 21, 576
The Jury Panel, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Question, Mr. Harrington; [no reply] *May* 7, 30; Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Macartney; Answers, Mr. Speaker *May* 11, 532;—*Trial of Joseph Brady*, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 400

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Threatening Letters—John J. Regan, Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1634

Law and Police

Conduct of the Police in Westmeath, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 392

Dublin Metropolitan Police—Office of Chief Superintendent, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 11, 525

The Belfast Police, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1328

Martin Nash, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 10, 390

The Magistracy

Mr. William Carson, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1621

Mr. J. F. L. Macfarlane, J.P., Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 24; *May* 28, 942

Special Resident Magistrates and the Constabulary, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 573

The King's County, Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 29, 1102

Prisons

Limerick Gaol, Questions, Mr. Synan, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 941

Mr. Healy, M.P., Mr. Davitt, and Mr. Quinn, Prisoners in Richmond Gaol, Questions, Mr. Lalor; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 586; Questions, Mr. Lalor, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Joseph Cowen; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 24, 758

Post Office

Belfast Post Office, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 24, 775

Ennis Post Office, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *June* 4, 1636

Mail Service in Co. Sligo, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 21, 578

Telegraph Office, Dundalk, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 10, 400

Poor Law

Appointment of Medical Officer to the Cashel Dispensary District, Questions, Mr. Moore; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 387

Belfast Workhouse—Irregularities in Book-keeping, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 391;—*Irregularities of Inmates*, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 944

Donegal Workhouse—The Roman Catholic Chaplain, Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 24

Dunfanaghy Workhouse, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 393

Dunfanaghy Board of Guardians—Outdoor Relief, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 394

Dunfanaghy Union—Outdoor Relief—Irregularities of Officials, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 31, 1327; Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Colonel Colthurst; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1639

[*cont.*

Ireland—*Poor Law*—cont.

Lurgan Workhouse, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 1, 1480

The Rathdown Guardians, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 25, 892

Case of John Flanagan, a Lunatic, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 42

Case of Patrick Kennedy, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 8, 224

Limerick Board of Guardians—State-Aided Emigration, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 960

Outdoor Relief, Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 11, 521

Poor Removal, Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 31, 1320

Election of Poor Law Guardians

Poor Law Elections—Waterford, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Plunket, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 574

Carrick-on-Shannon Union, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 33

Castleblayney Division—The Papers, Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 23

Clifden Union, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 7, 1905

Co. Leitrim, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 577

Co. Longford, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 24, 771

Kildysart, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 579

Mallow, Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 1, 1483

Shillelagh Union, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 25, 889

Railways

Loans to Irish Railways, Question, Mr. T. A. Dickson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 24, 754

West Clare Railway, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 5, 1759

Royal Irish Constabulary

Employment in cultivating Farms of Evicted Tenants, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 392

Sub-Inspector Smith (Moville), Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 399; Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 937; Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 1, 1481

Suicide of Sub-Constable Coleman, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 32; Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 938

Tearing down National League Placards, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 42

[*cont.*

Lawrence, Sir J. C., *Lambeth*
Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), 1618

Lawson, Sir W., *Carlisle*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 870
Betting Acts—Arrests at Newcastle, 1100, 1101
Criminal Law—Wife-Beating, 757
East India (Expenditure), Res. 306
Egypt—Questions
  Law and Justice—Trial of Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 561
  Massacre at Alexandria, 701
  Re-organization—Earl of Dufferin's Despatch, 232, 233;—Reform of Criminal Procedure, 951, 1331
  Toulba Pasha, 948
Lord Alcester's Annuity, Comm. 1455
Lord Alcester (Grant in Lieu of Annuity), Res. 1075
Parliament—Questions
  Adjournment—Derby Day, 530, 531, 532, 706, 711
  Business of the House, 1343
  Grants to Lords Alcester and Wolseley, 901, 902
  Order—Surrey (Trial of Causes) Bill, 320
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1982

Lea, Mr. T., *Donegal*
Board of Trade—Committee on Lighthouse Illuminants, 1746

Leake, Mr. R., *Lancashire, S.E.*
Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 262

Leamy, Mr. E., *Waterford*
Army (India)—Indian Medical Service—Junior Medical Officers, 954, 1638
Ireland—Questions
  Audit of Accounts—Wexford Corporation, 1637
  Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Waterford Co. 522, 897
  Landlord and Tenant—Reduction of Rent, 1323
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1250
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1974

Lefevre, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw (Chief Commissioner of Works), *Reading*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1126, 1131
Literature, Science, and Art—The Tapestries at Hampton Court, 1487
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 211, 215
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 1307;—Re-building of the Wellington Arch, 405
National Gallery and British Museum—Electric Lighting, 757
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Commons—Ventilation of the Committee Rooms, 1912, 1913
  Westminster Hall (Western Side), 389

[*cont.*

Lefevre, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw—*cont.*
Supply—British Museum, &c. 685, 687
  County Court Buildings, 633, 634, 635
  Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, 1368, 1369, 1370
  Furniture of Public Offices, 610
  Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 424, 427, 431, 433, 436, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445
  Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 638
  New Courts of Justice, &c. 643, 646, 649, 650, 651, 653, 655, 658
  Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 448, 451, 457, 460, 462, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473
  Public Offices Site, 592, 602, 605, 606, 607, 610
  Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 613, 616, 620, 622, 625, 630, 631
  Science and Art Department, 668, 673, 676, 677, 678, 679
  Surveys of the United Kingdom, 661, 666

Legitimacy Declaration Act, 1858, Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Onslow*)
l. Order for 2R. discharged* *May* 24 (No. 38)

Leighton, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
Explosive Substances Acts—Orders in Council, 772, 774
Supply—Public Offices Site, 600

Leighton, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1563
Burial Acts—Consecration of Cemeteries—Rhos, Denbighshire, 697
Law and Justice—Dormant Funds in Chancery, 386
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill—Recommendation of Parliamentary Candidates, 235
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 433
  Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1026

Lennox, Right Hon. Lord H. G. C. G., *Chichester*
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 76, 89

Lewis, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1047; *cl.* 8, 1070; *cl.* 10, 1072; *add. cl.* 1436
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Suspended Boroughs, 1103
Ireland—Questions
  Commissioners of National Education—Vote for Model Schools, 775
  Land Law Act, 1881—Judicial Rents—"Chaine *v.* Nelson," 781
  National Education—Model Schools, 953, 954
  Poor Removal, 1320
  Royal Irish Constabulary—Sub-Inspector Smith, 937

[*cont.*

LEWIS, Mr. C. E.—*cont.*
Parliament—Questions
Business of the House, 1343
Privilege—Parliamentary Oath (Mr. Bradlaugh), 236, 237, 238
Rules and Orders—Petitions—Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) Amendment—Proxy Signatures, 408
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1879
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 962; 2R. 1653, 1660, 1699; Comm. 1939, 1944, 1947
Poor Law—Case of William Davis, 936
Western Islands of the Pacific—Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland, 1335

LEVETT, Colonel T. J., *Lichfield*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 858

Lighthouse Illuminants, The Committee on—Resignation of Professor Tyndall
Question, Mr. Gibson; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 7, 28; Questions, Mr. Gibson, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 11, 520; Questions, Colonel King-Harman, Mr. Lea; Answers, Mr. Chamberlain *June* 5, 1744

LIMERICK, Earl of
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Law Adviser, 378

LINCOLN, Bishop of
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Petition of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland — Petition presented, 1283

Literature, Science, and Art
South Kensington Museum—Painting by Sir Frederick Leighton, Questions, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 25, 898;—*The Art Gallery*, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Mundella *June* 7, 1910
The National Gallery and British Museum—Electric Lighting, Question, Mr. Coope; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *May* 24, 756
The Reputed "Raphael," Question, Mr. Tomlinson; Answer, Mr. Courtney *June* 1, 1486
The Tapestries at Hampton Court, Question, Mr. Montague Guest; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *June* 1, 1486

LLOYD, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
Metropolitan Improvements—Proposed Park for Paddington, 1628

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (Rathmines, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 7 [Bill 153]
Report * *May* 25
Read 3° * *May* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *May* 29 (No. 64)
Read 2ª * *June* 7

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
(*The Lord President*)
l. Read 2ª * *May* 7 (No. 27)
Committee * *May* 25
Report * *May* 28
Read 3ª * *May* 29
c. Read 1° * *June* 1 [Bill 211]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) (Killarney) Bill
(*Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 172]
Read 2° * *May* 25
Report * *June* 5
Read 3° * *June* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord President*) *June* 7 (No. 81)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (Limerick Waterworks) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Carlingford*)
l. Committee * *May* 7 (No. 3)
Report * *May* 8
Read 3ª * *May* 10
c. Read 1° * (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) *May* 24 [Bill 197]
Read 2° * *June* 6

Local Government Provisional Orders Bill (*Lord Carrington*)
l. Read 2ª * *May* 25 (No. 54)
Committee *; Report *May* 28
Read 3ª * *May* 31

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 2) (West Hartlepool) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Report * *June* 5 [Bill 143]
Considered * *June* 7

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) (Bethesda, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 22 [Bill 170]
Report * *May* 30
Read 3° * *May* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *June* 1 (No. 73)

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) (Cheltenham, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 176]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Report * *May* 30
Read 3° * *May* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *June* 1 (No. 74)

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) (Ashton-in-Makerfield, &c.) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 194]
Read 2° * *June* 5

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) (Barnet Union, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 195]
Read 2° * *June* 4

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) (Bognor, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 196]
Read 2° * *June* 4

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) (Kingston-upon-Hull, &c.) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 25 [Bill 199]
Read 2° * *June* 5

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) (Haslingden, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 25 [Bill 200]
Read 2° * *June* 5

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) (Leeds) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 31 [Bill 206]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Highways) (County of Dorset) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 193]
Read 2° * *June* 5

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (Brafield-on-the-Green, &c.) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles W. Dilke*)
c. Report * *May* 25 [Bill 149]
Considered * *May* 29
Read 3° * *May* 30
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *May* 31 (No. 67)

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 2) (Black-Torrington, &c.) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 177]
Read 2° * *May* 25

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) (No. 3) (Birmingham and Lambeth) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 22 [Bill 192]
Read 2° * *June* 4

Local Government (Gas) Provisional Order (Festiniog) Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 21 [Bill 164]
Report * *May* 30
Read 3° * *May* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Carrington*) *June* 1 (No. 72)

London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *May* 8, 194
Amend. to leave out "now read 3°," insert "re-committed" (*Mr. A. J. Balfour*) v.; Question proposed, "That 'now read 3°,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 173, N. 157; M. 16 (D. L. 85)
Moved, "That the Vote of Mr. Plunket be disallowed" (*Mr. Kenny*); after short debate, Question put; A. 36, N. 254; M. 218 (D. L. 86)
Main Question put, and agreed to (Queen's Consent signified); Bill read 3°
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 31, 1265; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª, and committed
Moved, "That it be an instruction to the Committee to which the Bill is referred, that the Railway Company shall not be empowered to appropriate a larger portion of the Parochial Burial Ground of St. James' than is proved to be absolutely required for the necessary convenience of the travelling public, by means of the enlargement of the railway station and of the substitution of a new street in lieu of the existing street which is to be absorbed in the process of the enlargement of the station" (*The Lord Mount-Temple*); after further short debate, on Question? Cont. 49, Not-Cont. 89; M. 40; resolved in the negatived; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection
Div. List, Cont. and Not-Cont. 1271

London, Bishop of
Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1736
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1269

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Bill (by Order)
c. Read 3°, after short debate *June* 5, 1738

London Commissioners of Sewers (Ventilation of Railways) Bill
(*Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. William Lawrence, Mr. Robert Fowler*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 4

Long, Mr. W. H., *Wilts, N.*
Parliament—Alleged Candidature of Mr. Sub-Commissioner Wylie, 939

Longford, Earl of
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1605
Ireland—Arterial Drainage, 1464
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Law Adviser, 378

Lord Alcester (Grant in Lieu of Annuity)
Considered in Committee *May* 28, 1075; Moved, "That it is expedient to authorise the grant of a sum of £25,000, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, to Frederick Beauchamp Paget, Lord Al-

[*cont.*

Lord Alcester (*Grant in Lieu of Annuity*)—cont.
cester, Admiral in Her Majesty's Navy, in lieu of the Annuity of Two thousand pounds per annum, which was proposed to be granted to him in answer to the Message from Her Majesty on the 13th day of April last;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Resolution reported, and agreed to *May* 29
Instruction to the Committee on Lord Alcester's Annuity Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution

Lord Alcester's Annuity Bill
(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone*)
c. Committee; Report *May* 31, 1455 [Bill 145]

Lord Wolseley (*Grant in Lieu of Annuity*)
Considered in Committee *May* 28, 1075; Moved, "That it is expedient to authorise the grant of a sum of £30,000, out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, to Garnet Joseph, Lord Wolseley, General in Her Majesty's Army, in lieu of the Annuity of Two thousand pounds per annum, which was proposed to be granted to him in answer to the Message from Her Majesty on the 13th day of April last;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Resolution reported, and agreed to *May* 29
Instruction to the Committee on Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution

Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bill
(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone*)
c. Committee *; Report *May* 31 [Bill 146]

LOWTHER, Right Hon. J., *Lincolnshire, N.*
Magistracy (England and Wales)—Portsmouth Borough, 1479
Supply—County Court Buildings, 634
  Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 635
  New Courts of Justice, &c. 656
  Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 625, 626, 632
  Surveys of the United Kingdom, 660, 665, 668

Lunacy Acts
Case of Hugh Flanagan, Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answers, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 25, 887
Mr. Joseph Berry, Question, Mr. Brogden; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 24, 765

LUSK, Sir A., *Finsbury*
Supply—County Court Buildings, 633
  Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, 1369
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 995
  Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1014, 1015, 1017

[*cont.*

LUSK, Sir A.—*cont.*
  New Courts of Justice, &c. 650
  Public Works in Ireland, 1355, 1361
  Registry of Friendly Societies, 1377
  Revenue Department Buildings, 628

LYONS, Dr. R. D., *Dublin*
Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 816
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1062
Ireland—Utilization of Natural Resources, 929

MACARTNEY, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*
Army—Parading of Roman Catholic Soldiers for Divine Service on Holy Days, 1907
Ireland—Law and Justice—Dublin Murder Trials, 532
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1260
Law and Police—"Infernal Machines," 1926
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 218
Medals, 2R. 874
Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 1109
Parliament — Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2014
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1974
Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1916
  Mail Carts and Newspaper Parcels, 20

MCCARTHY, Mr. Justin, *Longford*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 693; Comm. *cl.* 8, 1069
Ireland—Questions
  Dublin Metropolitan Police and Royal Irish Constabulary — Committee of Inquiry, 228
  Evictions—Clonmany, Co. Donegal, 699
  Inland Revenue—Income Tax—Drumduff, Co. Leitrim, 698
  Magistracy—Special Resident Magistrates and the Constabulary, 573
  State of—Decrease of Crime—Withdrawal of Extra Police, 571
Ireland—Irish Land Commission—Applications under Arrears of Rent Act, 1882, 570
  Sub-Commissioners, Co. Longford, 384
Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
  Election of Guardians, Co. Longford, 771
  Kildysart—Election of Guardians, 579
  Patrick Kennedy, Case of, 224
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1958
Slavery and Slave Dealing at Tangier, 1317
Supply—British Museum, &c., Amendt. 684
Western Islands of the Pacific — Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland, 382

MCCOAN, Mr. J. C., *Wicklow*
Parliament—Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1336

MACFARLANE, Mr. D. H., *Carlow Co.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. 474, 483, 484

[*cont.*

MACFARLANE, Mr. D. H.—*cont.*
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 718
Income Tax — Assessment of Profits made Abroad, 22
India — Law and Justice — Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, 1747
Inland Revenue—Income Tax on Foreign Investments, 1333, 1741
Morocco—Slavery, 403
Theatres Regulation, 2R. 338

MCGAREL-HOGG, Sir J. M., *Truro*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 220
Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Act—"Hôtel Métropole," 383, 1623, 1624
Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), Amendt. 1614, 1617
Metropolitan Improvements—Proposed Park for Paddington, 1629
Widening of the Road at Knightsbridge, 1628
Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1005, 1009
Theatres Regulation, 2R. Amendt. 334, 337, 338

MAC IVER, Mr. D., *Birkenhead*
Ireland—State-aided Emigration, 383

MCKENNA, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
Army—Armoured Railway Trains—Lieutenant Colonel Campbell Walker, 1098
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 975
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1967

MCLAGAN, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. 1785, 1786

MCLAREN, Mr. C. B. B., *Stafford*
Burial Acts—Nonconformist Burials, 1311
India—Ex-Gaikwar of Baroda, The late, 220
Supply—Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 453

MACLIVER, Mr. P. S., *Plymouth*
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 62
Law and Police—Thomas Jones, a Convict, 1743
Navy (The Blue Ribbon), 388
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 123, 125
Parliament—Rules of Debate—Questions, 782

Madagascar
Bombardment of Mayunga by the French Fleet, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 24, 783
The French Invasion, Question, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 29, 1103
Protection of the Lives and Property of British Subjects, Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *June* 4, 1647

Madagascar—cont.
Regulation of Traffic in Spirituous Liquors, Question, Mr. Cropper; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 25, 894

Magistracy (England and Wales)—Portsmouth Borough Magistracy
Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 24, 755; *June* 1, 1478

MAKINS, Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 71
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1893

Malta—Refugees from Egypt
Moved for, "Papers from the Government of Malta to the Colonial Secretary in connexion with residence and cost of maintenance in Malta of refugees from Egypt during the autumn of year last, and for all Correspondence up to the present date" (*The Earl De La Warr*) *June.* 7, 1896; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to

Manchester Ship Canal Bill
c. Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Manchester Ship Canal Bill that they have power to inquire and consider whether the powers respecting the Canal can be properly granted, regard being had to the question whether, to make the Canal effective, a low-water channel in the estuary of the Mersey be necessary, and whether the formation and maintenance of such a channel is reasonably practicable" (*Sir Joseph Bailey*) *May* 7, 17; Motion agreed to

MARJORIBANKS, Hon. E., *Berwickshire*
East India (Expenditure), Res. Motion for Adjournment, 314

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Compensations, Motion for Papers, 1475, 1476

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Dalhousie*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 8 (No. 56)
Petition of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, Petition presented, The Bishop of Lincoln *May* 31, 1283; Petition read, and ordered to lie on the Table

MARRIOTT, Mr. W. T., *Brighton*
Metropolitan District Railway—Ventilators—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway), 1612

MARTIN, Mr. P., *Kilkenny Co.*
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1965, 1967

MARTIN, Mr. R. Biddulph, *Tewkesbury*
Supply—Science and Art Department, 675

[*cont.*

Marum, Mr. E. P. M., *Kilkenny Co.*
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 1999
- Parliament—Business of the House, 232

Maskelyne, Mr. M. H. N. Story-, *Cricklade*
- Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Act — Hôtel Métropole, 382, 1622, 1624

Maxwell, Sir H. E., *Wigtonshire*
- Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), 2R. 1762, 1769, 1771, 1796, 1798
- Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 817, 831, 846, 849
- General Assembly of the Church of Scotland—The Lord High Commissioner, 1331, 1332, 1333
- Ground Game Act, 1880—Spring Traps (Scotland), 220
- India—Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, 936
- Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, Motion for Adjournment, 701
  - Business of the House, 960; Ministerial Statement, 1649
- Supply—Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland, 1039

Maxwell-Heron, Captain J. M., *Kirkcudbright*
- Navy—"Clyde" Court Martial, 51, 1307

Mayne, Mr. T., *Tipperary*
- Ireland—State-Aided Emigration, 384
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1943, 1970
- Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 435, 442

Medals Bill (*Mr. Courtney, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 188]
Read 2°, after short debate *May* 24, 873

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord O'Hagan*)
l. Read 2ª *May* 10, 356 (No. 52)
Committee *; Report *May* 24
Read 3ª * *May* 25
c. Read 1° * (*Dr. Lyons*) *May* 30 [Bill 205]

Mercantile Marine
- *Signal Watch-house at Dungeness,* Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, The Marquess of Hartington *May* 31, 1323
- *The Passing Tolls Act—Collection of the Light Dues,* Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 22, 699

Metropolis (*Questions*)
- *Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Act—The "Hôtel Métropole,"* Questions, Mr. Story-Maskelyne; Answers, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *May* 10, 382; *June* 4, 1622

Metropolis—*cont.*
- *Obstructions in Main Thoroughfares,* Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 28, 956
- *Parks—Richmond Park — The Roehampton Gate,* Question, Observations, Lord Oranmore and Browne, Viscount Midleton; Reply, Lord Sudeley *May* 28, 930
- *Poor Law—St. Pancras Workhouse—Re-Vaccination of Females,* Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 31, 1322
- *The Coal and Wine Duties—Application for Renewal,* Questions, Mr. Firth, Mr. Slagg, Lord George Hamilton; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 28, 958

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (Saint George-in-the East) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 173]

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 2) (Limehouse) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 174]

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 3) (Lambeth) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 175]

Metropolis Improvement Provisional Order (No. 4) (Greenwich) Bill (*Mr. Hibbert, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 5 [Bill 214]

Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway) Bill (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Lord Algernon Percy, Mr. Marriott*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 4

Metropolitan District Railway—Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway)—The Ventilators on the Thames Embankment
- Moved, "That the Report from the Committee on the Metropolitan District Railway Bill [presented on 31st May] be now read" (*Mr. Marriott*) *June* 4, 1612; Motion agreed to; Observations, Mr. Marriott
- Moved, "That the Standing Orders be suspended, and that leave be given to the Metropolitan Board of Works to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1881,' in relation to the openings or shafts authorised by that Act to be constructed in roads or open spaces within the Metropolis, for the purpose of ventilating their Railways; and for other purposes" (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg*), 1616
- Amendt. in line 2, after "the," insert "Corporation of London and the" (*Sir Thomas Chambers*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Metropolitan District Railway — Metropolitan Board of Works (District Railway) — The Ventilators on the Thames Embankment—cont.

- Amendt. in line 4, after "Bill," insert "or Bills" (*Sir Thomas Chambers*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
- Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Metropolitan Improvements

- *Communications across the Thames*, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 28, 960
- *Hyde Park Corner*, Questions, Observations, Earl Fortescue, Earl Cadogan, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, Lord Sudeley *May* 28, 932; Questions, Mr. Gerard Noel, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *May* 31, 1307;—*Re-building of the Wellington Arch*, Questions, Mr. A. Pease, Mr. Gerard Noel; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *May* 10, 404;—*Re-erection of the Wellington Statue*, Observations, Lord Strathnairn; Reply, Lord Sudeley; short debate thereon *May* 31, 1288
- *Proposed Park for Paddington*, Questions, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Boord, Mr. Firth; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *June* 4, 1628
- *Widening of the Road at Knightsbridge*, Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg *June* 4, 1627

Mexico—Renewal of Diplomatic Relations

- Questions, Mr. Monk; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 24, 753; *May* 31, 1323

MIDLETON, Viscount

- Parks (Metropolis)—Richmond Park—Roehampton Gate, 831

MILES, Sir P. J. W., *Somerset, E.*

- Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 873

MOLLOY, Mr. B. C., *King's Co.*

- Egypt—Daira Lands, 1102
  - Re-organization—Mr. Sheldon Amos, 50, 230
- Ireland—Questions
  - Arterial Drainage — River Shannon — Drainage Works at Meeluk, 30
  - Magistracy—King's County, 1102
  - State of—Proclaimed Districts in King's County—Extra Police, 1101
- Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 880
- Medals, 2R. 877
- Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. Motion for Adjournment, 1891, 1895
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1429
  - Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 989; Amendt. 990, 991, 993, 994
  - Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 444, 445
  - Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c., 473

MOLLOY, Mr. B. C.—*cont.*

- Public Works in Ireland, 1354; Amendt. 1358, 1359, 1360, 1361
- Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 628
- Science and Art Department, 678, 679, 681, 682
- Surveys of the United Kingdom, 664, 666

MONCKTON, Mr. F., *Staffordshire, W.*

- Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. Amendt. 347

MONCREIFF, Lord

- Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1081; *cl.* 8, 1090

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*

- Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1501, 1506, 1511
- Italy—Renewal of Commercial Treaty, 385
- Mexico—Renewal of Diplomatic Relations, 753, 1323
- Parliament—Questions
  - Adjournment—Derby Day, 705
  - Order—Surrey (Trial of Causes) Bill, 320
  - Privilege—Petitions—Fraudulent Signatures, 940
- Supply—New Courts of Justice, &c. 642
  - Science and Art Department, 671

MONTEAGLE, Lord

- Ireland—Arterial Drainage, 1462

MOORE, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*

- Emigration (England and Wales), 527
- Ireland—Questions
  - Commissioners of National Education—Mr. Owen Ryan (Belfast), 1319
  - Poor Law—Appointment of Medical Officer to the Cashel Dispensary District, 387
  - State-Aided Emigration, 935
- Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1260
- Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 533

MORGAN, Right Hon. G. Osborne (Judge Advocate General), *Denbighshire*

- Army (Recruiting)—"Waste" of the Army, 1532, 1536, 1543
- Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 804, 809, 815, 816
- Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 58, 69, 75

MORLEY, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for War)

- Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1589

MORLEY, Mr. J., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*

- Betting Acts—Arrests at Newcastle, 1100

MORLEY, Mr. S., *Bristol*

- Education Department—The "Blue Ribbon" in Board Schools, 1485
- Trade and Commerce—Sugar Duties, 413

[*cont.*

Morocco
Slavery, Question, Mr. Macfarlane; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 10, 403
Slavery and Slave-Dealing at Tangier, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 31, 1317

Moss, Mr. R., *Winchester*
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 59

Mount-Temple, Lord
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1265

Mundella, Right Hon. A. J. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Sheffield*
City of London Livery Companies Commission, 1327
Education Department—Questions
Absence of the Senior Examiner, 227, 228
"Blue Ribbon" in Board Schools, 1485
Educational Standards (Wells Union), 226
Education (Wales)—Carnarvon Training College, 1311
Elementary Education Acts—Ashford Magistrates, 1624
Literature, Science, and Art—South Kensington Museum—The Art Gallery, 1910

Municipal Corporations (Unreformed) Bill (*Sir Charles Dilke, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Considered *May* 7, 147 [Bill 156]
Read 3° *May* 8, 317
l. Read 1^{a}* (*The Earl of Rosebery*) *May* 10
Read 2^{a} *May* 28, 930 (No. 59)

Muntz, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 217
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1889
Supply—Public Offices Site, 599

Napier of Magdala, Lord
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1607

National Debt Bill
(*The Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Courtney*)
c. Resolutions considered in Committee *May* 8, 317
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 182]
Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 4, 1648

National Museums and Galleries, Sunday Opening of—See title *Sunday Opening*

Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Northbrook*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a}* *May* 10 (No. 61)
Read 2^{a}, after short debate *May* 25, 882
Committee *June* 1, 1456
c. Questions, Mr. W. H. Smith, Captain Price; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *June* 7, 1906

Navy (*Questions*)
Engine Room Artificers, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 7, 18
Examination of Naval Cadets (*The "Britannia"*), Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 28, 956
First-Class Petty Officers, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 25, 889
H.M.S. "Clyde"—The Court Martial on Captain F. Maxwell-Heron, Question, Captain Maxwell-Heron; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 7, 51;—*The Papers*, Question, Captain Maxwell-Heron; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 31, 1307
H.M.S. "Hecla"—The Suez Canal, Question, Observations, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Earl of Northbrook *May* 7, 12
H.M.S. "London," Questions, Sir John Hay; Answers, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 11, 535
Iron-Clads for Foreign Powers, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 7, 27
The "Blue Ribbon" Movement, Question, Mr. Stewart Macliver; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 10, 388
The Dockyards—Shipwrights, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Sir Thomas Brassey *May* 25, 886
Victualling Accounts, Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 10, 405
Warrant Officers, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman *May* 24, 756

Newdegate, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 13, 505
Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1521
Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 766

New Forest (Highways) Bill
(*Mr. Courtney, Mr. Cotes*)
c. Committee nominated *May* 22; List of the Committee, 696

New Forest, The—Commissioners of Woods and Forests
Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 7, 1905

Newport, Viscount, *Shropshire, N.*
Army Estimates—Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 857

NICHOLSON, Mr. W. NEWZAM-, *Newark*
- Agricultural Holdings (England)—Incorporation of Clauses of the Act of 1875, 1917
- Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 847

NOEL, Right Hon. G. J., *Rutland*
- Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 1307

NOLAN, Colonel J. P., *Galway Co.*
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1679 ; Comm. 1973

NORTHBROOK, Earl of (First Lord of the Admiralty)
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses—Action of the Government, 372
- Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, 2R. 882, 884, 885 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1458 ; *cl.* 7, 1462
- Navy—H.M.S. "Hecla"—The Suez Canal, 13

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H., *Devon, N.*
- Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 63
- India—Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, 935
  - Legislative Council, Calcutta—Misleading Telegrams, 581, 582
- Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1503, 1504, 1506, 1507
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 768, 1995
- Parliament—Questions
  - Business of the House, 418, 533, 782, 900, 901, 1263, 1343, 1487, 1488 ;—Count-out on Friday, May 25, 963, 964
  - Lord Alcester's and Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bills, 528
  - Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1495
  - Public Business—Ministerial Statement, 1649, 1925
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1935
- Public Works Loans, 1909

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
- Egypt—Suez Canal—Proposed New Canal, 897, 898

O'BEIRNE, Colonel F., *Leitrim*
- Army—Cavalry Regiments in Ireland, 403
- Army Estimates—Divine Service, 789
  - Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 871
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1062

O'BRIEN, Mr. W., *Mallow*
- Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Roman Catholic Militiamen, 777
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1042, 1043, 1047 ; *cl.* 7, 1062 ; *cl.* 8, 1070 ; 3R. 1570

[*cont.*

O'BRIEN, Mr. W.—*cont.*
- Corrupt Practices at Elections—Suspended Boroughs, 1103
- Ireland—Questions
  - Criminal Law—Fees to Counsel, 951, 952
  - Hunting in Carlow Co., 397
  - Law and Justice—Jury Panel, Dublin, 30, 31 ;—Phœnix Park Murders—Patrick Delaney, 576 ;—Memorial to the late Mr. Burke, 1650
  - Royal Irish Constabulary—Employment in cultivating Farms of Evicted Tenants, 392 ;—Tearing down National League Placards, 42
  - Royal University, 1641
  - State of—Constabulary, 952
- Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
  - Dunfanaghy Board of Guardians—Outdoor Relief, 394, 1639
  - Dunfanaghy Workhouse, 393, 1327
  - Election of Guardians, Mallow, 1483
  - Limerick Board of Guardians—State-aided Emigration, 960
- Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Questions
  - Private Examinations at Dublin Castle, 233, 234
  - Sec. 14—Searches for Documents—Mr. John Cullen, of Manorhamilton, 524
  - Sec. 16—Private Examinations, 224, 417
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 768, 1998
- Parliament—Parliamentary Representation—The Disfranchised Irish Boroughs, 1334
  - Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1341
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1940, 1968
- Scotland—Irish National League in Glasgow, 1484
- Supply—Public Works in Ireland, 1365

O'CONNOR, Mr. A., *Queen's Co.*
- Army Estimates—Divine Service, 798
- Army (India)—Indian Establishments, 958
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. Schedule 2, 1453
- East India (Expenditure), Res. 314
- Education Department—Absence of the Senior Examiner, 227, 228
- General Assembly of the Church of Scotland—The Lord High Commissioner, 1333
- Inland Revenue—Cultivation of Tobacco, 420
- Ireland—Questions
  - Criminal Law—Fees to Counsel, 952
  - Irish Bankrupt and Insolvent Act, 1857—Transfer of Funds, 580
  - Licensing Acts, Dublin, 34
  - National Education—Model Schools, 954
  - Poor Law Elections, 574
  - Poor Removal, 1322
  - Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Sec. 14—Police Searches, 31, 32, 525
  - Registration Acts—Registered Charges on Estates, 530
  - State of—Extra Police (Tipperary), 575
- Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 1454
- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 146
- Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, 531

[*cont.*

O'Connor, Mr. A.—*cont.*
- Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1418, 1420, 1421, 1426
  - County Court Buildings, 634
  - Diplomatic and Consular Buildings, 1367
  - Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, Amendt. 987
  - Lighthouses Abroad, 1366
  - Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1031
  - Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland, 1040
  - Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 636
  - New Courts of Justice, &c., Amendt. 648, 650, 652, 658
  - Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 466
  - Public Works in Ireland, Amendt. 1344, 1350, 1360, 1365
  - Rates on Government Property, 999, 1000
  - Surveys of the United Kingdom, 662

O'Connor, Mr. T. P., *Galway*
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1049 ; *cl.* 7, 1054, 1058, 1060, 1061, 1064 ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1067 ; *add. cl.* 1434, 1442
- India—Law and Justice—Baboo Soorendro Nath Bannerjee, 1747
- Ireland—Questions
  - Bowling Green Mills (Galway)—Compensation Case, 1744
  - Custom Duties—Port of Galway, 899
  - Poor Law—Election of Guardians, Clifden Union, 1905
  - Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Extra Police at Ballinalough and Kiltully, 1742 ;—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 785
- Ireland—Irish Land Commission—Questions
  - Appeals from Sub-Commissioners, 1626
  - Marquess of Clanricarde's Tenants, 1631
  - Sub-Commissioners (Galway), 1743
- Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1240
- Parliament—Business of the House, 1760, 1761
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1936, 1972
- Passenger and Emigrant Ships—Alleged Starvation of Emigrants, 1930
- Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1756, 1757
- Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 986
- United States—Irish Emigrants, 1650, 1651

O'Donnell, Mr. F. H., *Dungarvan*
- Army Estimates—Divine Service, 786, 794, 802
  - Militia Pay and Allowances, 848, 849
- Army (India)—European Soldiers at Barrackpur, 582
- Commission on Technical Education—Report, 230
- East India (Expenditure), Res. 301, 302, 305
- East India (Financial Statement), Res. 725
- Egypt—Law and Justice—Trial of Ahmed Bey Khandeel, 569
- Factory Acts (Inspectors)—Mr. W. Paterson, 405, 406
- Harbours of Refuge, Nomination of Select Committee, 518

[*cont.*

O'Donnell, Mr. F. H.—*cont.*
- India—Questions
  - Bengal—Ryots of Meherpur, 582
  - Indian Penal Code — Newspapers — The "Calcutta Englishman," 36
  - Law and Justice—Courts of Law—Mr. Justice Norris—Conditions of Admission for Natives, 35 ;—Treatment of Europeans and Natives, 585, 769
  - Salem Riots—Mr. Maclean, 585
- Ireland—Questions
  - Law and Justice—Phœnix Park Murders—Patrick Delaney, 576
  - Poor Law—Donegal Workhouse—Roman Catholic Chaplain, 24 ;—Poor Law Elections, 574
  - Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Sec. 14—Police Searches, 399
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 767, 769, 1996
- Parliament—Rules of Debate—Questions, 782
- Post Office—Mail Carts and Newspaper Parcels, 20
- Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 763
- Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 994
  - Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 433, 440, 442, 445
- Turkey (Asiatic Provinces)—Governorship of the Lebanon, 402

O'Hagan, Lord
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 356

O'Kelly, Mr. J., *Roscommon*
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1053, 1056
- Ireland—Questions
  - Hunting in Carlow Co. 397
  - Law and Justice—Threatening Letters—John J. Regan, 1634
  - Poor Law — Election of Guardians for Castleblayney—Papers, 23
  - Prisons—Limerick Gaol, 942
  - State-Aided Emigration, 384
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 213, 217
- Parliament—Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1489, 1494
- Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 556, 1647 ;—Colonel Maceo, 406, 1908

Onslow, Mr. D. R., *Guildford*
- Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, Comm. 1572, 1573
- East India (Expenditure), Res. 295 ; Amendt. 306, 311, 315
- Parliament—Business of the House, 510, 511
- Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 238
- Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1190

Oranmore and Browne, Lord
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses—Action of the Government, 371

[*cont.*

Oranmore and Browne, Lord—*cont.*
Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 371
Parks (Metropolis)—Richmond Park—Roehampton Gate, 930, 932

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. R., *Limerick*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1056 ; *add. cl.* 1435 ; Schedule 2, 1448
Ireland—Inland Navigation—Upper Shannon, 417
  Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Sec. 16—Private Examinations, 417

O'Shea, Mr. W. H., *Clare*
Army Estimates—Divine Service, 794
  Militia Pay and Allowances, 846
Corn Sales, 2R. 1717

O'Sullivan, Mr. W. H., *Limerick Co.*
Ireland—Peace Preservation Act, 1881—Extra Police at Kilmallock, 1907, 1908

Otway, Sir A. J. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Rochester*
Army Estimates—Divine Service, 798
  Militia Pay and Allowances, 849
  Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances, 871
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1050, 1057 ; *cl.* 8, 1069 ; *add. cl.* 1442, 1443, 1444 ; Schedule 2, 1451, 1452, 1453 ; Preamble, 1454
Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 737
India—Debates on Indian Affairs, 27
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 207
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 124, 143, 145
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1837, 1894
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1415, 1416, 1417, 1418, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1422, 1425
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 990, 991
  Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 430
  Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland, 1040
  Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 637
  New Courts of Justice, &c. 659
  Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 448, 453, 458, 459, 462
  Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 628
  Science and Art Department, 679

Oxford, Aylesbury, and Metropolitan Junction Railway Bill (by Order)
c. Notice of Resolution, Viscount Folkestone *May* 31, 1303

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Orders Confirmation Bill (*Lord Sudeley*)
l. Royal Assent *May* 31 [46 *Vict.* c. x]

Paget, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
Army—Musketry Instructors, 382
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 67
Education Department—Educational Standards (Wells Union), 226
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 199
Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879—"Queen *v.* Taylor and Boynes," 1749
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1833, 1834

Palmer, Mr. C. M., *Durham, N.*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1213

Papal See — Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington
Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Newdegate, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. O'Donnell, Mr. Gorst, Mr. O'Brien ; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gladstone *May* 24, 765 ; Question, Lord Randolph Churchill ; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 25, 893 ; Questions, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Sir H. Drummond Wolff ; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 952 ; Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Gorst ; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Mr. Gladstone *May* 31, 1312 ; Observations, Mr. Gladstone *June* 1, 1488 ; Observations, Lord Randolph Churchill ; Reply, Mr. Gladstone ; debate thereon *June* 7, 1982

Parliament
LORDS—
Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords—"*Bradlaugh* v. *Clarke*," Question, Lord Denman ; Answer, The Lord Chancellor *May* 8, 192

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS
Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92 and 93 be suspended ; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the recess

Parliament—Parliamentary Procedure
Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to make such provision, by legislation or otherwise, as will enable either House of Parliament, if it shall think fit, at any stage of its proceedings upon any Bill which shall have been passed by the other House of Parliament, to adjourn further proceedings upon such Bill to such day as shall for that purpose be then named, in the first or second week of the next succeeding Session of Parliament" (*The Lord Balfour*) *May* 7, 1 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Parliament—*cont.*

COMMONS—

STANDING COMMITTEES

Reports of Proceedings, Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 11, 529

Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Moved, "That the Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures have leave to sit on Mondays till half-past Four of the clock, and on Fridays till half-past Two of the clock, during the sitting of the House" (*Mr. Goschen*) *June* 7, 2006; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); after short debate, Question put; A. 34, N. 99; M. 65 (D. L. 120)

Original Question put; A. 97, N. 30; M. 67 (D. L. 121)

RULES AND ORDERS OF THE HOUSE

Petitions — Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) *Amendment Bill—Proxy Signatures,* Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Sir Charles Forster *May* 10, 408

Order—Surrey (*Trial of Causes*) *Bill,* Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Speaker *May* 9, 320

RULES OF DEBATE

Questions, Questions, Mr. Stewart Macliver, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 24, 782

The Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule (*Dropped Orders*), Observations, Mr. Speaker *June* 7, 1930

PRIVILEGE

Parliamentary Oath (*Mr. Bradlaugh*), Questions, Mr. Lewis, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Speaker *May* 8, 236

Petitions—Fraudulent Signatures, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Sir Charles Forster *May* 28, 940

Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, Observations, Mr. M'Coan *May* 31, 1336; Moved, "That Mr. O'Kelly do attend in his place Tomorrow" (*Mr. Gladstone*); after short debate, Question put; A. 250, N. 19; M. 231 (D. L. 109); Observations, Mr. Speaker; Reply, Mr. O'Kelly; short debate thereon *June* 1, 1488

PROCEDURE

Parliamentary Oath (*The Standing Orders*), Withdrawal of Motion, Lord Randolph Churchill *May* 31, 1335

New Rules of Procedure—Rule as to Blocking Notices [97A], Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Speaker *May* 7, 49

The Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, Observations, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, Mr. Speaker; short debate thereon *June* 5, 1749

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Notices of Motions and Orders of the Day, Moved, "That the Order of the Day for the Second Reading of the Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill have precedence this day of Notices of Motions and the other Orders of the Day" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 29, 1109; Motion agreed to

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE AND PUBLIC BUSINESS

Ministerial Statement, Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 7, 45; Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, The Attorney General *May* 10, 408;—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Ritchie; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 10, 418;—*Ministerial Statement,* Questions, Mr. Moore, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 11, 533;—Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir George Campbell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 25, 899;—*Ministerial Statement,* Questions, Sir R. Assheton Cross, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Lord George Hamilton, Viscount Emlyn, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Macartney; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 29, 1105;—Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 30, 1263; Questions, Mr. Lewis, Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Courtney *May* 31, 1343; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *June* 1, 1487;—*Ministerial Statement,* Questions, Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Gorst, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *June* 4, 1648; Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; [no reply] *June* 7, 1925;—*Lords Alcester and Wolseley Annuities Bills,* Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Speaker *May* 7, 46;—*Drainage Consolidation* (*Ireland*) *Bill,* Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 8, 232;—*South Africa—The Transvaal—Policy of Her Majesty's Government,* Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 10, 508;—*East India* (*Expenditure*), Observations, Mr. Onslow; short debate thereon *May* 10, 510;—*The National Debt Bill,* Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 11, 532; Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 24, 782;—*Parliamentary Elections* (*Corrupt and Illegal Practices*) *Bill,* Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 21, 584; Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 24, 782;—*Scotch Business,* Question, Mr. A. Elliot; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 24, 777;—*Agricultural Holdings* (*England*) *Bill,* Questions, Mr. Heneage, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 24, 781;—*Agricultural Holdings* (*Scotland*) *Bill,* Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 28, 960;—*The "Count-out" on Friday, May* 26, Questions, Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 28, 963;—*Universities Scotland Bill,* Question, Mr. Craig-Sellar; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 29, 1104;—*La-*

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Business of the House and Public Business*—cont.

bourers (Ireland) Bill, Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Buchanan; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 5, 1760;—*The Medical Act Amendment Bill*, Questions, Lord Randolph Churchill; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *June* 7, 1922;—*Police Superannuation Bill*, Questions, Mr. A. Peel, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *June* 7, 1923

SITTING AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Adjournment (Whitsun Recess) — Spain — Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, Moved, "That this House, at its rising, do adjourn till Monday the 21st instant" (*Mr. Gladstone*) *May* 11, 535; after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

The Derby Day, Question, Mr. Bourke; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 8, 234; Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker *May* 11, 530; Moved, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn till Thursday" (*Sir Herbert Maxwell*) *May* 22, 701; after debate, Question put; A. 185, N. 85; M. 100 (D. L. 97)

QUESTIONS

Alleged Candidature of Mr. Sub-Commissioner Wylie, Question, Mr. Long; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 939

Corrupt Practices at Elections — The Suspended Boroughs, Questions, Mr. Lewis, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 29, 1103

Department of the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, Question, Mr. James Howard; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 7, 47

Lord Alcester's and Lord Wolseley's Annuity Bills, Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 11, 527

Grants to Lords Alcester and Wolseley, Questions, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answers, Mr. Gladstone *May* 25, 901

Scotch Business—The Earl of Rosebery, Questions, Mr. A. Elliot, Mr. Dalrymple, Mr. James Stewart; Answers, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Gladstone *June* 7, 1919

The Disfranchised Irish Boroughs, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 31, 1334

PALACE OF WESTMINSTER

The House of Commons—Ventilation of the Committee Rooms, Question, Mr. Vivian; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Observations, Mr. J. R. Yorke *June* 7, 1912

Westminster Hall (Western Side), Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *May* 10, 389

Parliament—Standing Order 167

Standing Order 167 read; An addition thereto moved (Payment of Interest out of Capital) (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *June* 6, 1837; Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate,

[*cont.*

Parliament—Standing Order 167—cont.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Molloy*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question put; A. 131, N. 123; M. 8 (D. L. 117)

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

Sat First

May 31—The Earl of Lonsdale, after the death of his brother

June 4—The Lord Lurgan, after the death of his father

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

New Writs Issued

June 4—*For* the County of Wexford, *v.* Garrett Michael Byrne, esquire, Manor of Northstead

June 6—*For* Leicester County (Northern Division), *v.* Major-General Edwyn Sherard Burnaby, deceased

For Derby Borough, *v.* Michael Thomas Bass, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill

Question, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 28, 962; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 4, 1650

Recommendation of Parliamentary Candidates, Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 8, 235

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Bill

(*Mr. Attorney General, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Solicitor General*)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 4, 1651

Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Warton*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 7]

Order for Committee read *June* 7, 1930

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert a new Clause in the Bill charging the returning officer's expenses at Parliamentary Elections upon the rates in boroughs and counties" (*Mr. Broadhurst*); after debate, Question put; A. 80, N. 247; M. 167 (D. L. 118)

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," 1944

Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "in the opinion of this House, the question of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary Elections in Ireland should be reserved for separate consideration" (*Mr. Parnell*), *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 243, N. 31; M. 212 (D. L. 119)

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P., 1981

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) [Payment of Costs and Expenses]
c. Considered in Committee *June* 7, 2018
Resolution reported *June* 8

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Cork City*
Ireland—Land Law Act, 1881—Judicial Rents —" Chaine *v.* Nelson," 779
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Questions
Sec. 14—Police Searches, 399
Sec. 16—Private Examinations, 414, 416, 417
Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 784, 785, 965, 966, 971
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1244, 1246
Parliament—Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1342
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. Amendt. 1947

Parochial Charities (London) Bill
(*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Pell, Sir Henry Peek, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Davey*)
c. Ordered, That the Report of the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty to inquire into the Parochial Charities of the City of London, which was presented to this House in the year 1880, be referred to the Select Committee on the Parochial Charities (London) Bill
Ordered, That the Report of the Select Committee on the London Parochial Charities (London) Bills, together with the Minutes of Evidence presented to this House in the year 1882, be referred to the Select Committee on the Parochial Charities (London) Bill (*Mr. Lefevre*) *May* 22
Report of Select Committee *June* 5 [No. 185]

Parochial Charities (London) [Salaries and Expenses]
c. Considered in Committee *May* 10, 520
Resolution reported *May* 11

Passenger and Emigrant Ships—Alleged Starvation of Emigrants
Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 7, 1930

PATRICK, Mr. R. W. COCHRAN-, *Ayrshire, N.*
Medals, 2R. 874

Pawnbroker's Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 5 (No. 79)

PEASE, Sir J. W., *Durham, S.*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 200
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. Amendt. 1844, 1851, 1854, 1878

PEASE, Mr. A., *Whitby*
Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner—Re-building of the Wellington Arch, 404

PEDDIE, Mr. J. DICK-, *Kilmarnock, &c.*
Supply—Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1016
Registry of Friendly Societies, 1376, 1378

PEEK, Sir H. W., *Surrey, Mid*
Supply—Public Offices Site, 606, 609
Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 614, 615, 616

PEEL, Mr. A. W., *Warwick Bo.*
Parliament—Business of the House, 1923

PELL, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1159
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1822

PERCY, Right Hon. Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
Army—Questions
Auxiliary Forces—Antrim Artillery, 1306; —Forage Allowance — Militia Officers' Horses, 1635
Militia Officers with Line Regiments, 1635
Recruiting—"Waste" of the Army, 1565
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 834, 844, 847
Medals, 2R. 876
Parliament—Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1755

PERCY, Lord A., *Westminster*
Army Estimates—Militia Pay and Allowances, 825

PETERBOROUGH, Bishop of
Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1721, 1731

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (Inverness, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Report * *May* 25 [Bill 147]
Considered * *May* 28
Read 3° * *May* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Sudeley*) *May* 31 (No. 68)

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) (Whitby) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 8 [Bill 158]
Report * *June* 5
Considered * *June* 6
Read 3° * *June* 7

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Sir Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1882
Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2014
Supply—Science and Art Department, 680
Vaccination—Syphilitic Infection, 1918
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Report of Select Committee, 1301; Consid. 1836

Plunket, Right Hon. D. R., *Dublin University*
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1442
- Ireland—Poor Law Elections, 574
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 210, 213, 220

Pluralities Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Rochester*)
- *l.* Committee, after short debate *May* 7, 17
- Report * *May* 8 (No. 42)
- Read 3ª * *May* 10
- *c.* Read 1° * (*Mr. Acland*) *June* 1 [Bill 212]

Poor Law Conferences Bill
(*Mr. Pell, Mr. Stansfeld, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Hollond*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *May* 10 [Bill 187]
- Read 2° * *May* 22
- Committee *; Report *May* 24
- Read 3° * *May* 28
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*Lord Henniker*) *May* 29 (No. 65)
- Read 2ª * *May* 31
- Committee *; Report *June* 1
- Read 3ª * *June* 7

Poor Law (England and Wales)
- *Case of William Davis*, Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 28, 936
- *Guardians of the Poor, Westminster*, Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 25, 891
- *Repayments for Pauper Relief*, Questions, Mr. E. Stanhope; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 29, 1097
- *St. James's Workhouse*, Questions, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. W. H. Smith; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 29, 1094

Porter, Right Hon. A. M. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Londonderry Co.*
- Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1057, 1061
- Ireland — Law and Justice — Phœnix Park Murders—Patrick Delaney, 576, 577
  - Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 981
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1961

Portugal — International Sailing Code— The "City of Mecca"
- Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 10, 404
- [See title *The Congo*]

Post Office (*Questions*)
- *Mail Carts and Newspaper Parcels*, Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Mr. Fawcett *May* 7, 20
- *Postal Service (Scotland)*, Question, Mr. Craig-Sellar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *June* 5, 1747
- *The American Mails*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *June* 4, 1634

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
- *The Parcels Post*, Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 25, 886;—*Appointment of Officials*, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 7, 20

Contracts
- *The Irish Mail Service*, Question, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 10, 402; Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 31, 1316; Questions, Mr. M. Brooks, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Gibson; Answers, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fawcett *June* 5, 1756; Questions, Mr. Gray, Mr. Gibson, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. Fawcett *June* 7, 1913

Telegraph Department
- *The General Post Office — Accommodation* Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 7, 25
- *Telegraph Clerks (Belfast)*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Fawcett *May* 7, 21

Power, Mr. J. O'Connor, *Mayo*
- Ireland—Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts —Westport, 1627
- Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1892
- Public Health—Nazareth House, Hammersmith —Report of Mr. Spears, 1927

Powerscourt, Viscount
- Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 166

Powis, Earl of
- Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner—Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1293

Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882
(*Questions*)
- *Extra Police at Ballinalough and Kiltully*, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 5, 1742
- *Extra Police at Kilmallock*, Questions, Mr. O'Sullivan; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 7, 1907
- *Extra Police at Tipperary*, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 575
- *Proclaimed Districts in King's Co.—Extra Police*, Question, Mr. Molloy; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 29, 1101
- *Decrease of Crime—Withdrawal of Extra Police*, Questions, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 21, 571
- *Police Protection—Mr. O'Neill, of Rathfoland*, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1636
- *Newspapers—Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel,"* Questions, Mr. Parnell, Colonel King-Harman, Mr. Harrington, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 24, 784; Questions, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 965
  - Moved, "That Motion for Adjournment be now made" (*Mr. Harrington*); Question put; A. 137, N. 135; M. 2 (D. L. 100)

[*cont.*

Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—cont.
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Harrington*); after debate, Motion withdrawn
Section 12—*Case of John O'Connor*, Question, Mr. Harrington; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 28, 948
Section 14—*Police Searches*, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 7, 31; Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan, 52; Questions, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 397;—*Searches for Documents—Mr. John Cullen, of Manorhamilton*, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan; Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; [no reply] *May* 11, 524
Section 16—*Private Examinations*, Questions, Mr. Kenny, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 8, 223; Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan, 233; Questions, Mr. Parnell; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan *May* 10, 414
The Compensation Clause—Murder of Mr. W. M. Bourke, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 1, 1482

Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act (1882) (Audience of Solicitors) Bill
(*Lord O'Hagan*)
l. Read 2ª * *May* 10 (No. 34)
Committee *; Report *May* 24
Read 3ª * *May* 25

Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882 —*Compensations*
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Minutes of Evidence taken in Court, before the investigators, under the Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, and the reports upon which His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has awarded compensation to persons injured and to the families of persons who have been murdered" (*The Marquess of Waterford*) *June* 1, 1466; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

PRICE, Captain G. E., *Devonport*
Army—Lieut.-General Wilby, 962
Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment Bill, 1906
Navy—Engine-Room Artificers, 18
Iron-Clads for Foreign Powers, 27
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 113, 145
West Indies (Jamaica)—Exports and Imports, 1851 to 1882, 961
Jamaica and the Leeward Islands—Commission of Inquiry, 947

Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879
The Director of Public Prosecutions—The Regulations, Questions, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Gorst; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *May* 28, 955
"*The Queen* v. *Taylor and Boynes*," Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answers, The Attorney General *June* 5, 1748

Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—The Army Medical Inquiry
Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Puleston, Dr. Cameron, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. Gladstone *May* 24, 760; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Sir Arthur Hayter *May* 25, 894

Public Health—Nazareth House, Hammersmith—Report of Mr. Spears
Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *June* 7, 1927

Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (Fraserburgh Waterworks) Bill (*The Lord Advocate, Secretary Sir William Harcourt*)
c. Report * *May* 11 [Bill 2]
Read 3° * *May* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Dalhousie*) *May* 24 (No. 63)

Public Works Loans—Legislation
Question, Sir Stafford Northcote; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 7, 1909

PUGH, Mr. L. P., *Cardiganshire*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 8, 486
East India (Expenditure), Res. 293, 315
India—Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill—Reports of Local Governments, 1324

PULESTON, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
Civil Service (Re-organization)—Promotion, 407
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for Adjournment of the House, 52, 53, 55, 66
Non-enforcement of Compulsory Examination—Withdrawal of the Police—Action of the Government, 402
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, 3R. 1738
Public Documents—Premature Disclosure to the Press—Army Medical Inquiry, 762
Supply—Public Offices Site, 590

RAIKES, Right Hon. H. C., *Cambridge University*
Parliament—Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1751
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1884
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1682; Comm. 1981

Railway Passenger Duty, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Arthur Hayter*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 7 [Bill 219]

RAMSAY, Mr. J., *Falkirk, &c.*
Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 994
Local Government Board, 1412

[*cont.*

Ramsay, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, Amendt. 1019, 1036
Maintenance of Disturnpiked Roads in Scotland, 1037; Amendt. 1038, 1040
Revenue Department Buildings, 617, 629

Rankin, Mr. J., *Leominster*
Corn Sales, 2R. 1712, 1717
State-Aided Emigration, Res. 1809

Redesdale, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1270
Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner, 933;—Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1293
Parliament—Parliamentary Procedure, Res. 7
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. 1077

Reed, Sir E. J., *Cardiff*
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 110
Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 992

Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Bill
(*Dr. Lyons, Mr. Maurice Brooks, Mr. Findlater*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 28 [Bill 202]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *June* 4, 1710; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Biggar*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Reid, Mr. R. T., *Hereford*
East India (Expenditure), Res. 275
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 717, 723

Representative Peers (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Committee (*on re-comm.*), after short debate *May* 29, 1077 (No. 53)

Richard, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Burial Acts—Nonconformist Burials, 1311
Education (Wales)—Carnarvon Training College, 1310

Richardson, Mr. J. N., *Armagh Co.*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1047
Ireland—Inland Revenue—Selling Porter without a Licence, 1304
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1977
Supply—Public Works in Ireland, 1347

Richmond and Gordon, Duke of
Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1232

Ritchie, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
General Post Office (Telegraph Department)—Accommodation, 25

Ritchie, Mr. C. T.—*cont.*
Metropolitan Improvements—Communications across the Thames, 900
Parliament—Business of the House—Count-out of Friday, May 25, 964

Robertson, Mr. H., *Shrewsbury*
Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 745

Rogers, Mr. J. E. Thorold, *Southwark*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 2R. 1160
Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 880
Supply—Local Government Board, 1394

Rosebery, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department)
Criminal Law Amendment, 1R. 1294, 1296
Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), 2R. 930
Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1280

Round, Mr. J., *Essex, E.*
Royal Commission on Agriculture, Report of, 770

Russell, Mr. G. W. E., *Aylesbury*
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1662
Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1188, 1191

Russia
Coronation of the Czar—The Embassy to Moscow, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 7, 52
Trans-Caucasus Transit Duties, Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 24, 763

Rylands, Mr. P., *Burnley*
Ballot Act Continuance and Amendment, 388, 389
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 13, 497
Navy—Victualling Accounts, 405
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 144
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1428
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 985
  Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, Amendt. 427, 428, 433
  Local Government Board in Ireland, 1407
  Maintenance of Disturnpiked, &c. Roads in England and Wales, 1025, 1026
  Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 451

St. Aubyn, Mr. W. N. M., *Helston*
Parliament—Adjournment—Derby Day, 710

St. Vincent, Viscount
Africa (South)—Transvaal—The Convention, 1285

[*cont.*

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (No. 2) Bill [Bill 51]
(*Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Birley, Sir William M'Arthur, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Charles Ross*)
c. 2R., after short debate [House counted out] *May* 22, 729

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham) Bill
(*Mr. Theodore Fry, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Lambton, Mr. Dodds, Mr. Thomas Richardson, Mr. Gourley, Mr. James Thompson*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 30, 1194
Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "this House, while willing to discuss the question of County Government, declines to consider Public Bills affecting only a single county" (*Mr. Thomasson*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 153, N. 57; M. 96 (D. L. 108)
Main Question again proposed, 1239; after short debate, main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 21]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Yorkshire) Bill
(*Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Barran, Mr. Caine Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Isaac Wilson, Sir Matthew Wilson, Mr. Pease*)
c. 2R., Debate adjourned *May* 30, 1263 [Bill 56]

Salisbury, Marquess of
Africa (South)—Transvaal—The Convention, 1288
Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of the Compulsory Clauses—Action of the Government, 377
Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners) —Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 364
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1271
Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, 2R. 1461
Parliament—Parliamentary Procedure, Res. 9
Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Compensations, Motion for Papers, 1476
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, 1089, 1091
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 190
Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1281

Salt, Mr. T., *Stafford*
Army and Navy Expenditure—"Extra Receipts," 1330
Census Returns, 1881—The Canal Population, 1927
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1863
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 432
  Lighthouses Abroad, 1367
  Local Government Board, 1396

Samuelson, Mr. B., *Banbury*
Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, 744

Science and Art—See title *Literature, Science, and Art*

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G., *Hants, N.*
Commissioners of Woods and Forests—New Forest, 1905
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), 2R. 687
Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 747
Parliament—Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2009, 2013
Supply — Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 612, 620
  Science and Art Department, 674

Scotland (*Questions*)
Court of Criminal Appeal—Legislation, Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 1, 1484
General Assembly of the Church of Scotland—The Lord High Commissioner, Question, Sir Herbert Maxwell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *May* 31, 1331
Law and Justice—Procurators Fiscal and Private Practice—Case of William Meikle, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 7, 26
The Fishery Board and the Post Office (Telegraph) Department—Extension of the Telegraph to Outlying Fishing Stations, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 1, 1479
The Highland Crofters—The Royal Commission (Easter Ross), Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *June* 4, 1625
The Irish National League in Glasgow, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Lord Advocate *June* 1, 1484
Scottish Legal Friendly Society—Dishonesty of Officials, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Lord Advocate *May* 24, 775

Scott, Mr. M. D., *Sussex, E.*
Treaty of Washington—"Alabama" Claims—Geneva Award, 1638

Sea Fisheries Commission
Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 31, 1334

Sellar, Mr. A. C., *Haddington, &c.*
Parliament—Business of the House, 1104
Post Office—Postal Service (Scotland), 1747

Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J., *Essex, W.*
Agricultural Holdings (England), 420
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 13, 495
East and West India Dock, 2R. 753
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 1307
Parliament—Business of the House, 1923
Supply—Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1418
  Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 996
  Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 430
  Land Commissioners for England, 1385

[*cont.*

Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.—*cont.*
Metropolitan Fire Brigade, 1000, 1012, 1015
Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 453, 456, 471
Public Offices Site, 591, 592
Public Works in Ireland, 1357, 1361
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 751 (Report of Select Committee), 1256, 1297, 1300, 1820, 1826, 1834, 1837

Sexton, Mr. T., *Sligo*
Army—Soldiers' Illegitimate Children, 30
Ireland—Questions
Criminal Code (Indictable Offences Procedure), 525
Evictions in Co. Sligo, 523, 524
Law and Police—Dublin Metropolitan Police, 525;—Martin Nash, 390
Poor Law—Carrick-on-Shannon Union—Election of Guardians, 33, 34
Royal Irish Constabulary—Suicide of a Constable, 32
Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 1991
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1895
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1954

Shaftesbury, Earl of
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. Amendt. 167, 190

Shaw, Mr. W., *Cork Co.*
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1895

Sheil, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
Ireland—Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Infected Districts in the Counties of Louth and Meath, 1324
Parliament—Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1341
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1664

Sheridan, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 350, 354

Sidmouth, Viscount
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 933
Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, 2R. 884; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1456, 1461; *cl.* 7, 1462
Navy—H.M.S. "Hecla"—The Suez Canal, 12

Simon, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1046

Slagg, Mr. J., *Manchester*
Africa (River Congo)—Action of Portugal, 1326
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 13, 492
East India (Expenditure), Res. 313

[*cont.*

Slagg, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Metropolis—Coal and Wine Duties—Application for Renewal, 958
Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 258

Smith, Right Hon. W. H., *Westminster*
Army and Navy Expenditure—"Extra Receipts," 1330
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 71
Customs and Inland Revenue, 316; Comm. *cl.* 13, 459; 3R. 726
Ireland—National School Teachers—Grants to Training Colleges, 414
Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, 1906
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines, 108, 125
Parliament—Business of the House, 419, 511
Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1753
Supply—Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade, 985
Privy Council for Trade, &c. 1707
Report, Res. 13, 1568
Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1189

Smith, Lt.-Col. G., *Wycombe*
Parliament — Standing Orders, Res. 1851, 1869, 1873, 1878

Smith, Mr. S., *Liverpool*
Supply—Local Government Board, 1392

Solicitor General, The (Sir Farrer Herschell), *Durham*
Medals, 2R. 877
Parliament — Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res, 2016

Somerset, Duke of
Naval Discipline and Enlistment Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1458
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 190

Spain — Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar — Colonel Maceo
Question, Mr. O'Kelly; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 10, 406; Observation, Sir R. Assheton Cross, 512; Questions, Mr. O'Kelly; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *June* 4, 1647; *June* 7, 1908

Speaker, The (Right Hon. Sir H. B. W. Brand), *Cambridgeshire*
Africa (South)—Cetewayo, 895
Agricultural Holdings (England), 419; Leave, 519
Agricultural Holdings (Scotland), Leave, 516
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), 2R. 687, 690
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 52, 72, 74
East India (Expenditure), Res. 306

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 717
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Military Hospitals in Cyprus, 1929
Exeter, Teign Valley, and Chagford Railway, Consid. 736
Forest of Dean (Highways), Nomination of Select Committee, 1455
General Assembly of the Church of Scotland—The Lord High Commissioner, 1332, 1333
Ground Game Act, 1880—Spring Traps (Scotland), 222
Harbours of Refuge, Nomination of Select Committee, 518
Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1511
Ireland—Questions
Land Law — Judicial Rents—"Chaine *v.* Nelson," 781
Law and Justice—Dublin Murder Trials, 532;—Execution of Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey, 44
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Questions
Sec. 14—Police Searches, 399
Sec. 16—Private Examinations, 417
Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 967, 968, 974, 975
Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 879
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 219, 220
Metropolitan Improvements—Proposed Park for Paddington, 1629
Municipal Corporations (Unreformed), Consid. 150, 151
Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 766, 2002, 2004, 2006
Parliament—Questions
Adjournment—Derby Day, 530, 531, 532
Business of the House, 511, 1762
Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule (Dropped Orders), 1930;—Blocking, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753
Lords Alcester and Wolseley Annuities Bills, 46
New Rule of Procedure—Rules of Blocking Notices, 50
Order—Surrey (Trial of Causes) Bill, 320
Privilege—Mr. M'Coan and Mr. O'Kelly, 1488, 1496;—Parliamentary Oath (Mr. Bradlaugh), 237, 238
Public Business, Ministerial Statement, 410
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1947, 1979, 1980
Post Office (Contracts)—Irish Mail Service, 1756
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1239
Southport Foreshore, 39; Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 238
Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway, Consid. 1816

STAIR, Earl of
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 8, 1088

STANHOPE, Earl
Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1273, 1279, 1282
Treaty of Berlin—Article X.—Bulgaria, 1476

STANHOPE, Hon. E., *Lincolnshire, Mid*
East India (Expenditure), 238; Res. 264, 277, 280, 309
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 717, 722
India—Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill—Reports of Local Governments, 1325
Debates on Indian Affairs, 27
Poor Law (England)—Repayment for Pauper Relief, 1097

STANLEY, Right Hon. Colonel F. A., *Lancashire, N.*
Army—Army Enlistment—New Regulations, 1641, 1643
Recruiting—"Waste" of the Army, 1534, 1558, 1559, 1566
Army Estimates—Administration of Military Law, 814
Militia Pay and Allowances, 840, 844

STANLEY, Hon. E. L., *Oldham*
Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 261

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord
Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries, Res. 167
Tithe Rent-Charge, 2R. 1280

STANTON, Mr. W. J., *Stroud*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 3R. 216

Statute of Frauds Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Reid, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Arthur Elliot*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 30 [Bill 204]

STEVENSON, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Supply—Local Government Board, 1407

STEWART, Mr. J., *Greenock*
Parliament — Ministerial Arrangements — Scotch Business, 1921

Stock Exchange—Report of the Royal Commission of 1878
Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *June* 4, 1627

Stolen Goods Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 5 (No. 78)

STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL, Lord
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1574, 1611

STRATHNAIRN, Lord
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner — Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1288

STUART, Mr. H. VILLIERS-, *Waterford Co.*
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1261

Sudeley, Lord
Metropolitan Improvements — Hyde Park Corner, 933
Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1291
Parks (Metropolis)—Richmond Park—Roehampton Gate, 931, 932

Sullivan, Mr. T. D., *Westmeath*
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), Comm. 1938, 1969

Sunday Closing (Wales) Act
Questions, Mr. Callan, Mr. Carbutt; Answers, Sir William Harcourt *June* 4, 1630

Sunday Opening of National Museums and Galleries
Moved to resolve, "That, seeing the success which has attended the action of Her Majesty's Government in opening on Sundays the national museums and galleries in the suburban districts of London and in the city of Dublin, and whereas this House was last Session informed by Her Majesty's Government that no opposition to Sunday opening, so far as it had already gone, had come before them, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived for extending the policy of Sunday opening after Two o'clock to all museums and galleries supported by national funds" (*The Earl of Dunraven*) *May* 8, 155
Amendt. to leave out after ("That") insert ("inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March, 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that the time has arrived when this recommendation should be carried out") (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*); after debate, on Question, whether the words, &c. ? Cont. 91, Not-Cont. 67; M. 24; resolved in the negative
Div. List, Cont. and Not-Cont, 185
Then the Earl of Shaftesbury's Resolution proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Moved, as an amendment to the foregoing Resolution, to leave out ("the time has arrived when") and in the last line after ("should") to insert ("if and so far as may be found consistent with the safety and general welfare of those institutions") (*The Earl Cairns*); after further short debate, the said amendment, on question, agreed to:
Resolved, That inasmuch as a Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Institutions have reported, on the 27th of March 1860, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened on week-day evenings to the public between the hours of seven and ten in the evening at least three days in the week, this House is of opinion that this recommendation should, if and so far as may be found consistent with the safety and general welfare of those institutions, be carried out.

Sunday Trading (London)—Legislation
Question, Mr. Grantham; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 8, 227

SUPPLY
The Army Estimates, Questions, Sir Henry Fletcher, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, Mr. Brand *May* 21, 587

SUPPLY
Considered in Committee *May* 7, 75—NAVY ESTIMATES — Vote 2, £937,400, Expense of Victuals and Clothing for Seamen and Marines; after long debate, Committee —R.P.
Considered in Committee *May* 10, 421—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS, Votes 4 to 6
Resolutions reported *May* 11
Considered in Committee *May* 21, 588—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS, Votes 7 to 16
Resolutions reported *May* 22
Considered in Committee *May* 24, 786—ARMY ESTIMATES, Votes 2, 3, 5, and 6
Resolutions reported *May* 28, 1076
Resolutions 1 and 2 agreed to
Resolution 3; after short debate, Resolution agreed to
Remaining Resolution agreed to
Considered in Committee *May* 28, 982—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS, Votes 17 to 22
Resolutions reported *May* 29
Considered in Committee *May* 31, 1344—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS, Votes 23 to 27;—CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF CIVIL DEPARTMENTS, Votes 1 to 7; 9 to 15
Resolutions reported *June* 1, 1566
Resolutions 1 to 6 agreed to
Resolution 7; after short debate, Resolution agreed to
Resolutions 8 and 9 agreed to
Resolution 10 postponed
Resolutions 11 and 12 agreed to
Resolution 13; after short debate, Resolution postponed
Remaining Resolutions agreed to
Postponed Resolution considered *June* 4, 1707
Resolution 10; after short debate, Resolution further postponed
Resolution 13; after short debate, Resolution agreed to
Postponed Resolution considered *June* 7, 1982
Resolution 10; said Resolution read a first time; Moved, "That the said Resolution be now read a second time; Question put, and agreed to; Resolution read a second time, and agreed to

Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) Bill
(*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Rowley Hill, Mr. John Morley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 30 [Bill 203]

Sutherland, Duke of
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 1266

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Ireland—Dispensary Houses Act, 1879—Sec. 8—Pallaskenry Dispensary, 1902, 1903
Prisons—Limerick Gaol, 941, 942

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Oxford University*
Contagious Diseases Acts—Non-enforcement of Compulsory Examination—Withdrawal of Police from Chatham—Action of the Government, 381
Corn Sales, 2R. 1716
Parliament—Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2015
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1221, 1224

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester*
India—Law and Justice—Alleged Severity of Sentence, 1900
Poor Law (Metropolis)—St. Pancras Workhouse—Re-vaccination of Females, 1322
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1210
Vaccination Acts — Prosecutions — Bristol, 1740
Syphilitic Infection, 1919

Technical Education, Commission on—The Report
Question, Mr. O'Donnell; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *May* 8, 230

Theatres Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. J. Lawrance, Mr. Macfarlane*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *May* 9, 331
Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 22, N. 141; M. 119 (D. L. 88)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off [Bill 81]

THOMASSON, Mr. J. P., *Bolton*
Armenia and European Turkey, Res. 928
East India (Expenditure), Res. 314
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. Amendt. 1207

THOMPSON, Mr. T. C., *Durham*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1056
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1215

Tithe Rent-Charge Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Stanhope*)
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 31, 1273
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") add ("this day six months") (*The Lord Bramwell*); after short debate, Amendt., original Motion, and Bill withdrawn (No. 22)

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1060
Literature, Science and Art—The Reputed Raphael, 1486
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1239
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 444
Public Works in Ireland, 1354

TOTTENHAM, Mr. A. L., *Leitrim*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *cl.* 7, 1053
Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 879

Trade and Commerce—The Sugar Duties
Question, Mr. Samuel Morley; Answer, Mr. Chamberlain *May* 10, 413

Tramways Provisional Orders (Aldershot and Farnborough, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 25 [Bill 167]

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 2) (Birmingham and Western District, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 22 [Bill 168]
Report * *June* 1
Considered * *June* 4
Read 3° * *June* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Sudeley*) *June* 7 (No. 80)

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 3) (Colchester, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 29 [Bill 169]

Tramways Provisional Orders (No. 4) (South Shields, &c.) Bill
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Ordered * *May* 24
Read 1° * *May* 25 [Bill 201]
Read 2° * *June* 4

Tramways (Ireland) Provisional Order (Extension of Time) Bill [H.L.]
c. Read 1° * *May* 7 [Bill 181]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Report * *June* 5
Considered * *June* 6
Read 3° * *June* 7

Treaty of Berlin
Article V.—Religious Liberty in Bulgaria, Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 24, 758
Article X.—Bulgaria, Question, Observations, Earl Stanhope; Reply, Earl Granville *June* 1, 1476;—*The Varna Railway Claims,* Questions, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 28, 938

Treaty of Berlin—Articles 61 *and* 23—*Armenia and European Turkey*
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 25, To leave out from "That," add "this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will, in conjunction with the other Powers of Europe, signataries of the Treaty of Berlin, continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin" (*Mr. Bryce*) *v.*, 902; Question proposed, "That the words, &c."; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Another Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "this House trusts that Her Majesty's Government will continue to press upon the Ottoman Porte the duty and necessity of forthwith carrying out effective reforms in Armenia and in European Turkey, conformably to the stipulations of the Sixty-first and Twenty-third Articles of the Treaty of Berlin" (*Mr. Bryce*) *v.*; Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and negatived
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Treaty of Washington—The "Alabama" Claims—The Geneva Award
Questions, Mr. Coleridge Kennard, Mr. Montagu Scott; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *June* 4, 1638

Trevelyan, Rt. Hon. G. O. (Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), *Hawick, &c.*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), 2R. 690, 691; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1042; *cl.* 3, *ib.*, 1044, 1048, 1051; *cl.* 7, 1053, 1063, 1067; *cl.* 8, *ib.*, 1070; *cl.* 10, 1073; *cl.* 12, 1074; *cl.* 13, 1430; *cl.* 14, 1432; *add. cl.* 1439, 1444; Schedule 1, 1445; Schedule 2, 1447, 1449, 1451, 1452, 1453; Preamble, 1454; 3R. 1569, 1570, 1571
Ireland—Questions
Arrears of Rent Act, 1882 — James M'Gowan, jun., Case of—Conacloon, Co. Limerick, 380
Audit of Accounts—Wexford Corporation, 1637
Borough Boundary Commission, 944
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Infected Districts in the Counties of Louth and Meath, 1324;—Westport, 1627
Criminal Law—Fees to Counsel, 952
Dublin Metropolitan Police and Royal Irish Constabulary, Committee of Inquiry, 229
Evictions—Clonmany, Co. Donegal, 700;—Co. Sligo, 523
Hunting in Carlow Co. 395, 396, 397
Inflammatory Language — Rev. Charles Flynn, 579
Inland Revenue—Selling Porter without a License, 1305
Irish Bankrupt and Insolvent Act, 1857—Transfer of Funds, 580
Landlord and Tenant—Reductions of Rent, 1323
Licensing Acts—Dublin, 35

Trevelyan, Right Hon. G. O.—*cont.*
National School Teachers, 1622;—Grants to Training Colleges, 414
Passenger and Emigrant Ships—Alleged Starvation of Emigrants, 1930
Peace Preservation Act, 1881 — Extra Police at Kilmallock, 1908
Phœnix Park Murders—Memorial to the late Mr. Burke, 1650
Prisons—Healy, Mr., M.P., Mr. Davitt, and Mr. Quinn, Prisoners in Richmond Gaol, 586, 587, 758, 759;—Limerick Gaol, 942
Registration Acts—Registered Charges on Estates, 530
Royal University, 1641
State-Aided Emigration, 383, 935
Ireland—Irish Land Commission—Questions
Additional Commissioners, Appointment of, 28
Applications under Arrears of Rent Act, 1882, 570
Kerry Sub-Commission, 949, 950
Marquess of Clanricarde's Tenants, 1632
Ireland—Irish Land Commission—Sub-Commissioners—Questions
Appeals from, 1628
Cavan, 578
Galway, 1743
Longford Co., 384
Newton, Mr. Philips, 37
Waterford Co., 522, 897
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Irish Crown Solicitorships, 1319
Jury Panel, Dublin, 30, 400
M'Farlane, Mr. J. F. L., J.P., 24, 942
Patrick Joyce and Patrick Casey, Execution of, 44
Sentence on James M'Claskey, 37
Threatening Letters—John J. Regan, 1635
Wicklow Assizes, Convictions at, 890
Ireland—Law and Police—Questions
Belfast Police, 1328
Conduct of the Police, 392
Dublin Metropolitan Police, 525
Special Resident Magistrates and the Constabulary, 573
Ireland—Magistracy—Questions
Carson, Mr. William, 1621
King's County, 1102
Ireland—National Education—Questions
Commissioners of—Vote for Model Schools, 775;—Mr. Owen Ryan, Assistant Teacher in the Belfast National School, 10, 1320
Model Schools, 953, 954
Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
Appointment of Medical Officer to the Cashel Dispensary District, 387
Belfast Workhouse, 944;—Irregularities in Book-keeping, 391
Donegal Workhouse — Roman Catholic Chaplain, 25
Dunfanaghy Workhouse, 393, 1327
John Flanagan, a Lunatic, Case of, 43, 888
Limerick Board of Guardians — State-Aided Emigration, 951
Lurgan Workhouse, 1480
Outdoor Relief, 521, 522;—Dunfanaghy Board of Guardians, 394, 1640
Patrick Kennedy, Case of, 225
Poor Law Elections, 574
Rathdown Guardians, 893

[cont,

[cont,

Trevelyan, Right Hon. G. O.—*cont.*
Ireland—Poor Law—Election of Guardians—Questions
Carrick-on-Shannon Union, 34
Castleblayney—Papers, 23
Clifden Union, 1906
Kildysart, 580
Leitrim Co. 577
Longford Co., 771
Mallow, 1483, 1484
Shillelagh Union, 889
Ireland—Prevention of Crime Act, 1882—Questions
Compensation Clause—Murder of Mr. W. M. Bourke, 1482
Extra Police at Ballinalough and Kiltully, 1742
King's Co., Proclaimed Districts—Extra Police, 1101
O'Neill, Mr., of Rathfoland, 1637
Sec. 12—John O'Connor, Case of, 948
Sec. 14—Police Searches, 31, 32, 52, 397, 398, 399, 524, 525
Sec. 16—Private Examinations, 223, 224, 233, 234, 415, 416, 417
Seizure of the "Kerry Sentinel," 784, 785, 965, 967, 971
Ireland — Royal Irish Constabulary — Questions
Employment in Cultivating Farms of Evicted Tenants, 392
Sub-Inspector Smith, 399, 937, 1481
Suicide of a Constable, 33
Suicide of Sub-Constable Coleman, 938
Tearing down National League Placards, 42
Ireland, State of—Questions
Agrarian Outrages at Miltown Milbay, Co. Clare, 226
Constabulary, 952
Crime, Decrease of—Withdrawal of Extra Police, 572, 573
Extra Police (Tipperary), 575
Police Protection at Rathfoland, Co. Clare, 947
Labourers (Ireland), 2R. 1252
Parliament—Alleged Candidature of Mr. Sub-Commissioner Wylie, 939
Business of the House—Labourers (Ireland) Bill, 1760, 1761
United States—Irish Emigrants, 1651

Truro, Lord
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1610
Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner—Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1194

Trust Funds (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. James Stewart, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Crum*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 8 [Bill 180]

Turkey
Asiatic Provinces—Governorship of the Lebanon, Questions, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. O'Donnell; Answers, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 10, 402
The New Tariff, Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice *May* 24, 783
[See title *Treaty of Berlin*]

Tyler, Sir H. W., *Harwich*
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Supply of Flour for the Troops, 1902

Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. George Russell, Mr. Edward Stanhope*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 183]
Read 2° * *May* 22
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 29, 1188; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck*); after short debate, Question put; A. 33, N. 44; M. 11 (D. L. 107)
Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Onslow*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. George Russell*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned

United States—Irish Emigrants
Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Trevelyan *June* 4, 1650

Vaccination Acts
Calf Lymph, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *May* 22, 697
Prosecutions — Bristol, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *June* 5, 1740

Vaccination—Syphilitic Infection
Questions, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answers, Sir Charles W. Dilke *June* 7, 1918

Vivian, Mr. A. P., *Cornwall, W.*
Parliament—House of Commons—Ventilation of the Committee Rooms, 1912

Waddy, Mr. S. D., *Edinburgh*
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1692

Wales (South) — Maintenance of Main Roads
Question, Mr. H. G. Allen; Answer, Sir Charles W. Dilke *June* 7, 1904

Warton, Mr. C. N., *Bridport*
Constabulary and Police (Ireland) (Pay and Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1442; Schedule 2, Amendt. 1446, 1448, 1450, 1452
Contagious Diseases Acts, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 72
Customs and Inland Revenue, 3R. 728
East India (Financial Statement), Res. 723
Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland), 2R. 880
Law and Police—Wandsworth Police Court, 886
Medals, 2R. 877
Mercantile Marine—Passing Tolls Act—Collection of the Light Dues, 699

[cont.

Warton, Mr. C. N.—*cont.*
Parliament—Half-past Twelve o'Clock Rule—Blocking, 1750, 1752
Order—Surrey (Trial of Causes) Bill, 320
Parliament—Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2008
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. Amendt. 1651
Post Office—Parcels Post, 886
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham), 2R. 1201
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (No. 2), 2R. 729
Supply—County Court Buildings, 635
Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 436
Land Commissioners for England, 1389
Lighthouses Abroad, 1367
Metropolitan Police Court Buildings, 637, 638
New Courts of Justice, &c. 655
Public Offices Site, 608
Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 631
Surveys of the United Kingdom, 659
Theatres Regulation, 2R. 340
Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1188

Waterford, Marquess of
Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882—Sec. 17—Annual Drainage Instalments, 14, 15
Irish Land Commission (Sub-Commissioners)—Messrs. Nolan and Smith, 369
Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Act, 1882—Compensations, Motion for Papers, 1466, 1476

Waterlow, Sir S. H., *Gravesend*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Foot-and-Mouth Disease — Metropolitan Cattle Market, 943
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. *cl.* 13, 502

Water Provisional Orders (Blandford District Water, &c.) Bill—*Formerly* **Gas and Water Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill**
(*Mr. John Holms, Mr. Chamberlain*)
c. Read 2° * *May* 21 [Bill 166]
Report * *June* 1
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Sudeley*) *June* 5 (No. 77)

Watkin, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Parliament—Standing Orders, Res. 1873
Southport Foreshore, Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 249
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Buildings of, 433, 441, 442, 444

Watson, Lord
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1081

Waugh, Mr. E., *Cockermouth*
Supply—Land Commissioners for England, &c. 1385

WAYS AND MEANS (Questions)
Inland Revenue
Cultivation of Tobacco, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 10, 420
Excise Permits, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 24, 774
Income Tax — Assessment of Profits made Abroad, Questions, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, Mr. Macfarlane, Sir R. Assheton Cross; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, 22
Income Tax on Foreign Investments, Questions, Mr. Macfarlane; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 31, 1333; *June* 5, 1741
Income Tax (Ireland)—Drumduff, Co. Leitrim, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 22, 698
The Financial Statement—The Railway Duties, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 4, 1650

Wemyss, Earl of
Army (Auxiliary Forces), 1610
Metropolitan Improvements—Hyde Park Corner—Re-erection of the Wellington Statue, 1293
Representative Peers (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1080; *cl.* 8, 1087, 1090

Western Islands of the Pacific—Australian Colonies—Annexation of New Guinea by Queensland
Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, Mr. Courtney *May* 10, 382; Questions, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Lewis; Answers, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 31, 1334
Further Correspondence relating to New Guinea (in continuation of [C.—1566] of July 1876) *May* 25, 881; Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, The Earl of Derby

West Indies (Jamaica)
Exports and Imports, 1851 *to* 1882, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 28, 961
Jamaica and the Leeward Islands—The Commission of Inquiry, Question, Captain Price; Answer, Mr. Evelyn Ashley *May* 28, 947

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1509
Parliament—Standing Committee on Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures, Res. 2013

Whitley, Mr. E., *Liverpool*
Corn Sales, 2R. 1716
East India — Code of Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, 1634
Lands Clauses (Umpire), 2R. 1192
Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1680
Supply—Judicature Acts—New Rules, 1335
Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 623

Wiggin, Mr. H., *Staffordshire, E.*
Factory and Workshop Act (1878) Amendment, 2R. 353

Wills, Mr. W. H., *Coventry*
- Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Case of John Rafferty, 770

Windsor, Ascot, and Aldershot Railway Bill (by Order)
- c. Moved, "That the Bill be now considered" (*Mr. Dodds*) *May* 24, 749
- Amendt. to leave out "now considered," add "re-committed to the former Committee" (*Viscount Folkestone*); Question proposed, "That 'now considered,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived
- Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
- Report of Select Comm. *May* 31, 1296
- Moved, "That the Report do lie upon the Table" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); after debate, Question put, and agreed to; Report to be printed
- Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be taken into consideration upon Thursday" (*Viscount Folkestone*) *June* 5, 1739
- Amendt. to leave out "upon Thursday," insert "To-morrow" (*Sir Gabriel Goldney*) *v.*; Question put, "That 'upon Thursday,' &c.;" A. 37, N. 73; M. 36 (D. L. 116)
- Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
- Moved, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered" *June* 6, 1809
- Amendt. to leave out "now considered," add "re-committed to the former Committee" (*Viscount Folkestone*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That 'now considered,' &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to
- Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill considered

Wolff, Sir H. D., *Portsmouth*
- Agricultural Holdings (England)—Leaseholders in Urban Districts, 1923, 1924
- Commissioners of Woods and Forests—The New Forest, 1905
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Questions
  - Motion for the Adjournment of the House, 62
  - Non-enforcement of Compulsory Examination—Withdrawal of the Police—Action of the Government, 401
  - Protection of Women and Young Persons, 584
- Convict Prisons—Pay and Position of Warders—Report of the Committee, 771
- Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, 1631
- Egypt—Hassam Bey Sadyk, 950
  - Military Expedition—Military Hospitals in Cyprus, 1929
- Inland Revenue (Circular), Res. 1511, 1514
- Law and Justice—Court of Criminal Appeal—Opinion of the Judges, 1306

[*cont.*

Wolff, Sir H. D.—*cont.*
- Magistracy (England and Wales)—Portsmouth Borough Magistracy, 755, 756, 1478, 1479
- Navy—Questions
  - Dockyards—Shipwrights, 886
  - First Class Petty Officers, 889
  - Warrant Officers, 756
- Papal See—Diplomatic Communications with the Vatican—Mr. Errington, 767, 768, 769, 953, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1488, 1990
- Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 535, 1648
- Spain—Expulsion of certain Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar, 546, 549
- Supply, 981
  - Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1417, 1418, 1420, 1425
  - County Court Buildings, 632, 633
  - New Courts of Justice, &c. 645, 658
  - Public Offices Site, 604
  - Revenue Department Buildings, Great Britain, 611, 614
  - Science and Art Department, 677, 681
  - Surveys of the United Kingdom, 660, 666
- Treaty of Berlin—Article V.—Religious Liberty in Bulgaria, 758

Woodall, Mr. W., *Stoke-on-Trent*
- Theatres Regulation, 2R. 340

Woods and Forests, Commissioners of—The New Forest
- Question, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 7, 1905

Wortley, Mr. C. B. Stuart-, *Sheffield*
- Friendly, &c. Societies (Nominations), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1192
- Parliament—Business of the House, Ministerial Statement, 1108
- Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices), 2R. 1666
- Union of Benefices Act (1860) Amendment, Comm. 1190

Wyndham, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
- Supply—Public Buildings in Great Britain and the Isle of Man, &c. 458; Amendt. 459, 460

York, Archbishop of
- Cathedral Statutes, 2R. 1735

Yorke, Mr. J. R., *Gloucestershire, E.*
- City of London Livery Companies Commission, 1308
- Parliament—House of Commons—Ventilation of the Committee Rooms, 1913

END OF VOLUME CCLXXIX., AND FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1883.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

BIBL. LONDIN UNIV.